



Legislature of Ontario Debates

Tuesday, March 11, 1978 – Friday, May 2, 1978



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, March 11, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, March 11, 1975, being the first day of the fifth session of the 29th Parliament of the Province of Ontario, for the despatch of business pursuant to a proclamation of the Honourable Pauline M. McGibbon, Lieutenant Governor of the Province.

TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1975

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, having entered the House and being seated upon the throne, was pleased to open the session with the following gracious speech.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Hon. Pauline M. McGibbon (Lieutenant Governor): Mr. Speaker and members of the legislative assembly, for the first time in many years the long prevailing prosperity and buoyant growth of the Province of Ontario have been challenged. Because of unprecedented inflation abroad and here in Canada and because of world recession, Ontario is presently confronted by economic conditions which will call for strong and decisive response from the people and their government.

From the people we must have moderation and restraint in the pricing of goods and services and in wage contract negotiations to help stem these inflationary pressures and maintain our competitive position in world markets.

From government, my ministers in their several responsibilities will place before you a number of measures that will be responsive to present economic conditions. The budget, which will be presented on April 7, will indicate clearly the government's response in areas relating to provincial economic and fiscal policy.

As would be expected, the province's financial requirements will be substantial but well within our capacity. Nevertheless, while my ministers will both practise and urge restraint, they do not intend to follow a policy of retrenchment.

For many prosperous years successive governments of Ontario have enjoyed buoyant revenues which have allowed us to achieve our priorities. In the last two consecutive years the publicly held debt has been reduced. It is now a time to invest in a determined effort to lessen the impact of current economic forces upon the Ontario people,

to maintain the high standards of services already provided, to improve the level of personal security and to encourage individual opportunity wherever government participation and initiative can be productive.

Ontario cannot stand still. It will continue to fulfil its accustomed role within the Canadian nation, which is that of a progressive, compassionate and innovative society with a standard of living and a quality of life unequalled on the North American continent.

For many years our labour force has enjoyed the highest wages in Canada. In many important areas these are now higher than in the United States. Social Services and provisions for the aged and the handicapped in this province have traditionally surpassed those of Ontario's sister provinces.

Investor confidence in Ontario today remains strong; the province continues to benefit in its financial transactions abroad from the highest credit ratings available.

Last year, Ontario's real economic growth, after discounting inflation, was approximately 3.5 per cent, compared to one per cent for Germany, -0.5 per cent for the United Kingdom, -2.2 per cent for the United States and -3.3 per cent for Japan.

My ministers await with interest and concern the ultimate determination of the government of Canada with respect to immigration policy. Ontario has been enriched beyond measure by those who have come to this province from all parts of the world, representing a wide and welcome diversity of languages, cultures and races. Indeed, of all immigrants who come to this country, this province is the first choice of more than 75 per cent of New Canadians as their preferred destination for beginning a new life in Canada. These new Canadians seek what citizens of this province have come to regard as major characteristics of life in Ontario—security and opportunity.

With respect to these and many other advantages which our province holds, the government is resolved to give leadership, and introduce legislation and policies which will

maintain the role and place of Ontario in Confederation.

Notwithstanding the present economic climate, the government of Ontario is determined to expand upon the benefits and advantages now enjoyed by the citizens of this province:

The government will seek the co-operation of law enforcement agencies and the general public so that our cities and streets will remain among the safest and most secure in North America;

It will strengthen the security and well-being of the elderly through the delivery of extended benefits and services;

It will maintain Ontario's leadership in the field of education to ensure that our youth have access to our learning and training institutions to allow them the fullest possible development of their potential;

The government will further encourage home ownership so that Ontario families may continue to be the best housed in Canada;

It is the right of all Ontario citizens to aspire to productive careers in occupations which satisfy their interests and abilities. To do so, both government and industry must make greater efforts to eliminate discrimination in career opportunities which now exists between men and women. It will be the deliberate policy of the government of Ontario to find greater opportunities for women within its public service and to find means to encourage this in the private sector;

Measures will be introduced to provide Ontario farmers with reasonable assurance of the profitable, continuing operation of their vital enterprise;

As a safeguard against the growing complexity of government and its relationship with the individual citizen, the government will establish the office of a provincial ombudsman—or ombudsperson—to ensure the protection of our citizens against arbitrary judgement or practices;

My ministers will take appropriate steps to compensate those whose social benefits have been discounted by inflation;

The government will take further measures to control administrative costs and to examine with greater scrutiny its programmes and activities in order to set a leading example of prudence and economy in the management of its affairs. It will continue to limit the civil service establishment to 1974 levels.

Mesdames et Messieurs les Honorables membres de cette Assemblée, quel que soit le défi que les conditions économiques actuelles

puissent poser, le gouvernement de l'Ontario demeure convaincu que son programme législatif dans cette session, ainsi que son budget, contribueront fortement à raffermir l'économie de notre province, à renforcer la sécurité et le bien-être de la population et à encourager chaque citoyen de l'Ontario à poursuivre une vie active et productive, dont dépend en définitive la prospérité soutenue de notre province.

Hon. members, however challenging the present economic conditions, the government of Ontario holds every confidence that its legislative programme in this session, together with the budget, will contribute substantially to the improvement of the provincial economy, strengthen the security and well-being of our people, and give incentive to every citizen in Ontario to pursue active, productive lives upon which the continued prosperity of our province ultimately depends.

In our Sovereign's name, I thank you.
God bless the Queen and Canada.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor was then pleased to retire from the chamber.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: To prevent mistakes, I have obtained a copy of Her Honour's speech, which I will now read.

(Reading dispensed with.)

JURIES AMENDMENT ACT, 1975

Hon. Mr. Welch, on behalf of hon. Mr. Clement, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Juries Act, 1974.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor to this House be taken into consideration on Thursday next.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that in accordance with the recent practice, and until further order, this House will not sit in the chamber on Wednesdays.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3:20 o'clock, p.m.

APPENDIX

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

(117 members)

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Parliament

Speaker: Hon. Russell Daniel Rowe

Clerk of the House: Roderick Lewis, QC

Member	Party	Constituency
Allan, James N.	PC	Haldimand-Norfolk
Apps, C. J. S.	PC	Kingston and the Islands
Auld, Hon. James A. C.	PC	Leeds
Bales, Dalton A.	PC	York Mills
Beckett, Dick	PC	Brantford
Belanger, J. Albert	PC	Prescott and Russell
Bennett, Hon. Claude	PC	Ottawa South
Bernier, Hon. Leo	PC	Kenora
Birch, Hon. Margaret	PC	Scarborough East
Bounsall, Ted	NDP	Windsor West
Braithwaite, Leonard A.	L	Etobicoke
Breithaupt, James R.	L	Kitchener
Brunelle, Hon. Rene	PC	Cochrane North
Bullbrook, James E.	L	Sarnia
Burr, Fred A.	NDP	Sandwich-Riverside
Campbell, Margaret	L	St. George
Carruthers, Alex	PC	Durham
Carton, Gordon R.	PC	Armourdale
Cassidy, Michael	NDP	Ottawa Centre
Clement, Hon. John T.	PC	Niagara Falls
Davis, Hon. William G.	PC	Peel North
Davison, Norm	NDP	Hamilton Centre
Deacon, Donald M.	L	York Centre
Deans, Ian	NDP	Wentworth
Downer, Rev. A. W.	PC	Dufferin-Simcoe
Drea, Frank	PC	Scarborough Centre
Dukszta, Dr. Jan	NDP	Parkdale
Dymond, Dr. Matthew B.	PC	Ontario
Eaton, Robert G.	PC	Middlesex South
Edighoffer, Hugh	L	Perth
Evans, D. Arthur	PC	Simcoe Centre
Ewen, Donald Wm.	PC	Wentworth North
Ferrier, Rev. William	NDP	Cochrane South
Foulds, James F.	NDP	Port Arthur
Gaunt, Murray	L	Huron-Bruce
Germa, Melville C.	NDP	Sudbury
Gilbertson, Bernt	PC	Algoma
Gisborn, Reg.	NDP	Hamilton East
Givens, Philip G.	L	York-Forest Hill
Good, Edward R.	L	Waterloo North
Grossman, Hon. Allan	PC	St. Andrew-St. Patrick

Member	Party	Constituency
Haggerty, Ray	L	Welland South
Hamilton, Maurice	PC	Renfrew North
Handleman, Hon. Sidney B.	PC	Carleton
Havrot, Edward M.	PC	Timiskaming
Henderson, Lorne C.	PC	Lambton
Hodgson, R. Glen	PC	Victoria-Haliburton
Hodgson, William	PC	York North
Irvine, Hon. Donald R.	PC	Grenville-Dundas
Jessiman, James H.	PC	Fort William
Johnston, Robert M.	PC	St. Catharines
Kennedy, R. Douglas	PC	Peel South
Kerr, George A.	PC	Halton West
Lane, John	PC	Algoma-Manitoulin
Laughren, Floyd	NDP	Nickel Belt
Lawlor, Patrick D.	NDP	Lakeshore
Leluk, Nicholas G.	PC	Humber
Lewis, Stephen	NDP	Scarborough West
MacBeth, Hon. John P.	PC	York West
MacDonald, Donald C.	NDP	York South
Maeck, Lorne	PC	Perry Sound
Martel, Elie W.	NDP	Sudbury East
McIlveen, Dr. Charles E.	PC	Oshawa
McKeough, Hon. W. Darcy	PC	Chatham-Kent
McNeil, Ronald K.	PC	Elgin
McNie, Hon. Jack	PC	Hamilton West
Meen, Hon. Arthur K.	PC	York East
Miller, Hon. Frank S.	PC	Muskoka
Morningstar, Ellis P.	PC	Welland
Morrow, Donald H.	PC	Ottawa West
Newman, Bernard	L	Windsor-Walkerville
Newman, Hon. William	PC	Ontario South
Nixon, George	PC	Dovercourt
Nixon, Robert F.	L	Brant
Nuttall, Dr. W. J.	PC	Frontenac-Addington
Parrott, Dr. Harry C.	PC	Oxford
Paterson, Donald A.	L	Essex South
Potter, M.D., Hon. Richard T.	PC	Quinte
Reid, T. Patrick	L-Lab	Rainy River
Reilly, Leonard M.	PC	Eglinton
Renwick, James A.	NDP	Riverdale
Reuter, Allan E.	PC	Waterloo South
Rhodes, Hon. John R.	PC	Sault Ste. Marie
Riddell, John	L	Huron
Rollins, Clarke T.	PC	Hastings
Root, John	PC	Wellington-Dufferin
Rowe, Hon. Russell D.	PC	Northumberland
Roy, Albert J.	L	Ottawa East
Ruston, Richard F.	L	Essex-Kent
Samis, George	NDP	Stormont
Sargent, Edward	L	Grey-Bruce
Scrivener, Mrs. Margaret	PC	St. David
Shulman, Dr. Morton	NDP	High Park

Member	Party	Constituency
Singer, Vernon M.	L	Downsview
Smith, Gordon E.	PC	Simcoe East
Smith, John R.	PC	Hamilton Mountain
Smith, Richard S.	L	Nipissing
Snow, Hon. James W.	PC	Halton East
Spence, John P.	L	Kent
Stewart, Hon. Wm. A.	PC	Middlesex North
Stokes, Jack E.	NDP	Thunder Bay
Taylor, P.	L	Carleton East
Taylor, James A.	PC	Prince Edward-Lennox
Timbrell, Hon. Dennis R.	PC	Don Mills
Turner, John M.	PC	Peterborough
Villeneuve, Osie F.	PC	Glengarry
Walker, Gordon W.	PC	London North
Wardle, Thomas A.	PC	Beaches-Woodbine
Welch, Hon. Robert	PC	Lincoln
Wells, Hon. Thomas L.	PC	Scarborough North
White, Hon. John	PC	London South
Winkler, Hon. Eric A.	PC	Grey South
Wiseman, Douglas J.	PC	Lanark
Worton, Harry	L	Wellington South
Yakubski, Paul J.	PC	Renfrew South
Yaremko, John	PC	Bellwoods
Young, Fred	NDP	Yorkview

MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

HON. WILLIAM G. DAVIS	<i>Premier and President of the Council</i>
HON. ROBERT WELCH	<i>Minister of Culture and Recreation</i>
HON. ALLAN GROSSMAN	<i>Provincial Secretary for Resources Development</i>
HON. WILLIAM A. STEWART	<i>Minister of Agriculture and Food</i>
HON. JAMES A. C. AULD	<i>Minister of Colleges and Universities</i>
HON. RENE BRUNELLE	<i>Minister of Community and Social Services</i>
HON. THOMAS L. WELLS	<i>Minister of Education</i>
HON. JOHN WHITE	<i>Minister without Portfolio</i>
HON. LEO BERNIER	<i>Minister of Natural Resources</i>
HON. ERIC A. WINKLER	<i>Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet</i>
HON. JAMES W. SNOW	<i>Minister of Government Services</i>
HON. RICHARD T. POTTER	<i>Minister of Correctional Services</i>
HON. JOHN T. CLEMENT	<i>Provincial Secretary for Justice and Attorney General; acting Solicitor General</i>
HON. JACK MCNIE	<i>Minister without Portfolio</i>
HON. MARGARET BIRCH	<i>Provincial Secretary for Social Development</i>
HON. CLAUDE BENNETT	<i>Minister of Industry and Tourism</i>
HON. W. DARCY MCKEOUGH	<i>Treasurer of Ontario, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs</i>
HON. ARTHUR K. MEEN	<i>Minister of Revenue</i>
HON. WILLIAM NEWMAN	<i>Minister of the Environment</i>
HON. SIDNEY B. HANDLEMAN	<i>Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations</i>
HON. FRANK S. MILLER	<i>Minister of Health</i>
HON. JOHN R. RHODES	<i>Minister of Transportation and Communications</i>
HON. DONALD R. IRVINE	<i>Minister of Housing</i>
HON. DENNIS R. TIMBRELL	<i>Minister of Energy</i>
HON. JOHN P. MACBETH	<i>Minister of Labour</i>

PARLIAMENTARY ASSISTANTS

Mr. John R. Smith (Assistant to the Minister of Education)
 Mr. Leonard M. Reilly (Assistant to the Minister of Industry and Tourism)
 Mr. Gordon W. Walker (Assistant to the Minister of Health)
 Mr. Robert G. Eaton (Assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food)
 Mr. Dick Beckett (Assistant to the Treasurer and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs)
 Mr. D. Arthur Evans (Assistant to the Minister of Energy)
 Mr. Lorne Maeck (Assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources)
 Dr. Harry C. Parrott (Assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities)
 Mrs. Margaret Scrivener (Assistant to the Minister of Housing)
 Mr. Frank Drea (Assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations)
 Mr. John M. Turner (Assistant to the Provincial Secretary for Justice and Attorney General, and acting Solicitor General)
 Mr. Nicholas G. Leluk (Assistant to the Minister of Culture and Recreation)
 Dr. Charles E. McIlveen (Assistant to the Minister of Transportation and Communications)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 11, 1975

Speech from the Throne, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor	3
Juries Amendment Act, 1975, Mr. Welch, first reading	4
Motion re Wednesday sittings, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	4
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Davis, agreed to	4
Appendix: Alphabetical list of the members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario ..	5



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, March 13, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 1975

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. J. H. Jessiman (Fort William): I am delighted to be able to bring to the attention of the House news of an event that took place last week in Fredericton, NB, when the Bill Tetley rink from Thunder Bay won the 1975 Canadian curling championship. This is the first time that the team from northwestern Ontario has won the Brier.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Northern Ontario, not northwestern.

Mr. Jessiman: Northwestern Ontario, sir. The team leaves this afternoon for Perth, Scotland, where it will be participating in the world's championship. The players are Bill Tetley, Rick Lang, Bill Hodgson and Peter Hnatiw. I am sure that everyone here would wish me to wish them success in the Silver Broom.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

ELECTRICAL POWER INQUIRY COMMISSION

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Mr. Speaker, on July 11, 1974, this government announced it would hold public hearings into the long-range planning of Ontario's electrical power system. At that time, it was stated that these hearings would be held by the Ontario Energy Board or the proposed Environmental Review Board or an independent commission.

I am able to announce today, sir, the government's decision to establish an independent commission of inquiry into the long-range planning of Ontario's power needs. The commission will focus on the broad conceptual consequences of alternative ways of supplying sufficient electrical power during the period 1983 to 1993.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): The provincial secretary will be dead then.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It will consider a wide—the member is dead now.

Mr. Sargent: Why doesn't the provincial secretary say something important and call the whole damn thing off?

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): Why doesn't the member listen? He might learn something.

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): He might learn something.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It will consider a wide range of social and economic factors, such as provincial planning policies; the impact of possible new generating stations and transmission corridors on the environment and farm lands; the economic base of, and social effects on, adjacent communities; commercial and residential energy requirements; industrial development; energy conservation and so on.

The commission will also examine more technical matters, including electrical load growth, system reliability, the management of heat discharge from generating stations, power pooling and linkages with neighbouring utilities, technology and the security of fuel supplies.

I wish to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that this special commission will be concerned more with broad planning principles and concepts than with narrow technical details. The public needs to know what demands for electricity will be placed upon Ontario Hydro in the long term, how these needs should be met and what impact this would have on Ontario's way of life and its physical environment.

The consequences of these policy decisions are so far-reaching and so directly affect the lives of Ontario citizens that we cannot make them hastily or arbitrarily. Consequently, the main thrust of the commission's activities will be the holding of public hearings throughout Ontario. It is possible these open discussions could take as long as two years to complete. We want to ensure that all relevant concerns and points of view are considered. These essential public hearings represent a significant step forward in

the open planning process to which this government is committed.

The commission will hold preliminary public hearings to define the issues which will subsequently be discussed in greater depth at the main hearings. The preliminary hearings should provide an educational forum and catalyst for later public participation and will enable the commission to establish procedures to be followed during the main hearings.

The need for such extensive public hearings is self-evident. Ontario Hydro is one of the world's largest electric power utilities. While it had assets in 1972 of about \$5.5 billion, by 1983—just eight years from now—these assets would exceed \$30 billion if Ontario Hydro's present plans are approved. A potential public investment of this magnitude and importance alone warrants widespread public involvement in directing its future growth.

While the commission's focal point is long-range planning, there are certain electrical power generating and transmission projects that Ontario Hydro considers it must initiate during the tenure of the commission. These projects include a generating station on the North Channel of Georgian Bay; extra-high voltage supply lines to Kitchener, London and the Ottawa-Cornwall area, and a second extra-high voltage transmission line out of the Bruce generating station.

It was previously announced that the hearing body into long-range planning would also be asked to consider and report on these short-range projects on a priority basis from the standpoint of need as well as from an environmental and socio-economic basis. However, we do not wish to unduly burden or delay the commission by bogging it down from the start with these projects. Consequently, the commission will be requested to consider and report only on the need for these particular projects.

If, however, further public hearings should be necessary to deal with specific aspects of transmission line routing or generating station location insofar as these projects are concerned, they will be assigned to some other appropriate body. This will ensure proper public examination of these projects while freeing the commission to proceed with its broader responsibilities.

I wish to stress, Mr. Speaker, that individuals and organizations throughout Ontario will be assured of ample opportunities to make their views known to the commission at the public hearings. In fact, we are taking this government's commitment to public participation in the planning process a major

step forward by providing funding for potential participants at the hearings. This funding of public involvement in the planning process is purely experimental. It is the first time such a direct step has been tried by this government.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): The first time in 32 years.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The commission will be allocated funds for distribution at its discretion to participants. Quite frankly, we do not know at this time how the commission will handle the delicate judgements as to which groups should receive financial assistance in preparing and making their presentations. This will be discussed in greater detail with the commission chairman.

The emphases on public hearings, open planning and the funding of participants all support the principles enunciated in Tuesday's Throne Speech to safeguard citizens against the growing complexity of government and its relationship with the individual, and to ensure their protection against arbitrary judgements.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): It's about time the government realized that.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): It's too late.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): What about arbitrary policies?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): What about arbitrary ministers?

Mr. Lewis: It's all over. In fact, the government caused the problem.

Mr. Cassidy: They are the problem.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister will continue.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Members opposite don't like it, do they?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It must be all right; it's making members over there unhappy.

Mr. Lewis: No, I am pleased the minister came in. I have some questions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why doesn't the member sound like he's pleased?

Mr. Lawlor: It shows we listen to the minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The commission will report its findings and recommendations to

the government through the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. The government will establish policy guidelines, based upon these recommendations, for planning Ontario Hydro's growth and the power needs of Ontario for the remainder of this century.

I am also pleased to announce, sir, at this time that the government has been successful in attracting an eminent international engineer and scientific scholar to serve as chairman of the commission. He is Dr. Arthur Porter, professor of industrial engineering at the University of Toronto and current chairman of the Canadian Environmental Advisory Council.

Dr. Porter was educated at the University of Manchester and subsequently completed his post-doctorate work at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Mr. Lewis: That's not doing badly.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He is perhaps the first scholar to inaugurate three new university chairs in three different subjects—instrument technology at the Royal Military College of Science in England; light electrical engineering at Imperial College, University of London; and in 1961, industrial engineering at the University of Toronto.

Dr. Porter was co-builder of Europe's first analogue computer. In fact, he is honoured in having his master and doctoral theses on this subject displayed in London's celebrated Science Museum.

Dr. Porter came to Canada in 1949 as head of the research division of Ferranti Electric Ltd., Toronto. He was later dean of engineering at the University of Saskatchewan. He chaired Ontario's Committee on Automation and Employment in the mid-1960s, was deeply involved with Expo '67 as chairman of the Committee on Science and Medicine, and subsequently was appointed by the federal government as first chairman of the Canadian Environmental Advisory Council. His outstanding achievements as a scientist and scholar, including the authorship of three specialized books, earned him the distinction in 1970 of becoming one of the few engineers to be accepted as a Fellow in the Royal Society of Canada.

We are, Mr. Speaker, most pleased that Dr. Porter has accepted the challenge of devoting so much of his time and energies to the long hours of hearings, travel and deliberations this commission will require.

Mr. Lewis: That is a first-rate appointment, by the way.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will shortly announce the names of the other members of the commission who will be selected in consultation with Dr. Porter.

Mr. Speaker, these hearings may well be the most important in this decade. The sheer scope of factors and values embraced in a public debate on long-term planning should involve all aspects of Ontario's future—economic, social, environmental, agricultural, urban planning, industrial growth and so on. The hearings should also bring into public focus basic philosophies about much of the kind of life we want for the next century and what price we are prepared to pay for its achievement.

MERCURY LEVELS IN ONTARIO WATER

Hon. W. Newman (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform this House that significant reduction has been achieved in the mercury levels in fish specimens sampled and analysed from 1970 to 1974. I am tabling for the hon. members the results of a sampling programme carried out in the English-Wabigoon and St. Clair river systems.

We have found improvements which show mercury levels 40 per cent below 1970 levels and, while those are still not acceptable for a general full restoration of commercial fishing, some specimens from the lakes sampled showed levels within the acceptable 0.5 parts per million level.

My colleague, the hon. Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier), advises me that his ministry will continue to monitor test results of mercury levels in fish during the next few months to determine which species and which lakes can be reopened for commercial fishing by the native people.

This weekend, a team of Japanese experts will begin a 10-day visit to Canada at the invitation of the National Indian Brotherhood. My ministry, as well as other provincial ministries and federal agencies, has been invited to exchange information and to discuss mercury contamination with the visitors from Japan. These scientists have worked on, and carried out research into the world's worst contamination experience at Minimata. We welcome this opportunity to work with the National Indian Brotherhood, which has demonstrated its concern by conscientious work on the problem, and those medical scientists with first-hand experience in the health and engineering problems related to mercury. We will be pleased to advise the

hon. members of the outcome of this exchange.

The government's programme of abatement and monitoring mercury discharges in our waters has been successful. Let me briefly summarize our programme and activities to date.

Since we first became aware of the hazard and the extent of mercury contamination in the province in the late 1960s, this government initiated an all-out programme to determine the public health hazard and to provide effective control of mercury in our water. Our prime concern then, as now, was the well-being of every resident of this province whose health, comfort and livelihood may be affected.

Through the Ministry of the Environment control orders imposed since 1970, my ministry has effectively eliminated the flow of mercury in industrial effluents. By the end of this year not an ounce of mercury will be entering the St. Clair and English-Wabigoon river systems from any industrial source.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): What about compensation for the past?

Hon. W. Newman: In co-operation with the federal fisheries agency of Environment Canada, we have constantly monitored and analysed the mercury levels of fish in the affected waters. As I stated earlier, the data we are receiving indicates a notable reduction since 1970. The Ministry of Health has been monitoring the blood levels of the residents in the affected areas.

I am pleased to provide this new analytical data and I hope it will assist all those interested in seeking and finding a satisfactory ultimate solution to these conditions.

TRIBUTE TO REV. MARTIN W. PINKER

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to an outstanding resident of Ontario, whose unflinching public service over two decades has been cut short by illness.

I regret to have to announce to the Legislature the resignation from the minister's advisory council on the treatment of the offender of its first chairman, Rev. Martin W. Pinker, OBE, truly one of the most distinguished leaders of the movement for correctional reform in Canada.

I know that members on all sides of the House will join with me in wishing Mr. Pinker well as he recovers at his Willowdale

home from the heart attack which he recently suffered.

Mr. Pinker joined the then Department of Reform Institutions in 1958, having already gained an international reputation in the field of correctional rehabilitation. The previous year his work had been recognized by the award of the Order of the British Empire by Her Majesty the Queen, who upon learning of his departure for Canada, sent him a personal message of good wishes for his success here.

Canada's gain has been England's loss. Mr. Pinker has been a director of the Central Aftercare Association and general secretary of the National Association of Discharged Prisoners Aid Societies for England and Wales, and from 1951 onward he has been a regular visitor to the USA and Canada.

In 1952 he went to Germany at the request of the United Nations high commissioner to investigate the problems of young displaced persons who were incarcerated in German prisons and to advise on aftercare procedures for them. As we prepare to receive the fifth United Nations Conference on Prevention of Crime and treatment of offenders in Toronto this September, we are losing the services of a man who attended the first such world meeting in Geneva in 1955, and had much to do with the preparations in Ontario for the second in 1960.

Mr. Pinker, as head of men's aftercare for the British prison system for some 20 years, was actively associated with penal reform within the United Nations, the American Congress of Corrections, and the International Prisoners Aid Association of which he was president in 1954.

When the member for Ontario (Mr. Dymond) was Minister of Reform Institutions in 1957, he determined to set up an advisory council along the lines of that established by the British Home Secretary in 1944, and he wanted Mr. Pinker as its chairman. After a short period as chairman of the Training Schools Advisory Board, Mr. Pinker became the first chairman of MACTO in November, 1959, when the body was established by order-in-council.

The then Premier, Hon. Leslie M. Frost, called the first meeting of MACTO in the executive council room and told the members: "You are going to advise the minister. There will be no holds barred in looking at these things, to enable you to find solutions and ways."

For 15 years, first as chairman and latterly as a most active member, Rev. Martin Pinker, OBE, has seen that MACTO's tradition of

fearless independent thought and advice has been upheld.

Mr. Speaker, let Hansard record the tribute of this government and this Legislature, as he now steps down with reluctance, but with a determination to continue to advise me by mail from the considerable depth of his wisdom and knowledge.

Mr. C. J. S. Apps (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, I hope I won't be called out of order if I add a few personal comments to the statement which the Minister of Correctional Services has just made.

Mr. Speaker: All right. I think with respect I should point out that the substance is not really the material for a statement at this time. It should have been done before the orders of the day but, since it has been made, we'll allow the hon. member to put his addendum on it.

Mr. Apps: What I wanted to do was to make a personal comment to the statement of the Minister of Correctional Services in that Rev. Martin Pinker was chairman of MACTO during my three years as Minister of Correctional Services.

I would like to say to the members of the Legislature that during that period of time he made a tremendous contribution to our ministry. He was a very kind, sympathetic, enthusiastic and competent chairman of MACTO. I would like to say thank you to him for the help that he was to me, and to wish him all the best and hope that his recovery is complete and comes along very soon. Thank you.

OTOPLASTY REINSTATED AS OHIP BENEFIT

Hon. F. S. Miller (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, recently an OHIP bulletin was released on a routine basis eliminating otoplasty, an operation to straighten a person's ears, as an OHIP benefit because it was cosmetic surgery.

Our previous policy, which paid for this procedure for young children but not adults, had been appealed successfully by an adult who had been denied the benefit.

As a result of my review of the decision, I have requested that otoplasty be reinstated as an insured benefit. We will shortly be advising physicians and hospitals of this decision officially.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

ELECTRICAL POWER INQUIRY COMMISSION

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have some clarification from the policy secretary for natural resources on his statement regarding the appointment of the royal commission on Hydro projects.

Since at least a major part of the proposals from Hydro were given approval in principle by the now Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), the former Minister of Energy, and since the vice-president of Hydro has indicated that he doesn't believe there should be public participation in Hydro's decision except a decade in advance, are we to presume from, let's say the central part of the minister's statement, where he said certain projects like the new atomic plant on the north shore of Lake Huron would not come under the ambit of this investigation, that in fact the next decade's work in Hydro will not come under the thorough review of the royal commission that, let's say, the total plan would have?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I think if the hon. member will read the statement he will find I did state they would be studied by the commission, there would be hearings, that they would be given top priority. However, unless it was proven to be absolutely necessary the commission would only deal with the need for the project, rather than any other aspects. That's merely from the standpoint of the priority of those particular projects referred to by my colleague in his statement, on July 11 I guess it was, and the statement which I made subsequent to that.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would this priority inquiry include looking into the matter of the Bradley Junction-Georgetown power line?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think, Mr. Speaker, the decision has already been made on that particular project. I am not too certain; with all of the different locations and transmission lines and so on, sometimes I'm apt to confuse one project with another. But if, in fact, the decision has not been made and hearings have not been held, it would be included. It seems to me on that particular project hearings have been held on that particular section, have they not?

Mr. Gaunt: Not as to the need.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have any further questions?

Mr. Gaunt: Supplementary: Since there have been no hearings as to the need for this particular line, wouldn't the minister agree this is vital with respect to this particular line, in view of the great public outcry in respect of the use of good agricultural land and other factors?

Hon. Mr. Crossman: Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to give an opinion on that particular area. I just want to make sure that when I give an answer we are talking about the same location. I'll look into that and advise the member.

Mr. Roy: The minister's only job is to read the statements he makes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

INVESTIGATIONS INTO DREDGING INDUSTRY

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, I would like to put a question to the Premier in the absence of the Attorney General and the Solicitor General and the Provincial Secretary of Justice (Mr. Clement). Has the government been involved in any of the investigations leading up to the charges on matters of collusion in the dredging industry in the province? And can the Premier straighten out what appears to be a difference of opinion as to the involvement of the OPP and possibly the municipal force in Hamilton?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Attorney General who is attending a meeting of Attorneys General at the moment, I have asked for this information and from the information I have received the OPP was not contacted by the RCMP with a request either to assist or to investigate the events that have been referred to.

Mr. Lewis: What?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Was it possible that there was a communication at a higher level, let us say either with the Attorney General's office or the Solicitor General's office, in this regard? Would the Premier be able to determine that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I haven't determined that, Mr. Speaker; all things are possible. As I say, I haven't discussed it with the Attorney General himself. This information came to me, I think, either Monday or Tuesday—at least I noticed it in the press and I asked for this report because I knew the Attorney

General was at this other meeting. While all things are possible I think it highly unlikely.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Supplementary question: It is obvious to everyone the OPP have been involved along the way. Would the Premier find out whether anyone approached the Ontario Provincial Police with regard to the necessity for an inquiry by them into the actions in the Hamilton harbour area in particular? If they did, would he then be prepared to make a statement as to how the OPP became involved and on the degree of involvement they've had during the course of the investigation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't know how it is so obvious that the OPP have been involved. As I say, my information, coming from the Deputy Solicitor General and coming from the OPP, is that they were not asked to be involved.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary on the Premier's answer: In view of the fact that the charges apparently are under the Criminal Code, which is clearly within the ambit of provincial jurisdiction, and the offences were committed in this province, did the Premier find out why the OPP or the local police in Hamilton were not in fact the ones carrying on this investigation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, of all the members in this House, I think the hon. member should totally understand that there are a number of cases under the Criminal Code which are prosecuted here in this province where we have the responsibility for the administration of justice. I think the hon. member knows full well that there are drug cases—

Mr. Roy: That's not under the code.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —there are other cases that are still part of the code and are investigated by the RCMP.

Mr. Roy: That's not under the code.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, there are, there are. I am just saying to the hon. member that from my information—and I emphasize that I have not discussed it with the Attorney General—from the information I have, the OPP was not in fact requested.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have a supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have a curious supplementary: Is the Premier not aware that the Solicitor General of Canada said quite

explicitly that the Ontario Provincial Police had been contacted by the RCMP, had examined the material, had indicated they were incapable of handling it, and that was part of the reason for the delay in the RCMP's eventual investigation? Is the Premier saying that Warren Allmand is simply wrong on his facts?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Yes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat what I have said—and I think that the Attorney General perhaps can enlighten the House to a greater extent because I am sure he has taken a look at it himself personally—I think it is conceivable that the Solicitor General of Canada could be wrong.

Mr. Lewis: That's very interesting on something like this.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'm just saying it could be. I don't know.

An hon. member: It won't be the first time.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, perhaps with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will put a new question to the Premier on the same subject.

Mr. Yakabuski: The Leader of the Opposition is in trouble.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Since this involves a cabinet minister in Ottawa and the Provincial Police force, we should really have a full statement—

Mr. Yakabuski: The Grits are in trouble. They are backing off.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —in which the facts of the case, from our point of view, can be put forward. Would the Premier undertake to provide that?

He indicates yes.

I would also like to ask the Premier if he is not concerned that one of the people indicated under the actions taken in the last 48 hours, I believe, is the president of C. A. Pitts, a firm that does extensive business with this province in many of our undertakings, the Arnprior dam being one of the lesser ones, I suppose. Has there been any evaluation of the tendering procedures used involving these principal companies in Canada, by way of the business they do with this province, in light of the information that has been made public?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition would repeat his question and say exactly what it is he wants me to say.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier can decide what he wants to say.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What is it he is trying to do? Is he trying to convict somebody before he has even come to trial? Is that what he is attempting to do?

Hon. D. R. Irvine (Minister of Housing): That's his attitude.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It's a little early to push that panic button.

Mr. G. Nixon: The Liberal leader goofed again. He goofed again.

Mr. Yakabuski: He is desperate these days.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Is that the member for Fort William who is heckling?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask the Premier if he is not concerned that this government gave a major contract to C. A. Pitts without a tender when it now appears that the president of that company is being indicted under charges having to do with a tendering procedure that is illegal.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, surely the Leader of the Opposition knows this much—and if he doesn't he should talk to his friend from Downsview or to the legal expert in all criminal matters seated right behind him—

Mr. Roy: It's obvious that the Premier is not an expert.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —that for me to answer his question when this firm and this man, amongst others, have been charged, I say would be totally irresponsible and I don't intend to answer it. I think it's a horrible question.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, I'd like to put a question—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier has defended the indefensible many times. He is probably doing it again.

Mr. Roy: He is all for law and order for everybody else.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to put a question—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: I think the hon. member for Renfrew South thinks it is a dastardly blow.

Mr. G. Nixon: Try again!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Leader of the Opposition will proceed with his questions.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is he trying to take the heat off?

Mr. Lewis: Come on!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Where is the Solicitor General?

Hon. Mr. Davis: He is at a meeting.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier speaks of the heat, but he put the heat on him. He dismissed him from his cabinet.

Mr. Roy: That's right. Talk about taking the heat off—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to put a question to the Minister of Education—

Hon. Mr. Davis: He resigned.

Mr. Roy: He resigned, yes; the Premier nudged him.

Mr. Lewis: This isn't very nice.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not nice at all.

SPENDING CEILINGS IN EDUCATION

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is the Minister of Education prepared to tell the House if there will be penalties levied by way of grants or any other procedure against those school boards which have decided to break the ceilings imposed by this government, or if he is prepared to reconsider his statements along those lines?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education will be prepared to make a statement on these matters in a very few days, but I can tell my friend that the ceilings policies of this government will remain.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Can he then explain to the House why his colleague,

the present Minister of Energy, said to a large public meeting of teachers and others that the ceiling policy was being phased out?

Hon. D. R. Timbrell (Minister of Energy): I did not say that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, he said it's on its last legs or it's in tatters or that it is no longer effective.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The Leader of the Opposition doesn't want me to start quoting back to him all the things that have been said by his friends about the Spadina Expressway, does he? My friend, the Minister of Energy, was merely talking about some time in the distant future when perhaps there would be a change in the way grants and financing of education are carried on in this province.

I would say to the Leader of the Opposition that I would be less than realistic if I didn't say there will probably be changes sometime in the future, because we are always looking for better ways to finance education. But I will also say to him that the policies of this government of raising grants and of having realistic ceilings have done more for the improvement of educational opportunity across this province than anything.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): That was pretty anaemic applause. It was lousy.

ONTARIO HYDRO SPENDING

Mr. Lewis: I have one question I would very much like to ask. May I begin by asking the policy minister on resources development what is he going to do about Ontario Hydro's assertion that it will cost them \$23.8 billion for 1974 to 1982—never mind the commission that starts in 1983—a 45 per cent error in estimate in one year? Last year they Hydro's assertion that it will cost them \$23.8 billion. How is the government going to bring Ontario Hydro's extreme growth ethic under control in the next eight years before they bankrupt the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, as far as the question of the so-called growth ethic of Ontario Hydro is concerned, that will be a proper matter for discussion before the hearings. As far as the control of other expenditures is concerned and matters relating to that, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that is

a proper question to be directed to the Minister of Energy.

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Energy: Just where is Hydro going to get \$23.8 billion, on which international market is the borrowing to be made and to what extent is the Province of Ontario going to underwrite that borrowing?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be impossible to say now, in March, 1975, where the best markets will be in 1976 or, for that matter, looking further ahead to 1982. I would have to say to the member that he realizes Hydro will be going before the Energy Board this year, as they will every year, to review their rates and review their plans. The Energy Board has commented, and does and will comment on those plans to the government and to Hydro.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: Does the minister think there is any sanity at all in the policy which Hydro is putting forward for the next eight or 10 years, in the absence of any effort to conserve energy? Does he agree with Mr. Taylor's speech on March 4 that part of the funding for this incredible capital expansion will have to come out of rate increases applied to individual consumers? How is the government going to control Ontario Hydro and maintain a stable economy in the next few years, if it doesn't become government policy rather than the OEB's?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I have to take exception to the member's suggestion that there is no effort to conserve energy. In point of fact, Ontario Hydro and the Ministry of Energy are very actively pursuing conservation and pushing it with industry and with the general public. I will have something more to say in a few weeks time on the next phase of the government's energy conservation programme.

Mr. Stokes: When did they disband their load building division?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: When the member for Thunder Bay is calmed down maybe I can finish.

The greatest control, Mr. Speaker, lies with the individual consumers in this province, be they residential or industrial, and we are actively pursuing this.

Mr. Martel: Put another sweater on. Ask the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. White).

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? The member for Scarborough West.

HEALTH AND SAFETY HAZARDS AT ELLIOT LAKE

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources, if I may: Is the minister aware that the latest dust samples taken in the Rio Algom mine at Elliot Lake, and posted, I think at his direction, in January, 1975, show that 67 of the 77 samples and eight of the 10 working areas are significantly over the limits acceptable for the safety of human health; and that in fact the dust levels have risen beyond the second quarter of 1973 and the second quarter of 1974? How is it we continue to allow miners to work in such conditions of risk and hazard month after month without government intervention?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Well Mr. Speaker, I am not exactly aware of the specifics to which the hon. member refers, but I can assure him that the members of my staff are monitoring, as he points out, various areas of the Elliot Lake mines. We will be announcing some more stringent regulations as to the time limits the miners are allowed to work in these specific areas; I hope to be announcing something in the not too distant future in this regard.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary? The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Could the minister not insist that the companies in fact purchase the type of equipment being used in Sweden, which are the self-contained packs, so that in fact the men aren't exposed to these large volumes while the minister prepares this policy he is going to announce?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to say we are looking at a number of different alternatives as to the ways and means by which we could correct this situation. We are working very closely with the union people and management too.

Mr. Lewis: I have a supplementary. Is the minister saying in effect that the level of safety established by the mines association, and indeed the level of safety established by the Ministry of Health, simply cannot and will not be met in the Province of Ontario; that given our dependence on this \$23 billion programme that Hydro is announcing, the workers in our uranium mines are forever obliged to work at levels of occupational hazard? Is that what is happening in fact?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that at all. These levels have been tested and they are above the acceptable

standard. As I said earlier, it may well be we will have to close down certain areas where they can't bring down the dust levels.

Mr. Lewis: The government will have to close down the whole mine in this instance.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It may well be we will have to do that.

Mr. Lewis: Well bring them down; don't close the mine.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): That was two months ago. When is the government going to do it?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We will move in this direction; we are moving.

OPERATIONS AT REEVES MINE

Mr. Lewis: I have a question on a related matter, if I could direct it to the Minister of Health; this is worrying some of my colleagues greatly. It relates to the closing down of the Johns-Manville mine in Reeves township near Timmins.

What were the asbestos fibre counts which were available to the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Natural Resources which the company had maintained and said it could not reduce? Secondly, how is it that a company like Johns-Manville, which is able to bring its mines and milling operation in the United States below the acceptable level cannot seem to do it in northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, to the first part of the question, I can't give the member the actual figures but I will get them.

Mr. Lewis: Thanks.

Hon. Mr. Miller: To the second part of the question, I don't know whether it was a question of not being able or not being willing to do so. I suspect there may be a good deal of the second part involved, because I am told this particular mine had a very short life expectancy and it may have been economically unfeasible to try to meet the requirements at this stage.

Mr. Ferrier: Seven or eight years.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. Ferrier: In view of the fact they are talking about closing, has the minister given any further thought to my request that in consideration of the health of the miners, examinations should be given to them before they scatter, if this has to take place?

Is the minister going to have them medically examined very carefully?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, you're aware that we have assumed the responsibility of the chest x-rays for these miners, and they were being done on a six-month basis in that area. I assume that the records are still available on that basis. I'm told most of those miners will be finding work in the immediate area; I don't know whether the member can confirm that or not.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): A supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: A final supplementary; the hon. member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. Laughren: Supplementary of the Minister of Health: Will the Minister of Health consider recommending to his cabinet colleagues, in view of the fact there are still nine years of asbestos ore left at the Reeves mine-site, that the government create a Crown corporation to operate that mine under model conditions of safety and health, so that it could set a benchmark for the rest of the industry?

Mr. Lewis: At zero emissions preferably. At zero emissions.

Hon. Mr. Miller: I find that difficult to take as a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, but I don't think, to this point in time, that our government has considered forming Crown corporations to take over private interests. I don't think it is likely that we will.

Mr. Martel: The Minister of Health better look at the select committee report.

Mr. Lewis: It is time the minister did.

Mr. Laughren: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Ferrier: How about the Minister of Natural Resources? Will he do that?

Mr. Laughren: I have a further supplementary, please.

Mr. Speaker: No, the last was the final. The question wasn't really a supplementary to the original one. If you want to pose a new one, you'll have your turn.

The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier, realizing he's having difficult times; the show must go on, Mr. Premier.

Mr. Speaker: Your question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member for Grey-Bruce is a great part of the show.

OIL PRICES

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, in view of the oil companies' experiencing the biggest profits in their history, and now talking about further increases in the cost of gasoline prices—

Mr. G. Nixon: What is the question?

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): Question.

Mr. Sargent: —has the government thought of giving some protection to the public in the basic commodity by warning companies that for every increase, unless they can show cause, they will be taxed accordingly? Has the Premier thought of giving some protection for the public that way?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can only say that we are interested in protecting the rights of the consumer of this province in every field.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary.

Mr. Sargent: This kind of nonsense doesn't go. In view of the fact the government gave them a five-cent-per-gallon increase a year ago, will it rescind that five-cent tax then, as a weapon? Will it rescind that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wants me to become somewhat controversial, I would say to him that it is his very close friends, allies—

Mr. Sargent: Come off that stuff.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and confrères of the federal government—who are helping him develop his party's own policies and priorities in election campaigns here—who very directly determined the price of oil a year ago—

Mr. Sargent: Why doesn't the Premier run the show here?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and who have, by any comparison whatsoever, the major direction in oil prices in this country.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

PAFCO INSURANCE CO.

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, Mr.

Speaker: Can the minister do something about the Pafco Insurance Co. which has had some publicity recently in using technicalities to refuse to pay off legitimate claims?

Hon. S. B. Handleman (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is much too modest to say that he is the source of the publicity.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): What is the minister the source of?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Yes, I read the hon. member's column with great interest, Mr. Speaker. He had told me about it a couple of weeks before, and I've been waiting ever since for the other shoe to drop. It finally did. I saw the column this week.

I've made arrangements to have the president of that company meet with me on Monday morning, and I hope at that time to be able to reconcile the problem which the hon. member raised in his column.

I do want to say that there is one indisputable fact, and that is that Mr. Bradette, who is mentioned in the column, is a completely innocent party, and it will be my function to do everything possible to see that his interests are protected.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Cassidy: What about beefing up the superintendent of insurance to make him effective?

Mr. Roy: I have a question of the Premier, and just to give him some free advice—

An hon. member: Question. Question.

Mr. Roy: Oh, don't get excited.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Roy: Just to say to the Premier that the Narcotic Control Act is not under the Code. My question, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: They're real tigers.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will place his question.

Mr. Roy: They are being bothered by the polls.

Mr. Sargent: The nerves are very close to the surface over there.

OTTAWA TEACHERS' DISPUTE

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, my question of the Premier deals with the strike of teachers in Ottawa. In view of the fact that the Premier said he would not intervene, why is he going around annoying the teachers by saying that their demands are excessive?

An hon. member: What does the member for Ottawa East want him to do?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member perhaps was at the meeting; I don't know. I was asked a question when I was attending a dinner meeting with a group of law students from the University of Ottawa, a very distinguished group. I was asked about certain things and I said the traditional approach had been for the boards and the teachers to endeavour to resolve their problems and I hoped this tradition would continue in spite of policies enunciated by the Liberal Party from time to time about taking over the boards and things of that kind. I recall these—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: Oh, when did we say that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I recall them—and I recall them very well. I didn't say I wasn't going to intervene; I don't think I said that. As a matter of fact—

Mr. Roy: The Premier was quoted.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I am just trying to recall—just to be as helpful as I can to the hon. member—

Mr. Roy: Beyond reason.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —exactly what went on that evening. I also went one step further—and before he asks me a supplementary, I will confess to it. I said I thought the request, if it was true—and I did say if it was true, because I hadn't talked to the profession in Ottawa—if they were asking for 40 or 41 per cent, I said I thought that was unreasonable. And if the hon. member is at all doubtful about my having said it, I will say it here again this afternoon: I think it is unreasonable.

Mr. Roy: A supplementary to this: In view of the fact that the Premier said he would not intervene, does he not feel that type of statement is exactly the type of political statement which makes it more difficult for the school boards and the teachers to get together?

Mr. Stokes: Doesn't he think it is unreasonable?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will match any statement I make on this side of the House related to teacher-school board negotiations as being less difficult, less conflicting, less causing of problems than almost anything that is said from the Liberal Party in this province at this particular time.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Would the Premier not agree that the 40 per cent statement is similar to any statements made about the 60 per cent associated with our own civil service, that they were obviously unreasonable?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: There is no contradiction there.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. We are waiting for the question.

Mr. Lewis: As the member for Carleton East (Mr. P. Taylor) says: "Power is the name of the game."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Time is flitting very rapidly. Does the member have a supplementary?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary I would like to ask the Premier if he would explain to the House why he feels the 28 per cent settlement in Windsor is any more inflationary than the government's settlement with its own civil servants, since the 28 per cent is over 16 months? Even with the kind of math the two of us understand, that is equivalent to a 21 per cent settlement. The one with the civil service was 21.5 per cent. All of it is inflationary; I wish we could have done better. But surely that sort of an intrusion does not settle the argument.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Leader of the Opposition says he wishes we could have done better. Why doesn't he have the honesty and intestinal fortitude, rather than use this comparison—which is totally unfair—to get up and say that if he formed the government he would reduce the award from 21 per cent to something else, because, Mr. Speaker, it is not a justifiable comparison.

Would the Leader of the Opposition please do himself the service of tracing over even just the last three-year period of time the rate of increase for the operational categories, their average pay, what it means in terms of a 20 per cent increase—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is not fair; the Premier is acting unfairly.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Let's face it. Now come on; listen for a change. When inflation is involved, the price of gasoline, the price of fuel oil, the price of many of the basic commodities are just the same in terms of increase for the people on lower incomes as people on higher incomes. If one is going to give a 30 per cent increase to people earning \$16,000 or \$18,000 or \$20,000, that has far more inflationary impact than giving a 21 per cent increase to people on an average, say, of \$8,000 or \$9,000 per year. It is a totally different situation, and the Leader of the Opposition knows it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Will the Leader of the Opposition please do his homework?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Wentworth with a supplementary, I believe.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier is learning. He's learning. It's probably too late but he's learning.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is never too late.

Mr. Lewis: I hope not.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The people under \$10,000 are against him.

Mr. Deans: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Given that the Premier now seems to care to pass judgement on the reasonableness, or otherwise, of requests, would he be prepared to make a judgement on the reasonableness of the request of the public health nurses in Parry Sound, given the range of settlement—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That's quite far removed from the teacher question. The member can ask it later.

The member for Cochrane South.

COCHRANE DISTRICT HOME FOR THE AGED

Mr. Ferrier: Yes, I have a question which I would like to ask the Premier. In view of the fact that the Cochrane District Home for the Aged board of management has been convicted in provincial court of violations whereby women who sought the provisions of the Employment Standards Act were discharged, and since there are to be two Lieutenant Governor in Council appointments to the new board of management to take effect April 1, will the Premier give a commitment that none of the present board of management will be among the Lieutenant Governor in Council appointments to the new board?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to look at any reasonable suggestion. Whether this falls into that category, I haven't the foggiest idea—because I must confess to the member that I don't know anything about it. But I'll certainly take a look at it.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre.

NORTH PICKERING DEVELOPMENT

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): I have a question of the Minister of Housing. In view of today's statement indicating his government's great concern for the rights of citizens affected by government projects, why is his ministry insisting that property owners, those in the greenbelt area of the North Pickering development, agree to forgo important rights that are given under the Expropriations Act before the government will negotiate with these owners? In effect, these owners have been expropriated without compensation.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't hear the question. Would the member repeat it?

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Why doesn't the minister listen?

Mr. Deacon: Yes. Why is his ministry insisting that property owners who are frozen in the greenbelt area of the North Pickering development agree to forgo important rights given under the Expropriations Act before the government will negotiate with these

owners who had, in effect, already been expropriated without compensation?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, any property owner in the North Pickering area has been fully protected by the actions taken by this government to date, and will be protected in the future.

Mr. Roy: Who says so?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: The only areas that are in contention are the areas related to the area under a ministerial order which is affected by the airport, not the areas that are related to the Ontario government.

Mr. Deacon: That is not what I'm talking about. No, not the airport.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Liberals' airport.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: The Ontario government has resolved the problems as far as the people in the new town area are concerned, but we cannot be responsible for the federal government.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is all Liberal.

Mr. Deacon: If the minister will listen this time—

An hon. member: That is what their caucus is about, federal plotting.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deacon: I am talking about the greenbelt area in the North Pickering development; the areas that Archie Little's land is in and some of the others—Sim Reesoc's land. Why are those people not allowed to have the same protection as other owners in the North Pickering development in negotiating with the government with regard to the acquisition of their lands? The agreement the Ministry of Housing has given them deletes specifically all the rights between sections 19 and 25 in the Expropriations Act.

Mr. Roy: Does the minister understand now?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would listen again, I will try to repeat as carefully as possible in saying that the Ontario government has fully protected those people in the lands that are underneath our ministerial order. In the greenbelt or in the area for development we have dealt with the people as fairly as possible and will continue to do so in the future.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It makes sense this time.

Mr. Deacon: The ministry should see that it does.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The government wouldn't allow a hearing.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: There isn't any particular person that I know of who has not been treated fairly. If the member can prove it he should let me know.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

LANDFILL IN HAMILTON HARBOUR

Mr. Deans: I have a question of the Premier. Since today is the day for talking about reasonableness, does it seem reasonable that the Hamilton conservation authority, exercising its jurisdiction on behalf of the government to ensure that no landfill would take place in the Hamilton harbour, should be forced into court to stop the CNR from dumping—the CNR being another public body? Doesn't it seem reasonable that the provincial government ought to be able to meet with the federal government and resolve the matter without the legal costs which will ultimately be borne by the taxpayers as a result of this legal action?

Mr. Roy: Give him a reasonable answer.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'm all in favour of reasonableness. I don't always see it demonstrated from the other side of the House, but I am in favour of reasonableness.

Mr. Deans: Well, I am trying.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Just to show how reasonable I am, in that I am not going to venture a legal opinion without some legal guidance on certain matters related to this—

Mr. Deans: I'm not asking for a legal opinion.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —I will discuss this with the Attorney General and those who might have some advice to offer and in a reasonable way reply as soon as possible.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Reasonably.

Mr. Deans: Supplementary question: In order to maintain the reasonable atmosphere that we have, does the Premier think it might be possible for the province to assume the legal costs on behalf of the conservation authority, since they are in fact enforcing provincial regulations?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there are regulations, and I would think perhaps in this instance the situation relates to those policies that have been initiated. I'm not that familiar with it. As I say, we will take a look at it and we will have a reasoned response for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

EGG PRODUCTION

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of Education but I see he has slipped out, so I'll direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

An hon. member: The same question?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: That's what we think of the educational system.

Mr. Gaunt: Since Quebec is increasing its egg production substantially and Ontario is asked to cut back, what does the minister intend to do by way of action? Does he intend to meet with the Minister of Agriculture from Quebec to see if this problem can be resolved?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Minister of Education would have had a hell of a time with that question.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, as is quite common with the Liberal position over there, they get themselves a little confused. Where the relationship is between education and agriculture in that question I don't know.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. MacDonald: They are both walking on eggs.

Mr. Foulds: Both of these guys can lay eggs, that's the similarity.

Mr. Roy: Very flexible.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Educate the hens.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I'd have to say this, Mr. Speaker. I'm always willing to try to educate my hon. friends over there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would simply say this. Meetings will take place within the next week to try to resolve those differences. But I don't want to have my hon. friend mislead the House to say that the Province of Quebec is producing more than within its own quota. As I understand it they've come up to approximately their own quota. They have increased very, very rapidly and perhaps in the last six months there may have been overproduction just a bit.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have fulfilled the obligation which we gave in Winnipeg last summer that we would reduce the poultry flock in Ontario to come within production quotas in Ontario. That we have accomplished; I think we have a great deal to be proud of.

Mr. Gaunt: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: One supplementary.

Mr. Gaunt: May I just say if there is any confusion it is in the mind of my friend, not in my mind.

An hon. member: Right, right.

Mr. Roy: Of course, that's not unusual.

Mr. Gaunt: Does the minister have any plans to support or guarantee the payment of producers through the buy-back programme of the marketing board in this province?

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): The Easter bunny is going to do that.

Hon. Mr. Steart: No, we haven't. If the member's federal friends at Ottawa would collect the money that is owing to them by other provinces through the national marketing council, there would be no problem whatsoever—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: Blame Ottawa!

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): They can't blame Ottawa for everything.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —but as long as our federal friends in Ottawa absolve themselves of any real obligations to enforce legislation they have in their own hands, we'll have those kinds of problems. But I'm not going to put the Province of Ontario in the position of bailing out the federal government. Let the member go and do it himself.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): They're laying enough eggs down there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please, the hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, there seem to be high spirits here today, for some reason or other.

Mr. Lewis: High hopes, perhaps.

LAYOFFS AT DOUGLAS AIRCRAFT

Mr. Young: I would like to ask of the Minister of Labour, in view of the very serious layoffs in Douglas Aircraft recently, has the minister any statement to make to the House in connection with the situation there now, as to whether perhaps his department, in co-operation with Ottawa, has some positive answer to the situation?

Hon. J. P. MacBeth (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, some time ago our re-employment service branch offered to—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Just a second; who is that?

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): The member knows who it is.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, it's the member for St. Catharines.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The Minister of Labour has the floor.

Mr. Lewis: Is he on the chart?

Mr. Foulds: I thought he was part of the furniture.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, we occasionally get a guttural spasm from that area of the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, the more time I have to try to formulate an answer, the more confused I'm getting.

Mr. Roy: That's normal over there.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: We have an employment adjustment service in my ministry. Some time ago we offered to work with the UAW union at Douglas, to give them our services. They didn't seem to wish to take advantage of it. I don't know whether there is any change in that position at the present time or not, but we have such a service and will be glad to work with them in any way we can.

I realize that when you are in a skilled industry such as the aircraft industry, there are not too many other industries which can offer alternative employment. But as all members know, again the aircraft industry is a federal matter, so it's a little difficult to come to the province and expect it to find employment along the same lines.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: We have our adjustment service, sir, and we will be glad to make it available.

Mr. Young: Supplementary: Did I hear the minister aright when he said he is waiting for the UAW to request assistance before he is going to act? If so perhaps the UAW can be moved to do this?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Our employment adjustment service is a system that works in co-operative effort involving the federal government, our own ministry and the union and management. It takes all four parties; there are agreements to be made. We have offered to work with them. I was out talking to them myself and made that offer, but we haven't had any response.

Now I'm not suggesting, sir, that there is a great deal we can do, but at least we do have this service and it is available to them.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. George.

LEAD POLLUTION HEARINGS

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, my question is of the Minister of Health. Is it a fact that having asked the city of Toronto to co-operate with the ministry on the lead hearings, the minister has refused to pay their expenses; if so why is that the case?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, it is not normal for us to pay the cost of any person's legal fees before hearings. I think just as justifiable a case could be made by any person coming before those hearings for help from us.

They have made a request which they assume we have turned down. I say they assume, because they have never had an answer from us at this point in time since I am still studying it.

Mrs. Campbell: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: One supplementary.

Mrs. Campbell: Is it not a fact that as a government they really do need to know where they stand financially, having expended most of their funds in this area to date?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Well Mr. Speaker, we have made offers to the city of Toronto over the years to increase their funding arrangements for health, which they have seen fit to turn down. There is a matter of some \$6 million at stake, not the \$30,000 we are talking about in this issue.

Mrs. Campbell: The minister wouldn't listen to the city when they asked him before.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Miller: We listened to them both times, but unlike many people we didn't coerce either the city or the boroughs into an amalgamation or marriage they didn't want. We have respected their willingness to pay a 50 per cent differential out of their own tax dollars because they want to be individuals.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The government didn't hesitate to coerce the people of Muskoka into regional government.

Hon. Mr. Miller: It is on that basis I say that if they are willing to raise \$6 million for their own public health units in Toronto because they want autonomy, surely they are willing to raise \$30,000 if they want autonomy.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

SURVIVAL OF NURSERY STOCK

Mr. Stokes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources.

Is the minister concerned that after five years of planting of black and white spruce nursery stock, the average survival rate across the province is just over 60 per cent? Is he further concerned that the average survival rate of tubed seedlings, after five years of planting across the province, is about 33 per cent? Is the minister satisfied that this is the kind of survival rate that he should be getting after spending millions and millions of dollars on reseedling and replanting? If he is not satisfied, what is he going to do about it?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, let me point out I am not totally familiar with the figures related by the member. I can assure him, and I am sure he is aware of it, that the

Ministry of Natural Resources is one of the leaders in the regeneration field right across the North American continent. We have done a tremendous amount of regeneration and research in this particular field.

Mr. Sargent: Mumble a little louder.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We were the pioneers of the tubeling planting system; in fact, very recently we came up with a new planting machine that is being patented at the present time.

Mr. MacDonald: What is the answer to the question?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I would point out that, no, we are not completely satisfied with the tubeling system we have been using for the last number of years. In fact, just very recently we embarked on a very ambitious research programme to see if we can improve and update the facilities and methods of regeneration and planting that will improve the life expectancy.

Mr. Stokes: But the minister is not satisfied?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I am not satisfied, no.

Mr. Foulds: A supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. Sargent: There are no ministers to report, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Snow presented the annual report of the Provincial Auditor for the year ended March 31, 1974.

Hon. Mr. Auld presented the report of the governing council of the University of Toronto under the University of Toronto Act, 1971.

Mr. Laughren: Well, well. What do you know!

Mr. Lawlor: That report is kind of late. Isn't it supposed to be in within six months, according to law?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Colleges and Universities): I was trying to get it in before 3 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

COMMISSIONER OF THE LEGISLATURE ACT, 1975

Mr. Singer moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the appointment of a Commissioner to investigate Administrative Decisions and Acts of Officials of the Government of Ontario and its Agencies and to define the Commissioner's Powers and Duties.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): Is this a tender?

Mr. Sargent: It's long overdue.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, in view of the particular paragraph that caught my ear in the Throne Speech, I thought it might be helpful to the Premier and to his colleagues to have before them a bill that I think would assist substantially in the pledge that they gave the people of Ontario to create this kind of official. Had they used the title "parliamentary commissioner," they could have avoided the awkwardness of talking about an ombudsperson, whatever that might be.

The suggestions set out in the bill take in, I believe, the best features of many similar types of bills throughout the world, and I would commend to the government's attention the contents of this bill and the practices embarked upon in Quebec and in the Province of Alberta. Let us hope that the government will either accept this bill as it is presented or bring in their own bill at the first possible opportunity.

ELECTION FINANCES REFORM ACT

Hon. Mr. White moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to regulate Political Party Financing and Election Contributions and Expenses.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. White (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I suppose this bill is the reason the Liberal campaign manager, otherwise known as "get \$5-million Blake," has resigned his position, leaving the field to the Liberal poison pen artist, Mr. Gordon Floyd.

As recommended by the royal commission on the Legislature—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Does the minister mean that he has something serious to say?

Hon. Mr. White: —I am pleased to announce that arrangements are being made,

with the co-operation of the Minister of Finance for Canada and the Minister of National Revenue, to introduce into the personal income tax system an Ontario political party contribution credit. This credit will be a deduction from Ontario tax otherwise payable with respect to bona fide contributions to Ontario political parties.

Mr. Roy: Now the minister is talking.

Hon. Mr. White: In developing this legislation it will be necessary to conform to the federal formula as closely as possible. Arrangements for audit and assessment must still be worked out in detail, as must the method of including the Ontario calculation in the income tax return. To effect the political party contribution credit, amendments will be required to the Ontario personal Income Tax Act.

As recommended by the commission, corporations will be permitted to deduct contributions to political parties, constituency associations and candidates registered under the proposed Act to regulate Political Party Financing and Election Contributions and Expenses up to an aggregate of \$4,000. This recommendation will require amendment to the Ontario Corporations Tax Act.

It should be noted that an individual may earn a maximum credit against personal income tax of \$500 at a level of contributions of \$1,150, and that a corporation taking full advantage of its allotment may earn a reduction of its Ontario corporation tax by a maximum of \$480.

CHILD WELFARE AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Brunelle moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Child Welfare Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to enable the province to assume a larger share of the costs of services of Children's Aid Societies, with a corresponding reduction in the financial burden on municipalities. This bill will also enable the province to revise and improve procedures for the submission of society budgets to municipalities in the province, and will also implement a number of other changes to improve child welfare services.

INTERPRETATION AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Foulds moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Interpretation Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Foulds: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The purpose of this bill is to make election days in Ontario, whether they are municipal, provincial or federal, statutory holidays.

Mr. Deans: It might also be a good idea to make the municipal ones in October.

Mr. Singer: You can't possibly accept that, Mr. Speaker.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Foulds moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading to the bill.

Mr. Foulds: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The purpose of this bill is to allow the use of studded tires in northern Ontario; and this is the third time I have introduced it.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for St. George have a bill?

POWER CORPORATION AMENDMENT ACT

Mrs. Campbell moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Power Corporation Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mrs. Campbell; Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the Act is simply this, to permit the corporation or its designate to carry out repairs to premises after an inspection and where the owner has been recalcitrant. The intent is to try to tighten up the process, hopefully to preclude the fires that we have seen, particularly in the city of Toronto, which occur after an inspection following which there is no ability to implement any order.

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of personal privilege. During the budget debate of Thursday, Feb. 13, in the evening session, I made the statement that I had written a letter to the Minister of Community and Social Services and didn't get a reply. Mr. Speaker, the minister sent me a letter shortly afterwards to state that he had sent a reply, and he sent a copy of it. In looking into my

files I did in fact find that a copy had come from him; that he had answered but the letter had gone in the file without my knowledge and I had inadvertently misled the House.

I would like to apologize to the minister for saying something about him that wasn't so, and in doing so to have the record of the House corrected.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, consideration of the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox.

Mr. J. A. Taylor moves, seconded by Mr. Lane, that a humble address be presented to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor as follows:

To the Honourable Pauline M. McGibbon, OC, BA, LL.D, DU. (Ottawa), BAA (Theatre), Lieutenant Governor of Ontario.

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the legislative assembly of the Province of Ontario now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has addressed to us.

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, I would like, first to sincerely compliment the Lieutenant Governor on her appointment to Ontario as the representative of Her Majesty the Queen in this province. I think we are certainly privileged to have a lady as Lieutenant Governor, the first in Ontario.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): He is starting off non-controversially.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I think the warm and friendly personality that exudes from Mrs. McGibbon is an inspiration to all of us. She certainly has a very friendly demeanour. Although her term in office to date has been short, I am personally convinced, as I think all of us are, that she is discharging her duties exceedingly well. I was particularly impressed with the opening day ceremonies on Tuesday last. I commend her on the meaningful role she plays and the pleasing manner in which she discharges her official duties.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): She had a very difficult job preparing that speech.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Yes, and she certainly commands the respect of all of us.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): It was wonderful material she had to work with.

Mr. Roy: Blame the feds for that.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, this is the first real opportunity I have had to congratulate you on your elevation to that throne. I am particularly impressed with the way you run the House.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Yes; the Speaker is friendly but he is firm, and in my opinion he adds dignity to the office. I do indeed hope, and I am convinced, that he will restore the respect of all of us for the Chair.

I have been particularly disturbed that there has been some deterioration in the tradition of this House in terms of the manner in which order is imposed. It concerns me that in some way our traditions and our procedures may have been weakened. At some times I think there are certain members of this House who do not hold the House and the Speaker in the respect in which they should be held.

I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that you will continue in the fine job you are doing to see that this House operates not only in an orderly fashion but with dignity.

I would also like to compliment the hon. members who have recently been appointed to various new portfolios. I am convinced they will discharge their new duties in a conscientious, skillful and meaningful way.

Mr. Roy: He had better hope the member for London South (Mr. White) does a good job, because that member won't be back here.

Mr. Lawlor: What can anyone conceivably say in defence of that speech?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: While it is traditional for a government supporter to thank the Lieutenant Governor for the pronouncements in a Throne Speech, it seems equally traditional for leaders of the opposition parties to criticize and condemn these same pronouncements.

Mr. Roy: There were no pronouncements.

Mr. Lawlor: There wasn't too much to get onto.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I was surprised, therefore, to hear the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon) declare that Her Honour's speech was bankrupt of ideas—

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): It was the government's speech. Don't blame Her Honour for it.

An hon. member: Shame, shame.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Commenting on Her Honour's speech.

Mr. Cassidy: The government is hiding behind Her Honour's petticoats.

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): We are not hiding behind anybody.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Can you imagine the leader of the New Democratic Party—

Mr. Turner: No, we can't.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —stating that it was almost totally without substance?

Mr. Turner: Did the leader of the New Democratic Party say that?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I think his reference to the Lieutenant Governor's speech in those terms is sheer impudence.

Mr. Cassidy: That's the attitude of the member for Prince Edward-Lennox in private.

Mr. Turner: No, sir.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It is for the government to use her or abuse her in that fashion.

Mr. Cassidy: She may resign after that speech.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: As a matter of fact I sincerely commend her for the brevity of her remarks.

Mr. MacDonald: Is it a fact he's going to be able to commend the hon. member in the same way?

Mr. Turner: Yes sir.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It's often the tradition to make a great deal of developing a programme which heralds the introduction of multitudinous pieces of legislation which is going to be dealt with over the current year.

Mr. Roy: They're going to be surprised because it wasn't in the speech.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Yes, indeed, and those people in the opposition parties are continually concerned about the amount of legislation than can be introduced—

Mr. Roy: Especially on the last few days of the session.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —and, of course, that all translates into further restrictions on the people of the province. We have a lot of good legislation that has gone forward and has to go forward—

Mr. Turner: All of it's good.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —but at the same time I can see why people would gripe, as this government does, about developing a bureaucratic jungle that the people can hardly slash through to achieve freedom and justice in this province.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): The assistant to the Attorney General (Mr. Turner) has criticized his own government.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): It couldn't be much worse than the one this government has developed.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The NDP—and I think the hon. member for Lakeshore should consider this very seriously—

Mr. Roy: Was it a good speech?

Mr. Turner: Very good.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —have always been concerned about interfering and regulating ad nauseam the personal conduct and behaviour of the people of our province.

Mr. Roy: That is backtracking. The government is starting to backtrack. It is making a U-turn.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That is their philosophy.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It's no wonder society is growing complex.

Mr. Roy: I don't think the government knows where it is going.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It's getting complex and we have a great deal of legislation on the books.

Mr. Turner: We know.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: But I think the time has come to stop and think about just what we should be doing in terms of more legislation

—meaningful legislation, progressive legislation—

Mr. Turner: They should stop and think seriously.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —which is going to assist the people in this province to develop themselves—

Mr. Turner: To uphold those high ideals.

Mr. Roy: Right. Let's talk law and order.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —to develop their own potentials; to realize themselves.

Mr. Lawlor: Down with legislation. That's what I always say.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The member for Lakeshore would have a homogenized society.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: He would have the bland leading the bland.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): That's it.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: There's no question about that.

Mr. Turner: No question at all.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The people of Ontario don't want more government. In many cases they want to get government off their backs.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ferrier: They want a better government.

An hon. member: They can't get a better one.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Ah, the hypocrisy of those socialists.

Mr. Ferrier: We'll give it to them.

Mr. Lawlor: Members can see it everywhere.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They preach freedom and they preach self-determination and at the same time they want government take-over.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Did the member read the Minister of Energy's (Mr. Timbrell) last speech?

An hon. member: What did the Minister of Energy say?

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Yes, that's the Minister of Energy's line.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They want more and more government. They want government to take over the complete means of production.

Mr. Young: Oh, no!

An hon. member: Oh, he's nuts!

Mr. Lawlor: We think government has a responsibility, yes.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They certainly do. That's part and parcel of their political philosophy; and the sooner the people of this province realize what they truly stand for the better it will be.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, you know and I know that once you have government control and direction of the means of production you have at the same time a lessening of the standard of living—anything that government has taken over—

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Like Hydro?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —in terms of the production of consumer products of this province, or in any other nation, has cost more and has lessened the standard of living.

An hon. member: Come on!

Mr. Young: Every minister of this government is running a socialist enterprise.

Mr. Turner: No way.

Mr. Ferrier: Like Ontario Northland. What about Ontario Northland?

An hon. member: It takes Prince Edward Island to bring it out.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They should be exposed for what they are.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

An hon. member: They should be exposed for that kind of socialism.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Our economic achievement in this province is due to our market economy and the strong private sector.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, he is not addressing the Chair. They are attacking the socialists. They cannot defend themselves.

An hon. member: Will these members also take responsibility for the unemployment?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Social and economic objectives can only be financed from successful business ventures.

Mr. Roy: Let's talk law and order. That's what I want to hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The member will hear it, just be patient.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Right.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The Lieutenant Governor in the Speech from the Throne mentioned the matter of immigration. I would like to point out that Ontario's population increased rapidly since the end of World War II, faster than any other industrialized country in the world—

Mr. Roy: That is emphasizing the obvious.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —and of course faster than Canada's population as a whole. Immigration accounted for almost one-third of that population increase. One result of this explosive population growth was expansion in employment, output and incomes. Over the past decade gross provincial product has grown by 82 per cent in real terms.

Mr. Roy: How much again?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Over the same period employment has grown by 41 per cent, while real per capita income has risen by almost 70 per cent. The people of Ontario now have one of the highest standards of living in the world.

Mr. Haggerty: Some have, some have.

Mr. Roy: Why is that?

Hon. C. Bennett (Minister of Industry and Tourism): Federal, not provincial—

Mr. Turner: Because of the Tory government.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: In Ontario during the past year we have experienced a two per cent increase in real disposable income and have seen 151,000 new jobs created, with our labour force up 4.7 per cent—

Mr. Ferrier: How many jobs were lost?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —and our gross provincial product at \$56 billion, up four per cent in real terms.

Mr. Haggerty: For what?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Real income.

Mr. Roy: Who prepared that for the member?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Ontario is home to 36 per cent of Canada's population.

Mr. Martel: There are 5.5 per cent unemployed.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It's production of goods and services accounts for 40 per cent of the gross national product, 52 per cent of manufacturing shipments and 43 per cent of all capital spending; in addition 33 per cent of Canada's agricultural production is derived from Ontario farms.

Ontario's per capita income is the highest in Canada, 25 per cent higher than Quebec, 20 per cent higher than Manitoba, and 14 per cent above the Canadian average.

Mr. Martel: Below Alberta.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Increased population, and the shifting of population from the rural to the urban areas, has exerted tremendous pressure on our cities.

Mr. Roy: Was the Minister of Industry and Tourism in Hamilton yesterday? There was nobody there.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: They didn't invite the Liberals.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Housing and road, sewer and waterworks systems had to be constructed. Schools, hospitals and other public buildings had to be erected. The full range of public utilities was needed. Massive amounts of capital were required, more than could be raised at home.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Let me tell the member for Ottawa East, there are not that many problems in Ontario.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The government's involvement in these things was in terms of providing—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

I'm wondering if the hon. members would be good enough to extend their courtesy to the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox so that he may continue and complete his address.

Mr. Lawlor: He is doing all right.

Mr. Martel: Name the minister.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The young, the old, the sick, the disabled had to be cared for—

Mr. Martel: Oh good grief.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Education, health and welfare became very costly priorities—

Mr. Martel: This government should have followed BC's example.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Just let's take a look at some of the accomplishments of this government during the last session.

Mr. Roy: Indeed, let's.

Mr. Martel: Let's talk about this session.

Mr. Roy: That shouldn't take long. I will be back in two seconds.

Mr. J. R. Smith: Tell us about Bill 21.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Since its implementation last July, the GAINS programme, for example—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Martel: That came out of BC in 1971. This government is a little late.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —has been increased twice, currently providing an income of \$2,766 per person and \$5,542 for a married couple.

Mr. Martel: The government took that from BC, they did it in 1971. This government was embarrassed into doing it.

Mr. Ferrier: BC always has to give the lead.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The total payment in this fiscal year by the Ontario government will amount to \$84.5 million—

Mr. Martel: It is 60 years old in BC, not 65.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: You socialists are very quick to take credit when you shouldn't.

Mr. Martel: It's 60 in BC.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Martel: Don't give us that clap-trap.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The member for Sudbury East is very embarrassed.

Mr. Martel: I am not embarrassed.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox will continue.

Mr. Martel: The government here is two years after BC; and it is 60 years of age out there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. members will direct their comments to the Chair and not exchange conversations with the hon. members adjacent. Will the hon. member continue?

An hon. member: Especially when they don't have anything to exchange.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: A new drug programme was introduced on Sept. 1.

Mr. Martel: That's also following in the footsteps of what BC did. This government is late there too.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It extended further the benefits of the province's health system to allow over a half million residents to receive their supply of drugs without charge. Can members opposite imagine that?

An hon. member: No I can't.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It is just a tremendous programme that has been implemented by this province, and members opposite just hate to think of what we have done.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, it is two years after it was introduced in BC.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member will continue and direct his comments to the Chair.

Mr. Martel: It aggravates me.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): The truth always hurts.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, the sales tax cuts.

Mr. Martel: It's painstaking to bring the government along.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The retail sales tax on a broad range of items was removed.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The first category was the exemption of personal hygiene products.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The second category covers household cleaning products.

Mr. Martel: We could use a little of that in here.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The third category included the lifting of the retail sales tax on footwear sold for \$30 or less. Those are great accomplishments.

An hon. member: They sure are.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: These are steps forward.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Especially in the footwear field.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: There is no question about that. People in the opposition parties are just reluctant to admit that constructive and positive programmes have been implemented by this government for the people of Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Tell us about magnetic levitation.

An hon. member: Let the Leader of the Opposition give us his views.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): We would like that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is the government going to build it or not?

Interjections from hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member will continue.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker: I compliment the Chair on its—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Fairness?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Ear for order I was going to say. Possibly the Speaker could ensure that the same respect is given to this speaker as members of the opposition parties expect when they stand to speak.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I'll become indignantly righteous before long.

An hon. member: As long as he doesn't become self-righteous.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's a halo around his head.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Family-held mortgages and promissory notes were made eligible for

forgiveness in relation to farm succession duties. This change was retroactive to April 12, 1973, when the concept of forgivable farm duty was introduced.

Changes were also made with respect to the once-in-a-life-time gift affecting farm families so that the gift tax may be paid in several annual instalments.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The member is supposed to be talking about this year's speech. Can he find anything in this year's speech?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Farming is a very important and basic industry of this province.

Mr. Young: Particularly in Toronto.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I don't think there has been any other government that has been conscious of the role played by farmers.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: When you look at the representation in this House from the rural community, Mr. Speaker, you will understand that the rural communities, that the farmers—

Mr. Ferrier: When is that new land drainage Act coming in?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The government has only one farmer. If it had another it would have a new minister.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —have confidence in the Conservative government and know what is being done for them. Members opposite do not have a constructive comment to offer in terms of assisting the farmer. They can't dream up a programme that would assist in any constructive and positive way, that is being adopted and presented by—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: We have, in this province, the finest Minister of Agriculture and Food that has been seen anywhere; no question about that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: There is a real tall statement. He is a good guy, but I don't know if he is that good.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: A great speech!

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It is important that we maintain our good farm land, no question about that.

Mr. Ferrier: The government is not doing anything about it.

Mr. Lawlor: There is no provincial plan.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It is important that the farmer receive a fair return on his capital investment.

Mr. Lawlor: The government can always get by on a cliché.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: We listen to the socialists; and we have to watch them, because they are an insidious force in this province.

Mr. Martel: Beautiful.

Mr. Lawlor: We are the people who keep the members opposite alive.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I suggest that if one could pierce that tissue and see what lies beneath, the whole populace would be frightened by the NDP's policies and its philosophy.

An hon. member: We are all for turning everyone into a civil servant.

Mr. Lawlor: We will see what the budget brings.

Mr. Turner: We will indeed.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: And socialists are the first to cry when the farmer wants to get a fair return on his investment. They cry "consumer," not knowing where the consumer—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: All they can dream about is what kind of—

Mr. Ferrier: The member for York South anticipates the needs of farmers by two to three weeks before the government does.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They don't have a farmer among the whole bunch of them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: In our hearts we are farmers.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: In their stomachs, he means.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, I have seldom heard a more provocative reply to the Throne Speech.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: We have a very impressive Minister of Agriculture and Food and there is no question that anything we can do in this government for the farmers of this province will be done. The members

opposite haven't taught us one idea, haven't one programme or policy or a thing that can be done to better the lot of the farmers. If they have, I challenge them to bring it forward.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Their only policy is to hoodwink the public.

I have talked for a long time about the private sector and the importance of the small businessman. I think it is important that we look after the little businessman, that we create a strong economic climate so that he can survive. Let us not see him get lost in the tangle—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: But he is dying now under this government's policies.

Mr. Turner: Nonsense.

Mr. Ferrier: This government won't even pay him for collecting sales tax.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The member needn't worry about that.

Mr. Ferrier: They are worrying about it.

Mr. Speaker: Order please; the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox has the floor.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, if I may respond, I am concerned as any of them about the small businessman. I am concerned about the little guy who has to do the book work for the bureaucrats, there is no question about that. I can understand the policy of the government in terms of helping those large corporations—

Mr. Lawlor: Who can't help themselves.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —by paying them for the refunding of sales tax while they have the assistance of large staffs and electronic equipment. I can understand them saying: "Why should we pay them for this particular duty?" I can understand that. But I think we must always be mindful of the little businessman who has to use part of his staff—which he can ill afford to do—for filling in government forms.

An hon. member: Right.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I think that he should be reimbursed for that chore.

Mr. Martel: Did the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Meen) hear that?

Mr. Ferrier: Did the minister hear that?

Mr. Lawlor: That wasn't in the Throne Speech, was it?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: There's no reason why we could not put a ceiling on the amount that could be paid to him, which would assist the small businessman and at the same time give a fair return for the efforts and labours of the large corporation.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lawlor: The former Treasurer (Mr. White) said that last spring. I didn't hear the member stand up and argue against it.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The member doesn't hear everything. He just hears what he wants to hear. As a matter of fact, he probably had his hearing aid turned off at that time. If the member would turn the ear that it comes in toward me, instead of the ear it goes out, then maybe he would learn more.

Mr. Lawlor: The member just dreamed up this policy when he stood up, did he? Is it something brand new?

Mr. Yakabuski: The member for Lakeshore knows that British socialism has been a failure.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Two significant measures to the problem of availability of capital and its high cost to small businesses were implemented:

1. A new income tax credit equal to five per cent up to a maximum of \$3,000;
2. A new incentive, venture investment corporations, is designed to motivate private sources of capital to provide funds for small businesses. Under this plan, corporations are allowed to deduct such funds from their taxable income. The members of the opposition never thought of that because they are not interested in it. They are not interested in the small businessmen.

Mr. Lawlor: Lord; it existed in Saskatchewan before the member was born.

Mr. Foulds: I'm not sure he was born.

Mr. Turner: Nonsense.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I wouldn't brag about my old age and my senility if I were the member.

Mr. Martel: Is the member trying for a cabinet post in this defunct government?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I will remind members of the opposition of the workmen's compensation benefits.

Mr. Martel: He will remind us of that, will he?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Yes, I will remind them—

Mr. Martel: He'll remind us?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —because if there was any improvement it was from this side of the House—

Mr. Martel: Take a look at the injured workmen who are downstairs every day.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —and it was this House that implemented the plan and the programme.

Mr. Martel: Boy, what a lot of nonsense! Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Pensions were increased by as much as 60 per cent, based on a formula related to the year in which an individual's pension commenced.

Mr. Lawlor: Listen, I'll be back. I couldn't stay away.

Mr. Turner: The member should make sure he does.

Mr. L. Maeck (Parry Sound): Does the member want us to adjourn until he gets back?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: There were also increased pension benefits to widows—

Mr. Ferrier: Ten dollars!

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —dependants of deceased injured workmen and full compensation for partially injured workmen who are unable to find suitable employment.

Mr. Martel: Sixty per cent for 24 years.

Mr. Turner: The member is distorting the facts.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Overall, the earnings ceiling for calculation of benefits was increased from \$10,000 to \$12,000, effective July 1, 1974.

Mr. Young: They are going to become part of the government's programme.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: We don't hear the opposition talking about that.

Mr. Young: No, we don't.

Mr. Foulds: It didn't affect very many workers.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It affected a lot of workers.

Mr. Foulds: How many compensation cases are there?

Mr. Martel: The 60 per cent increase didn't affect any of them, because the actual increase was 180 per cent.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The members opposite don't understand. They don't understand the whole history and purpose of this legislation when they talk like that.

Mr. Martel: Sure, nobody understands except the government.

Mr. Foulds: How many compensation cases are there?

Mr. Ferrier: The injured workmen certainly don't understand.

Mr. Martel: They don't understand either.

Mr. Havrot: Not one of them has ever met a payroll.

Mr. Yakabuski: No, they've all been—

Mr. Martel: No, we've been too busy running around—

Mr. Havrot: They've never met a payroll in their lives.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: The member's problem is that his head has been too close to the boiler all these years.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I wish you would restore some order—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please; order please.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Please extend the courtesy to the hon. member that he may continue his speech.

Mr. Martel: There are a few hot rolls running around.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I would remind the member that an empty wagon makes a lot of noise.

Mr. Martel: Well, then I suggest the member fill himself up.

Mr. Ferrier: The member is really autobiographical today.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Yes, indeed. I will get to the member for Cochrane South a little later.

Mr. Martel: He wants a cabinet post, so be careful.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Plans have also been developed to promote the use of Ontario's 5,000 elementary and secondary schools as focal centres of the communities they serve. The province's school boards are being offered complete administrative and financial support grants of up to \$10,000 for community school projects.

Mr. Foulds: That's really complete.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: In addition, the Ontario government has endorsed full community use of school facilities after regular school hours by groups and agencies working in concert with their local boards of education.

The Speech from the Throne mentioned housing—

Mr. Foulds: That's all it did—it mentioned housing.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It mentioned it—

Mr. Haggerty: More paper work—like housing—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: When I think of Liberals and their federal counterparts in Ottawa, I think of the federal programme in terms of housing, which has been nothing over the years.

Mr. Turner: Nothing.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The federal Liberals have used housing merely as an economic tap.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): They turn it on and off:

Mr. J. A. Taylor: When they wanted more activity in the construction industry, they would merely turn the tap on and float more dollars into the industry.

An hon. member: They didn't produce any more energy.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They weren't concerned about houses. Houses didn't mean a thing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: When they wanted to tighten the money supply, what did they do? They cut off the funds to nothing.

Mr. Turner: They put the workers out of work.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That's the federal Liberal programme.

Mr. Renwick: Good stuff.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Nobody respects them but the people.

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Yeal

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That's all they've ever done in Ottawa. Where else have the people got the same opportunity to own a home as they have here in this great Province of Ontario? And this government is making it easier.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Some even have two.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They are very difficult times indeed, but it's doing everything possible to facilitate people to own their own homes.

Mr. Haggerty: One can't buy a home.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Our philosophy is that it's important that the people of the province have a vested interest in the province and that they own something, which is contrary to the socialist philosophy that the state should own everything.

Mr. Foulds: There is one thing we are glad we don't own, and that's the member.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, may I protest this colossal ignorance of socialist philosophy.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member may continue.

Mr. Foulds: We protest this colossal ignorance.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This province has given high priority to the funding of housing. There is no question about that. The budgetary allocation of 1974 was \$284 million—

Mr. Martel: It costs \$426 a month in carrying charges.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —compared with \$195 million in 1973 and \$164 million in 1972.

Mr. Maeck: That shows you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: And I dare say that the amount will be increased probably 50 per cent in 1975—

Mr. Martel: If Ottawa give us money.

Mr. Foulds: Can the member dare say that?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —to the point where provincial funding for housing will exceed, probably for the first time in our history, moneys paid by Ottawa for housing.

Mr. Foulds: Oh, oh. For the first time, after 32 years of effort.

Mr. Morningstar: Right.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That's something the people of this province should be proud of.

Mr. Turner: Yes, we indeed are.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It is significant—

Mr. G. Nixon: (Dovercourt): Right on.

Mr. Morningstar: Right on.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —that the people who immigrate to Canada come to this province.

Mr. Martel: It costs \$426 a month in carrying charges.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The hon. member for Sudbury East can afford a \$75,000 home on a \$20,000 salary.

Mr. Martel: That just eats one's heart out.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They don't believe in work over there; so it doesn't matter to them what effort one makes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: In connection with housing, the Ontario Building Code was developed and new legislation passed in the last session which should significantly benefit the citizens of Ontario by ensuring effective building safety standards and evaluating new business techniques and materials.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Don't tell me the member wrote that.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: We have heard something today about energy. I think a forward step was the establishment of the Ontario Energy Corp. in order to ensure that Ontario has enough natural gas for its consumers and industries at the end of this decade. There is no question that this energy corporation will provide the initiative and support required to get large energy projects under way.

Mr. Sargent: How does the member know that?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Because I have confidence in this government and the people that run this government.

Mr. G. Nixon: He is right on there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: When I look at the alternatives, I see nothing.

Mr. Turner: What alternatives indeed?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I am confident and convinced that the people of Ontario—

An hon. member: Members opposite shudder.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —will return this government in the next election to carry on with its constructive and forward programmes.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Don't count on that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ferrier: How can he see with his eyes closed?

Mr. Turner: The member for Cochrane South might better ask that.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: What are some major priorities? Support for the polar gas project; support for the Mackenzie Valley pipeline planned by Canadian Arctic Gas Study Ltd.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Turner: Right on; right on.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The Ontario government has invested \$100 million in Syncrude—

An hon. member: Gambled it away.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The project is to remove the oil from the Athabaska tar sands.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: In connection with the Syncrude project and Ontario's financial contribution, Ontario will receive many, many major benefits.

Mr. Martel: Right: Like world prices.

Mr. Haggerty: What happened to the pipeline that was supposed to come down from the Arctic with oil? What happened to that deal?

An hon. member: Name one benefit.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I will name one; certainly I will name one. At the end of 1974, this past year, orders for the manufacture of major equipment by the factories of Ontario for the Syncrude project totalled \$105 million.

Mr. Martel: The value of it is only a billion dollars.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: And Ontario's share of the equipment purchases by the end of the project will total almost a quarter of a billion dollars. That's a benefit, and we are getting that right here in Ontario.

Mr. G. Nixon: Work for the people of Ontario.

Mr. Martel: Can anyone imagine the Liberals opposing that when their government signed the deal?

Mr. Turner: They don't know what they are talking about.

Mr. Martel: It's an awful position to be in.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The Ontario government has given approval to several power development projects for Ontario Hydro between 1977 and 1982. They include construction of a new generating station at Wesleyville, expansion of the Pickering generating station, and construction of two additional heavy water plants in Bruce nuclear power project.

Mr. Sargent: That is the biggest pork barrel in the world and he knows it.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The route of a 5,000-kw transmission line from Nanticoke to Pickering has been determined and the government has given approval for its construction at an estimated cost of \$360 million.

We have programmes to develop watts from waste, and we have heard the Minister of the Environment (Mr. W. Newman) enlarge upon this. These are forward and progressive steps. The experiment is to be carried out at the Lakeview generating station.

Mr. Haggerty: Just turn some of the lights off in the government buildings and it would be quite a bit of saving.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Processed solid waste will be used as fuel in the production of electrical power.

Mr. Ferrier: He is talking about the past. The Throne Speech is supposed to be about the future.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Last fall the Ontario government also took the initiative in launching a comprehensive province-wide programme to reclaim and recycle useful resources from solid waste.

Mr. Sargent: Who wrote his speech?

Mr. G. Nixon: It wasn't the member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Initially six reclamation and recycling plants are to be built at a cost of \$17 million for the Kingston, Sudbury, London, Metro Toronto and Halton-Peel areas. That indeed is great news and another forward advance.

Mr. G. Nixon: Great stuff.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): What is that; a stock market prediction?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: What does the member for Thunder Bay know about farming?

Mr. Martel: He is back on the farming kick. Is he trying to influence the Minister of Agriculture and Food or something today? Does the minister need another parliamentary assistant?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That is the only stock market he alludes to.

Now let's mention consumer protection and legislation that has been developed to assist the unwary, the consumer, the ordinary citizen who has to purchase products. The Business Practices Act is designed to remove deceptive and false business practices. And some of the unfair business practices which were considered.

Mr. Sargent: Like the Fidinam affair and the Moog and Davis hotel. They don't count those things. How about the Bill Davis hotel?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They are now covered.

Mr. Turner: Just be careful; just be careful.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —on the selling of a consumer product and informing him that services and parts are available when they are not.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Tell us about John Munro.

Mr. Turner: Tell us about Hamilton.

Mr. Sargent: I don't know about that, but I do know about this thing.

Mr. Turner: No he doesn't.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Selling goods or services under false circumstances, such as a warehouse clearance sale; a salesman using a devious technique to enter a home—these

are some of the matters that are covered by the Business Practices Act.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask you please to restore some semblance of order to this chamber.

Mr. Turner: Right, right.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Try to keep the member for Scarborough Centre quiet.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: When you begin to point out the constructive, forward policies and legislation and accomplishments of this government just during the past session, they are so embarrassed they try to drown out the speaker so the public won't know what's going on. There's nothing that frightens them more than the truth.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: What did they feed him today?

Mr. Sargent: Tell us about Hydrogate.

Mr. Young: Tell us about Hamilton.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The new Consumer Reporting Act proclaimed on July 2 protects consumers in credit and personal information reporting, granting them the right to know what is reported and to whom. The law also makes provision for correction of false information.

Aren't the opposition members concerned about the legislation that we've developed?

Mr. Stokes: Yes, we're concerned.

Mr. Martel: We're vitally concerned, that is the reason.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The Travel Industry Act, then—listen to this. The new Travel Industry Act was designed to curb irresponsible selling and administrative procedures used by some travel agents and travel wholesalers in the normal course of business.

An hon. member: We just put them in jail now.

An hon. member: All of them?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Under the Act all travel agents and their employees and travel wholesalers will have to be licensed. Each travel agent and travel wholesaler must post a \$5,000 bond which will be forfeit if the Act is contravened.

Mr. Sargent: That was a real break, that one.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Regulations have been drafted in order to fully protect deposits made by customers and an industry financed compensation fund has been established to benefit customers whose travel funds have been abused.

Then, of course, the Motorized Snow Vehicles Act was passed and there are many changes in that legislation—

Mr. Ferrier: The member for Lambton wasn't too happy about that.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —to improve the safety of both the snowmobiler and the public alike.

Mr. Sargent: Tell us about Krauss-Maffei. Let's hear about that one.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Snowmobilers will no longer be able to drive their machines on the travelled portion of any provincial highway or secondary road. Local municipalities will be able to pass bylaws regulating the operation of motorized snow vehicles within their jurisdiction. Under this legislation a property owner or occupier will not be liable for injuries sustained by a trespassing snowmobiler unless those injuries were caused maliciously or wilfully. Provisions regarding the age of snowmobile drivers have also been established under the bill. No one under the age of 12 will be permitted to drive a snow vehicle on a public trail.

Getting back to the matter of agriculture and agricultural societies. The Agricultural Societies Amendment Act provides a grant—

Mr. Stokes: Meanwhile, back at the farm.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —for one-third of the cost up to \$500. The members of the NDP ridicule this because they don't know what farming is, or what agricultural societies are—

Mr. Stokes: What is the member's background?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —but these additional grants permit entertainment programmes to be developed based on local talent—

Mr. Stokes: How many cows did the member milk this morning?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —as opposed to imported performers.

Mr. Turner: Be careful, he's got a farm.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The bill also provides grants for farm improvement competitions and special events with light horses.

The Act is intended to encourage greater community participation on the part of agricultural societies. I think that's a wonderful thing and it helps our local talent. We have some great groups in Prince Edward county and Lennox—

Mr. Turner: Great riding.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —just wonderful local entertainers who are happy to perform and are very well received, such as the Good family and the Post family and so forth—just some tremendous talent that is being encouraged to be used locally and inspired by additional grants for local entertainment through this government.

Mr. Young: We're getting good entertainment this afternoon.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I think that's a great thing, and I think it's about time the opposition members acknowledged it.

Mr. Turner: It is a very good thing, indeed.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Sure it is.

Mr. Turner: It's one the whole country shouldn't be without.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: To get into the matter of public transit, for example. We've heard a lot of that lately.

Mr. Sargent: That's a great one. Tell us how much went down the drain in that field.

Mr. Morningstar: That's a federal matter—Trudeau's.

An hon. member: We have to pay them back, don't we?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: We don't hear the opposition saying that the Province of Ontario—

Mr. Turner: We don't hear them saying anything.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —is paying one-half of the operating losses of the municipalities in the public transportation field. We don't hear the opposition parties telling the local municipalities and the leaders in the transportation areas that the province pays 75 per cent of the cost of all new subway cars, buses, streetcars and trains.

Mr. Sargent: We can't get a subway in Owen Sound.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: This province recognizes the need for modern, up-to-date transporta-

tion to get people around. We realize that, so we're doing something—

Mr. Turner: It is a very good thing.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —and we're making these financial payments to the municipalities.

Mr. Morningstar: Right on. Right on.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: And another \$17 million in grants were made for rural roads.

Mr. Morningstar: That's federal matter—Trudeau's.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: In this current fiscal year the province will be spending \$229 million in road building and maintenance grants—

Mr. Sargent: Where is that money coming from?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: As far as local government is concerned again, there is a provincial commitment to share with the local municipalities the increase in gross of the net provincial product, and this province is—

Mr. Sargent: Where else would it go?

Mr. Ferrier: Dragging its feet, is that what the member meant to say?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —it has made that commitment and it has lived up to that commitment. More and more money is being transferred from the provincial treasury to the municipalities every year. We don't often get any credit for it.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: No, there are others who brag about keeping the mill rate down and exercising economies, and we at the provincial level get criticized if there is any taxation. But it is through the actions—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —of this government and the responsibility it feels for the homeowners of this province that these transfer payments have been made from the provincial treasury to the municipalities to ensure that the mill rate is kept down.

Mr. Morningstar: Good stuff.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: In 1974 we paid over \$2.1 billion—

Mr. Sargent: And had a billion-dollar deficit.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —which was an increase of \$277 million over 1973 to the municipalities. It is interesting that nearly 30 per cent of the provincial budget in the 1974-1975 fiscal year has been transferred to the municipalities and school boards to keep the real property tax at a reasonable level.

Mr. Haggerty: Why shouldn't they get a share of that?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It's too bad that the members—

Mr. Haggerty: They should get a share of the sales tax—the municipalities.

Mr. Sargent: Let the member have the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. White) tell him what is going to happen in 1976.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It's too bad the Liberals wouldn't go to their Ottawa friends who seek so hard to control the provincial party, and talk a little bit of reason and common sense in sharing the wealth of this nation, because we'd get more money back from them. The Liberals don't do that.

But it is just the one great big fill-the-bucket routine in Ottawa. We are squeezed more and more every year, and the wealth is generated in this province. It is time, when they are talking in terms of fairness and equity, that they sought out their so-called friends in that Liberal Party in Ottawa, and saw that some justice is done for the residents of Ontario.

Mr. G. Nixon. Right on.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I hear so often the cries of these members from northern Ontario in terms of provincial assistance, and in some cases neglect by the province of those northern areas.

Mr. Yakabuski: That's the NDP.

Mr. Haggerty: They have a strong commitment there.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I have heard people from northern Ontario brag about the development that's going on there, the level of prosperity that they are experiencing, the high wages that they are earning—

Mr. Stokes: And the lack of services.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I hear about that. When I listen to the New Democratic members in this House talk about northern Ontario, you'd think everyone had to wear a gas mask and was just choking for air, that it was a pocket of poverty in this great province, and that

they were members of the weak and the oppressed.

I think it's time the opposition members did service to their constituents and came down to Queen's Park and started to brag about the north country, and what is being done in the north country.

Mr. Stokes: Why is this government closing mines in Timmins? The member doesn't have to tell me what is good about the north. I have lived there.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They cry and they scream and they poor-mouth.

Mr. Yakabuski: The guy from Marathon knows that is good.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: And this province has been doing a great deal to open up development, to promote the northern regions.

Mr. Stokes: He doesn't have to tell me anything about the north. I live there.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: There is no question about that.

Mr. Ferrier: What about eastern Ontario?

Hon. A. K. Meen (Minister of Revenue): We are not doing too badly there.

Mr. Sargent: He should be on the Johnny Carson show.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I think those northern members should go back home and tell the people like it is. Tell them the truth.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): That is the NDP members, he means.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Don't keep them in the dark.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): They don't have to tell them; they see it.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I'll tell you I know, Mr. Speaker, because I was raised and born in the north country—

Mr. Stokes: In what order?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —and I came to Toronto. I'm not like members opposite; I wasn't issued by the government. That's what they would have—everything from the government service.

The stereotype of the north that is projected here is completely false.

Mr. Sargent: Why hasn't the government more members up there then?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I think the people of Ontario generally are proud of the north country and proud that it is a part of this great province. I think this government is doing everything to involve it in the development and growth of the province so that it experiences that increasing economic advantage enjoyed by the people in the urban areas.

Mr. Stokes: Why is that Tory up there trying to form a new province then?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Give the member the floor.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: We have certain insidious forces at work trying to destroy Ontario just as some forces are trying to destroy—

Mr. Stokes: In the Tory party.

Mr. Ferrier: Like the government is doing at Queen's Park.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for calling the House to order because I've had to bring this matter to the attention of the Chair before. I think the members should respect the Speaker surely until I finish my address.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I'm not trying to be deterred from my speech or distracted in any way. At the same time, I can't fail but respond to the interjections that members are making which try to distort the picture.

Mr. Ferrier: Even the member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root) is paying attention.

An hon. member: All the time.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: There were special northern Ontario grants which were increased in 1974. In 1974 the special support grant was increased from 10 per cent to 12 per cent of the net general dollar levy, bringing the total of special assistance to northern communities to nearly \$14 million.

The increased assistance for northwestern Ontario I think should be known to the members from that area. The province's regional priority budget for northwestern Ontario should be familiar to all of them. Funds have been increased from \$2.4 million in 1973-1974 to \$9.3 million for 28 projects in the current fiscal year.

The 10-year general development agreement with the government of Canada was signed for northwestern Ontario. The northwestern Ontario agreement is for seven specific projects, including sewage, road construction and town site assistance at a cost of \$42 million over a three-year period. Members have talked about servicing. There's a forward step in terms of providing services for the northern communities.

Mr. Ferrier: What about the northeast though? They haven't done anything.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The member makes a lot of noise but he doesn't know what is going on. That's the trouble with the opposition.

Mr. Ferrier: The Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) has been telling us what is going to be done for the last 2½ years.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Plans to improve essential services for people in northwestern Ontario are progressing. An air communications network is scheduled for full service in 1977, with norOntair links between 12 isolated communities and national and regional air services at Dryden, Thunder Bay and Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. Gilbertson: We are going to have it into Wawa shortly.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That's right. And where are all the opposition's policies?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: The member might be interested to know that it was at my urging they got it done.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: All they've done is talk and complain.

An hon. member: That's all they ever do.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They harp and complain and condemn. How they can condemn and take the credit at the same time is beyond me.

An hon. member: They do.

Mr. Stokes: I am not condemning.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The Liberal member for Carleton East (Mr. P. Taylor) was speaking recently in eastern Ontario and he stated that the Liberal Party does indeed have a policy; but he was not sure whether that policy was suitable for Ontario. I think it's

time that party consulted with the member for Carleton East and let him in on any policies that it might be thinking about. I know they have been a very closely kept secret to date, but if the party has any it better tip the member off because he is going to have to say something constructive and positive one day, and he hasn't yet.

Mr. Gaunt: A gross misrepresentation, I say.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): What is the policy in the Throne Speech?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They haven't had time to think about it.

Mr. Gaunt: There is a difference between a platform and a policy.

Mr. Stokes: How would the member for Huron-Bruce know; he hasn't got a leader.

Mr. B. Newman: Tell us about the poll results.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The Liberal member for Ottawa East was interested in law and order—

Mr. Turner: Was he?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —but I see he has vacated his seat. I was going to speak about law and order for a few moments, because law and order has been a concern of this government and of course is indicated in the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Haggerty: It was to Wintermeyer too, but they wouldn't listen to him.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Don't let's get on to Wintermeyer. That was a catastrophic adventure and it sure signalled his demise in a hurry. I don't want to get involved in personalities, either his or that of the member.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Can we have a little order in the chamber for just a little while?

Mr. Gaunt: Those guys keep bugging me.

Mr. Sargent: What kind of a speech is that?

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for calling order. When one touches raw nerves, you get that kind of response.

Mr. Speaker: If the member for Prince Edward-Lennox would address the Speaker

rather than address other members, I think we would get along better too.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, with respect, I have been trying to do that in a vain effort to restore order to this forum so that I can be heard.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They don't have much in their heads anyway.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The breakdown in law and order today is something that I think concerns all of us. Regardless of the political party you might subscribe to or support, I think it is important that all of us assume responsibility in terms of public attitudes regarding law and order. I think it is time for all of us to take up a very responsible posture in that regard.

Mr. Ferrier: The same as Richard Nixon did?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: This truly concerns me, because we are in an era of confrontation. We are in an era of civil disobedience. We are in an era of changing attitudes where the law is supposed to apply to the individual but not to the crowd. It doesn't matter if it is one person or a number of persons who break the law, it is still a breach of the law. It's important that the law be respected, because when the rule of law breaks down we have chaos.

I think it is important that we become responsible in that regard. And please let's not play politics with that, because it is too serious a matter for all of the people of Ontario.

We've heard a lot of criticism about our law enforcement agencies. We've heard cries for investigations. We've heard of so-called police brutality.

You know, we always look at the law-breaker and we commiserate with him in terms of his conviction and his term of sentence, but it is seldom that we look at the victim of the crime. We don't see these same things through the eyes of the families who are grieved, the next of kin and others, and I think we should.

We have just had today a stay of execution in connection with a conviction for the murder of a policeman. I think we are all familiar with the Rene Vaillancourt case. Now that sentence has been put off until May 15 so that it can be decided whether or not that convicted murderer should hang, or whether his sentence should be commuted to life in prison.

Mr. Stokes: What does the member think?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I am personally convinced that capital punishment should be restored in this nation. That's a personal conviction I have. Those who think that we have reached such a degree of civilization that we can look so charitably upon those who kill others, that we can afford to keep them in comfort rather than to take their lives, I think are deluding themselves.

Mr. Ferrier: He is back in the Old Testament days.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: We can talk about the Old Testament, if you will; I don't personally believe in killing. I am just as compassionate and considerate of others as, I am sure, is every member of the House. But I think we have got to think about the people of society who are to be protected. Maybe we have to concentrate more on the community than on the criminal.

There has not been one execution in the past 12 years. It's deceitful of the federal government to delude the people of this nation of ours that there is capital punishment in effect for the murder of a policeman or a prison guard, when in fact that has never been carried out in this last 12 years. That should be changed.

It is significant to me that just last Sunday, on March 9 in Belleville, the Royal Canadian Legion, District "F", sponsored an action meeting. These meetings will be held right across Canada. The Legion is involving itself in the concern of many people right across this nation—the breakdown of law and order. I heard it said there that members of the Legion went outside of this country to fight for law and order, for peace, and good government, and now they have to look within their own homes and say: "Maybe we had better concern ourselves with what's happening in this province and in this country, right at home."

Mr. Sargent: Right here in Queen's Park is where the breakdown is.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: And I think it's important and significant that the Royal Canadian Legion—

Mr. Sargent: Look who's talking about law and order.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —has taken on this task. What better agency? What better agency—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Give the member the floor and let him proceed.

Mr. Sargent: I am interjecting very intelligently.

Mr. Speaker: I know you are.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —to analyse the role of the police, the role of the citizen, the law-maker, the lawyers, the judges, the parole officers, the prisons, capital punishment, civil liberties, vandalism? These are all important matters that are being looked at very closely now.

All of the community leaders were involved and are being involved in this action programme—so that their views can be voiced, so that their thoughts can be projected and carried to the various levels of government, expressing their concern and seeking action where necessary. This action includes—and must include—the better enforcement of the laws of this province, and of this nation, because that is important. I think we have good laws, generally speaking. Now it's a matter of seeing that those laws are enforced openly and evenly, without fear, in our favour.

Mr. Sargent: Tell us about all the charges in the Ontario Housing Corp., the people convicted there.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The Throne Speech mentioned the establishment of an ombudsman, and I know this has been a particular pet project of a member of this Legislature for many, many years.

I think it's significant that the state of our laws and the bureaucracy and the matters handled by the administrative boards and commissions and tribunals have reached the stage where the ordinary citizen gets entangled in the red tape and trapped in those alleys of bureaucracy.

The need for an ombudsman also indicates a concern for what has developed in terms of the regulation of the lives of the people of the province. I don't disagree with the fact that we should have some public protector to help people to find their way through an often bureaucratic nightmare to seek justice, to see that their grievance is heard and to see that something constructive be done.

I think maybe we'd better be looking as well at the large urban areas. At the provincial level we deal with a lot of bread and butter issues. A lot of bread and butter issues are also dealt with at the municipal level, and the larger the municipal government the less able is the citizen equipped to deal with those matters that affect his daily life. Now that we have reached this point, I believe that we had better take a good look at the entire area so that we can ensure that the citizens of this province are not

voices in the wilderness crying out for help in trying to find a solution to a problem which is very close to them and which concerns and often upsets them very much.

Mr. Stokes: There is no problem in my riding.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I think this message that is in the Throne Speech is something that is meaningful indeed. I am convinced that there will be a great deal of discussion and debate when the legislation comes before this House. And, again, there is no question that it is a forward step.

The matter of immigration was mentioned in the Throne Speech as well. These are just words to so many people. I pointed out earlier that one-third of the increase in population in this province since the Second World War was through immigration. Don't think that that doesn't provide immense problems for any government, whether it's municipal or provincial, to provide the housing and the services—the soft services as well as the hard services—for those people.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): The government doesn't provide any housing.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It's a difficult task, indeed, especially when we get the racial and cultural mix that has come to this great Province of Ontario. I think it's significant that they've come to Ontario, but that doesn't lessen our problem of having to cope with a very large influx of people, to cope with their hopes and aspirations and their needs. This has proved a tremendous burden on the municipal and provincial levels of government. The fact that this province has been able to develop and grow through the free enterprise system to the creation of a good atmosphere and environment for private development is significant, because otherwise we would not be able to reap the rewards of those profits and to purchase the soft services in terms of the welfare programmes that we've been able to do.

I've tried this afternoon to outline what steps, what programmes, what policies and what legislation has been passed just during the past session by this government. I think the government is to be commended for those programmes and policies. Leaving political considerations and the political posturing that has gone on, I think the government of Ontario has been just a tremendous force, a very progressive and determined force, in the development of the economy and the social welfare of the people of Ontario.

Mr. Laughren: A spent force—the Tories are a spent force.

Mr. Havrot: Wishful thinking!

Mr. J. A. Taylor: We must awaken to the realities of our responsibilities. The words of the late Leslie M. Frost, spoken more than 30 years ago in his 1944 budget address, still ring loud and clear in my mind:

We are building not only for these times; we are planning for a greater population—for industrial expansion, for prosperous farms and for a happy and healthy people. We are laying the sure foundation for a greater and stronger Ontario.

We are indeed fortunate to have a Premier of this province who is both youthful and vigorous and determined, who has taken bold and progressive steps. Sometimes these steps have been not too popular, because it is often essential to lead, and not just to follow. But the Premier of this province is equipped and prepared to lead, and he has done that admirably.

Mr. Havrot: Yes sir.

Mr. Turner: Tremendous!

Mr. J. A. Taylor: When you have the pressures of development, pressures of growth, the social pressures on any area, the problems are horrendous.

Mr. Sargent: You'd better believe it.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It takes a brave and courageous person to tackle those problems and to solve them, regardless of how popular the solution might be at any moment. The Premier of this province has done that; and not only has he done it, he has done it with dignity.

Mr. G. Nixon: Right on!

Mr. Sargent: The Premier should quit before he messes up any more.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: He is a gentleman, he is knowledgeable, he has honour and he has integrity—

An hon. member: Oh boy!

Mr. Sargent: I wouldn't say that too much.

Mr. J. A. Taylor:—and he has compassion and understanding. I am convinced that under his leadership, Ontario will march far down the road of prosperity. Thank you very much.

Mr. J. Lane (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to have this op-

portunity to second the motion of the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox for adoption of the Speech from the Throne presented by the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario.

The Speech from the Throne indicates concern for the economy of the province and for the welfare of our people, coupled with a good common-sense approach.

Mr. Morningstar: Good.

Mr. Lane: Mr. Speaker, I will not take the time of the House to make reference to the various programmes and policies indicated in the speech as the ministers responsible for these services will provide us with details of these in the weeks and months ahead. There are, however, a few items that I would like to make special reference to, and come first to the matter of extended benefits for our elderly people.

Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for our elderly. Without the sacrifices and contributions that they have made to the province, we all would not now enjoy the many good things in life that we do. It is now our turn to make some contribution to them. This we have continued to do over the years and, as the Throne Speech indicates, we will continue to do so.

Mr. Laughren: Is the member for Algoma listening to this?

Mr. Lane: I am very concerned that our senior citizens should have proper housing. I know that the hon. Minister of Housing (Mr. Irvine) has the same concerns. We all know the current difficulties being experienced in obtaining needed support from the federal government, which appears to have placed a lower priority on this matter than indicated earlier. I therefore urge the hon. minister to continue to press his federal counterpart for financial assistance so that we may provide more rent-geared-to-income housing for senior people.

Mr. Speaker, the other matter in the Throne Speech to which I would like to make direct reference is the assurance that assistance will be provided for our farmers.

Farmers, particularly beef farmers in my riding, as in other parts of the province, are experiencing a very difficult period. If further measures of assistance are not provided, some farmers may go bankrupt and many will be forced out of business. In fact, as we are all well aware, the question of adequate production and distribution of food is a matter

of world-wide concern. Ontario has played a significant role in food production in the past, both on a national and international scale, and I for one regard it as a role that must be maintained. I know the Minister of Agriculture and Food shares this view most sincerely. I am very pleased to see that assistance to Ontario farmers will be provided and I am assured that this will be in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to discuss my riding, the great riding of Algoma-Manitoulin. I feel that I represent some of the best people in the province, and not least among them are our native Canadians living on the eight Indian reserves in the riding.

Mr. Gilbertson: It is second to Algoma.

Mr. Lane: I work very closely with the native people on self-help programmes and I am very, very proud of them. In the past 3½ years we have managed to improve greatly the quality of life and employment opportunities on the reserves in Algoma-Manitoulin. These people are very proud of their heritage and culture and are making great contributions in the field of culture and education.

Just two weeks ago, at the West Bay reserve on Manitoulin Island, Ministry of Education officials released a resource guide for the people of native ancestry. It was a great personal pleasure for me to have this guide released on Manitoulin Island. I assure the native people of Algoma-Manitoulin of the combined interest and support on my behalf as their elected representative and on behalf of this government.

Mr. Gilbertson: He is doing a good job. Keep it up.

Mr. G. Nixon: Full-time too.

Mr. Lane: Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the very serious silicosis problem affecting our miners in Elliot Lake and other areas of the province. A few months ago, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) appointed a royal commission to investigate all matters related to health and safety involved in the working conditions and working environment in the mines in Ontario.

Mr. Gilbertson: A concerned government.

Mr. Lane: Mr. Speaker, I regard the appointment of the commission as a very positive step in the right direction. However, it seems to me that much could have been

accomplished, and sooner, if all parties had worked together and laid aside—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lane: —personal and political differences. Officials of the United Steelworkers of America in Elliot Lake chose to ignore me and direct all their requests through NDP members.

Mr. G. Nixon: Discrimination.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Laughren: Because the Minister of Natural Resources doesn't give a damn and the member knows it. He never has and he never will.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

An hon. member: Why are we in power and the people over there still yakking?

Mr. Lane: Until a few weeks ago, I had no communication from the union. I received not a visit, a phone call, a letter, a brief or any type of communication of any kind.

Mr. Laughren: Did the member call on them? Did he go to Elliot Lake? He didn't even go into the community to meet with the people. That is why.

Mr. Lane: Approximately three weeks ago, I received a letter inviting me to attend a meeting on Sunday, March 16. This was the first such approach in the three years that I've been a member of this House.

Mr. Gilbertson: That's on account of those NDP fellows sneaking in the back way.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: The member is the one who went in the back way.

Mr. Lane: Yet during the last week in January, 1975, the Elliot Lake NDP Community Club took it upon themselves to distribute a letter to the good people of Elliot Lake. I have a copy of this letter here, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Havrot: It is a good piece of garbage.

Mr. Lane: It was distributed to the householders in Elliot Lake—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lane: Mr. Speaker, could I have some order, please?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Gilbertson: The member for Algoma-Manitoulin has the floor. Keep quiet.

Mr. Lane: This letter was distributed to the householders in Elliot Lake a few days prior to my meeting with the ladies' action group at Elliot Lake. I feel this was done to discredit me. Mr. Speaker, this is a full two-page letter and I would like to take the time of the House to read a few paragraphs from it.

Until a suitable NDP replacement can be elected in the place of the present Conservative member of the Ontario Legislature, citizens of Elliot Lake may refer any problems requiring the attention of a real MPP to any member of the club executive. We, in turn, will forward requests for assistance to Elie Martel, Sudbury East, MPP, who will continue to work for the people of Elliot Lake as he has in the past.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lane: Mr. Speaker, many years before I became the member for Algoma-Manitoulin the riding was well served by Mr. Stan Farquhar and although he and I were of different political persuasions, we worked very closely together during the years that I was the mayor of the town of Gore Bay, and we got the job done by working together.

Mr. Ferrier: That is how the silicosis developed.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Turner: A city of socialist forces.

Mr. Lane: He, in my mind, was a real MPP. Do you know sir, I too feel very real. I have flesh on my bones and blood in my veins. I'll assure the NDP Community Club of Elliot Lake that the constituents of Algoma-Manitoulin will be shown just how real I am when we go out for the next provincial election.

Mr. Martel: That is really all the member cares about, isn't it?

Mr. Lane: I assure you, Mr. Speaker, I will not take advantage of the silicotic miner and his family by making political hay as the NDP are doing.

Mr. Laughren: He will ignore him.

Mr. Martel: Where was the member during the hassle in the House?

Mr. Lane: I am working and will continue to work for positive control of the situation. I say at this time—

Mr. Martel: From the member that would be impossible.

Mr. Lane: If the member listens the member might learn something.

I say at this time any miner showing any percentage of silicosis wishing to have a job that will not expose him further can and will be retrained and re-employed in the Elliot Lake area.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lane: I will also continue working toward a method to subsidize his earnings from the time he leaves the job underground until he is relocated with comparable earnings. There is no way the affected miner should feel obligated to work underground to provide a livelihood for his family even though his health, and perhaps his life, are at stake.

I have many other suggestions that could be improved. I have mentioned these on other occasions. Again I say we can accomplish more by working together, so why don't we try that route, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Martel: Why didn't the member come up just once?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Gilbertson: Members opposite don't care about people.

Mr. Lane: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to quote again from the letter I have referred to:

Stephen Lewis was responsible for the inquiry into uranium mining at Elliot Lake. His three-hour speech in the Ontario Legislature directed at the minister of mines, the Hon. Leo Bernier, forced the formation of the royal commission.

An hon. member: Wrong!

Mr. Ferrier: Right. Without the member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) there would be no inquiry.

Mr. Lane: Mr. Speaker, this is of course an erroneous statement.

Mr. Martel: He sure was.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lane: I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Natural Resources was not forced into forming the royal commission on mines. He—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lane: —has been concerned as I and many others have been—miners, management and the public alike.

Mr. Havrot: Grandstanding.

Mr. Martel: Management is really concerned; they are still working in there.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. G. Nixon: Stop their yakking.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Martel: They are a disgrace because they weren't in there.

Mr. Lane: Mr. Speaker, he has been concerned as have I and as many others—miners, management and the public at large—have been.

Mr. Martel: Management is really concerned. They are still working in the mines.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Lane: I am sure that these concerns, together with information provided by members of the staff and others is what prompted the royal commission and it is a very positive step.

Mr. Martel: The member is upset all right.

Mr. Lane: I have great respect for the speaking ability of the leader of the NDP. However, I do not have much respect for what he says.

Mrs. Campbell: That's the truth.

Mr. Lane: Not any. In fact it could very well be that he speaks more and says less than anyone else in government today.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate you on the very fine job you have done—

Mr. Martel: Does he think that will recoup anything?

Mr. Lane: —often under very trying circumstances. I'm quite sure you will continue to be wise and efficient in the months ahead.

I am looking forward to the business of this session with my colleagues, and to the programmes and legislation that will no doubt enhance further the quality of life and the prosperity of the people of Ontario.

Mr. G. Nixon: Great stuff.

Mrs. Campbell moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 4:50 o'clock p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 13, 1975

Electrical power inquiry commission, statement by Mr. Grossman	11
Mercury levels in Ontario water, statement by Mr. W. Newman	13
Tribute to Rev. Martin W. Pinker, Mr. Potter, Mr. Apps	14
Otoplasty reinstated as OHIP benefit, statement by Mr. Miller	15
Electrical power inquiry commission, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Gaunt	15
Investigations into dredging industry, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Deans, Mr. Roy, Mr. Lewis	16
Spending ceilings in education, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. R. F. Nixon	18
Ontario Hydro spending, questions of Mr. Grossman and Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Lewis	18
Health and safety hazards at Elliot Lake, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Martel	19
Operations at Reeves mine, questions of Mr. Miller: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Ferrier, Mr. Laughren	20
Oil prices, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Sargent	21
Pafco Insurance Co., question of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Shulman	21
Ottawa teachers' dispute, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Roy, Mr. R. F. Nixon	22
Cochrane District Home for the Aged, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Ferrier	23
North Pickering development, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Deacon	23
Landfill in Hamilton harbour, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Deans	24
Egg production, questions of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Gaunt	25
Layoffs at Douglas Aircraft, questions of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Young	26
Lead pollution hearings, questions of Mr. Miller: Mrs. Campbell	26
Survival of nursery stock, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Stokes	27
Report, re Provincial Auditor, Mr. Snow	27
Report, re governing council of University of Toronto, Mr. Auld	27
Commissioner of the Legislature Act, 1975, Mr. Singer, first reading	28
Election Finances Reform Act, Mr. White, first reading	28
Child Welfare Amendment Act, Mr. Brunelle, first reading	28
Interpretation Amendment Act, Mr. Foulds, first reading	29
Highway Traffic Amendment Act, Mr. Foulds, first reading	29
Power Corporation Amendment Act, Mrs. Campbell, first reading	29
Debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. J. A. Taylor, Mr. Lane	29
Motion to adjourn debate, Mrs. Campbell, agreed to	51
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Stewart, agreed to	51



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Friday, March 14, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MARCH 14, 1975

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

PAFCO INSURANCE CO.

Hon. S. B. Handleman (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, in response to a question from the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) yesterday I informed the House that I would be meeting with the president of Pafoo Insurance Co. on Monday morning. I am pleased to inform the House that the insurance company has now decided to settle its claim by paying Mr. Bradette the full \$1,300 to have his truck and means of business released from the repair shop where it has been sitting for a few weeks. I would like to commend the hon. member for High Park for bringing this to the attention of the ministry.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Hon. W. Newman (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, as part of this government's stated intention in the Speech from the Throne to maintain the present level of current programmes under way in Ontario, later today I will move first reading of a bill to amend the Pollution Abatement Incentive Act, 1970, in order to ensure that the provisions and benefits of this Act continue to be available to Ontario industry and to local municipalities.

This Act enables private industry to recover, under a grant system, the Ontario sales tax which has been paid on pollution control equipment required to meet the standards set by my ministry.

Since 1970, we have stimulated the spending of millions of dollars by industry and by this province and its municipalities on abatement control equipment which has resulted in a better quality of air over our communities, a better quality of water in our lakes and rivers, and greater safeguards for our lands and forests.

This Act has played an important part in this continuing programme to protect and to enhance the environment of this province not only for ourselves, but for future generations. Since the Pollution Abatement Incentive Act came into effect in 1970, the government has approved 1,557 claims for rebate from private industry and under the Act has paid out \$8.5 million to those industries in the form of grants. In addition, more than \$535,000 has been paid out in grants to Ontario municipalities.

This bill provides for provincial grants on equipment purchased, installed and operational prior to April 1, 1976. This extension of the Pollution Abatement Act will enable the government to continue to grant relief to private industry and companies which are anxious to co-operate fully as good citizens of our environmentally concerned society.

This Act represents the government's continuing effort to provide this Province with an effective environmental control programme second to no other in the world.

HOUSING PROGRAMMES

Hon. D. R. Irvine (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech stated that the government would "further increase home ownership so that Ontario families may continue to be the best-housed in Canada."

Today I am pleased to inform the House about two agreements signed with municipalities to accelerate housing production within the Ontario Housing Action Programme. These agreements are important not only for the units they will bring on to the market, but also because they establish valuable precedents for the future direction of the housing production process.

The first of the agreements is with the city of Brampton. This is a master agreement covering the production of 15,000 new houses over the next three years. The pace of this development will be nearly twice that of recent years.

Development will be directed toward moderate incomes according to established OHAP guidelines. Brampton will receive per-unit grants from OHAP at the rate of \$600

for HOME units, \$525 to the moderate-income range and \$450 for the remainder. The total amount is \$7,875,000 for the 15,000 units. These grants are designed to minimize the costs to existing Brampton taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, 12,000 of these units have already received draft subdivision plan approval from both Brampton and my ministry. The signed agreement detailing the scheduling, location and price range of housing will now accelerate these draft plans through to completion, with the first starts likely by the end of this year.

Individual agreements with developers will shortly be signed for the units included within the Brampton master agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to make mention of five other signed municipal agreements—two with Scarborough, two with Brampton and one with Mississauga. These agreements provide for the payment of OHAP's capital housing incentive grants totalling nearly \$790,000.

Regarding developer agreements, I would like to inform the House today about 13 OHAP agreements that I have signed with developers during the past 10 weeks.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): The member has missed a page.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: The 13 agreements cover a total of 3,545 units and a further 2,281 acres of land in seven communities across Ontario. Of the total number of units, 65 per cent or 2,301 are for household incomes between \$14,000 and \$20,000. A further 340 units are committed to the HOME programme income range, bringing production for moderate incomes to 75 per cent of the total.

Of the 3,545 units, 737 will be started this fiscal year. The remainder is phased over the next three years. The 2,281 acres of prime residential land are for longer-term development and are dependent upon OHAP-financed planning, engineering and housing studies, which are now in progress.

In Hamilton, we have an agreement that has been signed with Vin Ton Construction Ltd. for 36 semi-detached townhouses.

In Markham, an agreement has been signed with Cedarland Properties Ltd. covering 1,200 acres in Milliken Mills. Two OHAP study grants have been made to Markham to help prepare for possible Milliken Mills development — one grant for \$95,000 to develop an official plan and another grant for \$43,000 to prepare secondary plans. An accelerated schedule for these studies should

enable completion this summer. A further agreement with Markham will then be necessary to schedule and set out the terms of development in the area.

In Mississauga, two agreements have been signed — one with Cadillac-Fairview Ltd. and the other with Welglen Ltd. for a total of 813 townhouses.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Doesn't this sound all terribly familiar? Haven't we heard all this before?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: In Newcastle, agreements have been concluded with three developers —

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If the ministry built houses like it claims in its press releases, we wouldn't have any trouble.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —Claret Investments, Duffins Creek Estates and Taunton Courtice, for a development total of 1,081 acres. Terms of development will depend upon municipal and regional government approvals, once OHAP-financed studies of the areas have been completed.

In Nepean, agreements have been signed with Greenehaven Construction Ltd. and Tartan Development Corp. for construction of 2,201 units in the Barrhaven community. This development has been made possible by the OHAP-financed storm sewer, which I mentioned earlier. The amount of finance made available by OHAP was \$2.4 million.

In Oshawa, both Anglo York Industrial Ltd. and McLaughlin Square Inc. have signed agreements covering 385 units for moderate-income families.

Finally, in Scarborough, Charter-Global Ltd. and Chiavatti Construction Ltd. have signed agreements for 110 townhouses.

Mr. Speaker, we now have a total of 24 developer agreements signed, with commitments for 15,939 units and a further 4,431 acres of land for development.

Mr. Lewis: Over how many years?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Sometime between now and the year 2000.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Many of the agreements I have mentioned today are based upon the developer bringing the land and units into OHAP.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the opposition will be glad to hear that I will be announcing further agreements in the very near future.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Of course he will.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): That's action for you.

Mr. MacDonald: Announcing and announcing and announcing.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Transportation and Communications.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RESPONSIBILITIES FOR COMMUNICATIONS

Hon. J. R. Rhodes (Minister of Transportation and Communications): On Oct. 29 of last year, Mr. Speaker, I drew to the attention of the Legislature the status of federal-provincial discussions regarding communications.

At that time I pointed out that the government of Ontario has consistently followed the process of negotiation in federal-provincial discussions, rather than adopting a policy of unilateral action, in seeking to preserve Ontario's rightful role in the field of communications.

While this government continues to believe that the proper course to follow is the intergovernmental discussion process, we are being severely tested in our resolve by recent extremely disturbing actions by one of the federal regulatory agencies, the Canadian Radio-Television Commission. I am aware of similar concerns in other provinces as well.

As the members are aware, there have been a number of activities in the last two years involving the federal and provincial governments in the communications field. Advanced for discussion have been fundamental policy issues related to broadcasting, cable and telecommunications common carriers, the roles and responsibilities of governments, major new federal legislation, a new federal regulatory body and a structure for intergovernmental co-operation.

I regret I must report that little progress has been made in the discussions since last October. While there has been a further exchange of letters between the federal minister responsible for communications and myself as chairman of the Interprovincial Conference of Communications Ministers, no agreement on a date for a second federal-provincial conference has yet been reached; nor has there been an agreement on an agenda. However, we are

hopeful that a second and increasingly important conference will take place shortly.

In the meantime, the Canadian Radio-Television Commission issued policy statements and proposals on Feb. 17. These are more far-reaching in their policy implications than anything put forward to date by the federal government in its 1974 green paper on communications policy, at the first federal-provincial conference, in correspondence with the provinces or in private discussions.

These proposals would appropriate to the federal government all areas of cable communications, including those areas which have previously been considered by the provinces, and also the federal minister dealing with communications, as being the responsibility of the provinces. We are confronted with a situation in which the regulatory agency, without clear legislative authority, is zealously acting to consolidate the maximum of de facto federal jurisdiction, regardless of existing provincial activities and legitimate claims. This is all going on at the same time as the federal minister is denying the provinces an opportunity to discuss jurisdictional matters.

I have expressed my concerns most strenuously to the minister of communications and told him that the CRTC action surprised and disappointed me. The Premier (Mr. Davis) has also written emphasizing this government's concern.

Mr. Lewis: Hey, this minister, too, is missing things.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The impact of the proposals is not restricted to cable but—

Mr. Lewis: This is a day for leaving out sentences, phrases, pages.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —will firmly establish a new industry structure involving cable, the telecommunications common carriers and broadcasting. They severely restrict the method by which new and potentially innovative services, such as pay-TV and two-way educational communications, may be developed. They ignore the role and the rights of the provinces and complicate, if not preclude, further constructive discussions between this and the federal government.

Much of the substance of these documents suggests an insensitivity by the CRTC to the interests and needs of the people of Ontario as well as to the potential of the communications industry. While I fully support and endorse the necessity of preserving and extending a strong and viable Canadian broadcasting system, the CRTC's policy, of guarding

the broadcasting industry at all costs, hinders the potential of cable and restricts it to being only a distribution system.

This government believes that the cable industry is still evolving. Restrictive, rigid policies at this time will prevent it from realizing its full potential for the benefit of the people of this province.

For example, the policies contained in the CRTC documents do not recognize the differences throughout Ontario. Obviously all cable systems in Ontario are not identical but exist in various states of economic development and growth potential. Treating all systems the same—big or small, rural or urban—shows misunderstanding of the unique geographic and economic characteristics which exist throughout Ontario and the need of our people, especially in northern Ontario, for a wider range of services than they now enjoy. Such an attitude can only work to the detriment of all cable systems, proving unduly restrictive to some and jeopardizing the very existence of others.

The proposals of the CRTC are not federal government policy statements. They are unilateral actions by an appointed regulatory agency. I would have expected the federal government to put forward such proposals itself so that the people of Canada and the provincial governments could effectively discuss them with the responsible federal minister as matters of important public policy.

We do not accept that such far-reaching actions can be taken by a regulatory body which apparently considers itself beyond the need for political control, and which appears to be beyond the control of the federal government.

I am making public today the letter I wrote to the federal minister on Monday requesting a public clarification of the federal government's position on the subject of consultation between governments on policy issues. I have asked that the federal government make its position known on the issues and proposals of the Canadian Radio-Television Commission. I have also asked that the initiatives of the CRTC be indefinitely deferred until there has been a resolution of the major policy issues involved by the federal and provincial governments.

Mr. Speaker, the government of Ontario has a responsibility to represent the interests of the people of Ontario with respect to the development of communications systems and services in this province. The future development of broadcasting, cable and telecommunications common carrier industries will

have a great impact on the people of Ontario who will benefit from the operation of these industries.

Mr. Speaker, I have grave concern about the concentration of power over communications in a single government, let alone the advisability of placing that future in the hands of a single regulatory body. It is for these reasons that I have asked Mr. Pelletier for his government's views and urged that discussions take place at the earliest possible date among the federal and provincial governments on all important issues related to communications policy.

I would hope that in the meantime no further attempts would be made by the federal government or its agencies to appropriate areas of provincial responsibilities or those in which the provinces have shown their interest. It is because these issues are extremely important for the people of Ontario that I have brought these matters to the attention of the House today.

TASK FORCE ON LEGAL AID

Hon. J. T. Clement (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Mr. Speaker, later today I will be tabling part I of the report of the task force on legal aid. This report reviews all aspects of Ontario's legal aid programme with one exception—the delivery of legal aid services to native people. This subject will be considered in a separate report.

The task force was created by order in council on Jan. 2, 1974. Under the able chairmanship of the hon. Mr. Justice John Osler, the task force has completed a very thorough review. Public hearings were conducted in Toronto, Sudbury, London, Ottawa, Kingston, Hamilton, Windsor, Thunder Bay and Kenora. Public participation included 105 oral and 285 written submissions from both individuals and organizations.

Mr. Speaker, the legal aid programme is important to all members of this Legislature. Individual liberty is jeopardized if a full participation in the legal process depends upon financial circumstances. We therefore regard this report as a most important document. It includes recommendations on all aspects of legal aid, including its structure, coverage under the plan, delivery of legal services, neighbourhood legal aid clinics, student legal aid societies, financial eligibility and assessment.

Implementation of the recommendations would have a significant impact on the legal aid programme. For example, one recom-

mendation would restructure the legal aid plan around a non-profit corporation replacing the present administrative role played by the Law Society. Proposals of such a fundamental nature will require intensive assessment by my ministry before any decisions can be made.

Mr. Speaker, Ontario was a pioneer in its legal aid programme when it was established in 1966. After six full years of operation, an examination was, I believe, a responsible idea. Four provinces have followed our example and established legal aid programmes of their own. Each has included its own features which have tended to make the various plans different. The opportunity to study these variations was also part of the motivation for the task force report.

In addition, variations in the method of funding the legal aid plan have resulted, both from the cost-sharing arrangements for legal aid in criminal matters with the government of Canada, and the establishment of the Law Foundation, pursuant to the Law Society Amendment Act, 1973, which directs three-quarters of the interest in lawyers' mixed trust accounts into legal aid.

This task force review has been carried out with full appreciation for the quality of the present legal aid programme. At its inception, the Ontario plan was by far the most comprehensive in the English-speaking world and the best available anywhere. Many believe, with justification, that it still is. The Law Society deserves our sincere thanks for operating the plan and developing it to its current state. Nor should it be forgotten that at least 14 per cent of all Ontario residents have benefited from the existing programme.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to report back to the House in due course with our response to the various task force recommendations. I would also like to express my great appreciation at this time for the efforts of Mr. Justice Osler and his colleagues. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

The Leader of the Opposition.

AWARDS FOR ADVERTISING WORK

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Chairman of the Management Board what the circumstances were that led him, as Chairman of the Management Board, to approve the expenditure of \$3.2 million for advertising work that was neither awarded by tender nor subject to

contract, particularly after the award of such work had been specifically criticized by the Provincial Auditor in a previous report?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Obviously this is a broad question, Mr. Speaker, that would require me to look into the details of each particular situation, which I will do and report to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: If the minister is going to examine the records and get further information, would he make it clear as to what he feels his responsibilities are as Chairman of the Management Board to fulfil with all expedition the recommendations of the Provincial Auditor, particularly when it entails decisions made specifically in his own office?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, in a general sense it is probably quite true, but from time to time, and not only in this particular area but in other areas, the situation is presented to me as Chairman of the Management Board as being of a critical nature and a decision must be made probably as an exception.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary, if I may. I am sorry to put it this way, but what game is the minister playing? Surely the minister knows that the \$3.2 million that emerged in the auditor's report involved names and contracts or undertakings by specific advertising agencies in specific areas, all of which were potentially controversial, all of which were known to the minister, and all of which had been dealt with in the previous auditor's report. Why does the minister duck a direct question by saying he has to go back and look at the details? The minister knows, as he sits there now, what caused him to confirm those expenditures without tenders—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. You asked your question.

Mr. Lewis: Why doesn't the minister tell us?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to answer that question, but that is absolutely untrue. I cannot stand here and give an answer on the complete detail of that particular question but I will get it for the hon. member.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, could the minister tell us whether he is prepared to recommend, and whether cabinet is prepared to implement, a

policy whereby contracts such as these will be awarded only after tenders? In that regard, could I ask the minister if he's taken the occasion to look at another one of my private bills which says just that, and whether they care to implement that one too?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would care to look a little further he will find that we have directives in this particular matter, as I said.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They are not the best in the world in this regard.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That may be, but there are exceptions to every rule. I will be prepared to deal with these questions when they come before me and as they are presented.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask a question of the Attorney General and acting Solicitor General—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): The government should look after Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) in favour of patronage? Is he still in favour of it after all he's been through?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

STANDARD TUBE CO.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Was the acting Solicitor General consulted in the decision made by the OPP commissioners apparently to put 120 of the OPP officers on duty in Woodstock at the premises of the Standard Tube Co. in order to permit General Motors to remove certain properties that they have within those premises? In fact, the riot squad was called out to allow General Motors to take out those properties—tools and dies.

Hon. Mr. Clement: I have had no discussions on that matter. Could the Leader of the Opposition tell me when this was?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It was within the last two weeks, since the minister asked. Would he get us some information on the circumstances there? With your permission, Mr.

Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Labour if he could give us a report on the status of the strike at Standard Tube in Woodstock at the present time? They had to bring in the OPP riot squad. He ought to know something about that one.

Hon. J. P. MacBeth (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I have a little note on Standard Tube to the effect that they've been out since Feb. 17 and the union is the United Automobile Workers. So far we have not been involved in the matter. We generally wait until one side asks us to intervene.

Mr. Lewis: That's illuminating.

Mr. Singer: The minister is brimming over with information.

Mr. Lewis: It's certainly a little note.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, we will be glad to get into it if either party wants us.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): What does the minister mean, if either party wants him to?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, if I may: Since it required the OPP riot squad there in recent days, wouldn't the minister think that his responsibility would be to show a little more initiative and not wait for one party or the other to request his assistance? Surely his people should have informed him as to the very serious circumstances in this strike, a very disruptive one indeed.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition's question?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What is the minister going to do about it?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, we're not in the habit of forcing ourselves into these situations.

Mr. Lewis: They certainly aren't.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Unless people seek our assistance on this thing and are ready to co-operate with us there is very little we can do. The United Automobile Workers are very reluctant to call upon our services.

Mr. Lewis: With good reason.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to get further information and take some action on our own part to see if we can be of any assistance to them.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question: Would the minister be prepared to ask Mr. Dickie to, in his normal form, contact both parties and see whether they might be prepared to sit down and talk?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: That is the procedure, Mr. Speaker. When neither party has asked our assistance and when we, or somebody else, suggest that we should get in it then we contact both parties and that's what we'll do in this case.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Mr. Lewis: It is better than his abnormal form.

Mr. Deans: That's the way the minister always does it.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, if I may: Does the minister mean that when police in large numbers are involved in an industrial dispute, either to open up picket lines or to take machinery and equipment out of a plant, and clearly the law is involved in such large numbers, he doesn't feel that that is a sufficient basis for him to intervene?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: I think it is, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Mr. Lewis: Then what is the delay?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He didn't know about it.

An hon. member: He needs a new broom.

PICKEREL FISHING SEASON ON LAKE NIPISSING

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. Can he either reconsider the decision to shorten the pickerel fishing season at Lake Nipissing or at least to bring forward another type of programme to assist the outfitters in the area who are going to be, let's say, seriously affected by the shortening of the pickerel season there? Is he aware of the problems they face with the potential loss of up to \$2 million worth of outfitting business?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, this issue has been one of long standing. About two years ago, I would explain to you, sir, I went to North Bay with the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. R. S. Smith). We met with the local staff and we met with the local tourist operators and the chambers of commerce. At that time, sir, I established an advisory committee to look at all aspects of the Lake Nipissing issue as it relates to pickerel fishing and the seasons. After 12 meetings—I believe two or three of them were public meetings—they came forward with some recommendations which I accepted after careful consideration. I might say I accepted those recommendations after I was called on a number of occasions by the member for Nipissing, who felt that the recommendations were very carefully thought out and were acceptable ones to the entire area.

I met further in Sault Ste. Marie at the NOTO convention with operators from the Nipissing area. Following further discussions, there was some concern that the advisory committee did not go into the economics of the entire situation and they felt that a further study was required. I indicated at that time to them—and just as late as yesterday I met with a similar group and reiterated my stand—that we would establish the pickerel season dates this year as were announced. I would not confirm the pickerel season dates for 1976—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That would have meant a further study.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —until I had conducted a complete economic survey and study of the last two years and the result of this year's change. This seems to have been acceptable to all parties.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would not a partial solution to this whole problem be to increase the size of the pickerel that can be kept?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, Mr. Speaker, the advisory committee went into this possibility in great detail and after very careful consideration with the biologists and those people involved and the expertise that we have in the ministry. I might say that the member for Nipissing here again agreed with all the recommendations of that advisory committee.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions from the Leader of the Opposition? The member for Scarborough West.

ONTARIO HYDRO SPENDING

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I want to return to the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development, and the energy proposals he put yesterday, because I continue to be quite perplexed. As I understand it from the amount of money in the most recent year for which we have figures, 1973, Hydro's debt underwritten by Ontario was a total of \$688 million, and Hydro is now asking for \$3 billion a year for eight years. I want to understand how that is financially possible for the Province of Ontario and why that is not subject to an independent commission as well as the plans from 1983 to 1993.

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, as I mentioned yesterday, that is not a question to direct to me. I think it is a question the hon. member should direct to the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), who deals with the financing of the province.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Isn't that policy?

Mr. Lewis: This is a policy area.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is unleashing a monster here.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not unleashing anything. All I unleashed yesterday was a programme whereby the public can ask precisely the questions the hon. member is talking about.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is just a mouthpiece for a statement by somebody else.

Mr. Breithaupt: He doesn't get paid extra just for that.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, what I'm asking the minister is, can he widen the mandate of the inquiry, almost on an emergency basis, on an urgent basis, to take a look at the validity or the reality of the preposterous financial requirements which Hydro has laid down, which will pre-occupy every underwriting capacity that Ontario has, and more, for the next eight years?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to preclude this being debated publicly before the commission. Indeed I expect it will be. I expect that there are people who are concerned about the large expenditures, who will require Hydro—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Everybody is concerned.

Mr. Deans: I would hope everyone is.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —to produce a case to establish that they need to spend this kind of money. The public is going to have to make a decision as to whether it is prepared to do without those expenditures and what it is prepared to pay for that by way of perhaps reduced power supply. This is precisely one of the reasons for the inquiry.

Mr. Lewis: Reduced power supply but Hydro growth.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The whole matter of the growth of Hydro surely is implicit. In fact, it was stated quite bluntly in my statement that it's a wide-open inquiry.

Mr. Lewis: But this is approved.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't see any reason for any holds to be barred at all. They can discuss any matter relating to the plans which Hydro has in that period of time. They can deal with the financing of it, they can deal with the need for it and they can deal with practically anything relating to the matter.

Mr. Speaker: I think the member for Huron-Bruce has a supplementary.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister: Would the minister consider widening the mandate of the commission to include a study of the need for the Bradley-Georgetown power line?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asked me that question yesterday. It has been decided that that should be proceeded with.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): What a waste of \$150 million.

Mr. Lewis: That's part of the growth mania.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member will appreciate you can't stop everything at this particular time. And while there may be some concerns about the location of the transmission lines, or perhaps the location of the generating—

Mr. Deacon: The government proceeds whether it is needed or not.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —plant in the first instance, there may be others who feel the same way too.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Have an inquiry.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: However, having regard for the fact that we are so dependent at this particular time on electrical energy, it was agreed, and indeed it was announced in this Legislature—we didn't hear too much complaint, if we heard any at all from the opposition—

Mr. Deacon: Oh yes, they did.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Deacon: The minister hasn't been listening. He doesn't listen.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —at that time and it was necessary to proceed with some of the plans which had already gone some distance down the road.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think the hon. members should be quite satisfied, having regard for the fact that the long-term needs, as outlined yesterday,—

Mr. Deacon: The long-term needs aren't there.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —are going to be subject to an exhaustive examination by all concerned including the public.

Mr. Deacon: A waste of 50 million bucks.

Mr. Gaunt: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Since that particular line is tied directly to a new plant, a second plant, on Lake Huron which involves the whole growth aspect of Ontario Hydro, would the minister not consider that that particular line and its study are vital to the whole concept of what the provincial secretary is bringing forward?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. This matter is becoming a debate. Now it's the same question repeated over again. Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

Mr. Lewis: I'd like then to go to the Minister of Energy. Since Hydro's total debt —total debt guaranteed by Ontario, in 1973, the last year for which figures are available —was approximately one-quarter of the additional annual debt it intends to accrue every year for the next eight years—\$3 billion a year—can the minister tell us how much of that Ontario intends to underwrite by way of

guarantor, and how much of it will be incorporated in rate increases? This is now a matter of government policy.

Hon. D. R. Timbrell (Minister of Energy): Mr. Speaker, at the last Energy Board review of Ontario Hydro's rates, there was considerable discussion of the debt-equity ratio—I believe it now stands at about 80-20—and Hydro is conducting additional studies internally on what would be the best possible ratio.

I can't say what the Energy Board will say this year. I would expect within the next three or four weeks to have the material from Ontario Hydro for reference to the Energy Board this year. I'm sure that will be considered again.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Is the minister not prepared to recommend that this independent inquiry take a look at what we have apparently committed ourselves to? And can he make a statement of government policy about how Ontario can afford it? How can this province afford Ontario Hydro's growth ethic and how are our people to pay for it?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member keeps referring to the growth ethic—

Mr. Lewis: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —and I think that's a gross error.

Mr. Lewis: Seven per cent a year.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The Ontario Hydro estimates are based on the patterns of growth that we know to have been established over the last decade or two—

Mr. Lewis: No, they are not.

Mr. Gaunt: No, that's not right.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —and they are also taking into account national factors, bearing in mind oil and gas supplies, bearing in mind the possibilities of conversions in the next five to 10 years as we face oil and gas shortages.

Mr. Lewis: They have seduced this minister as well.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I should be so lucky to be seduced.

Mr. Lewis: By Taylor? By Stelco?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The point that was made by my hon. colleague, the provincial secretary, is very valid, that in the public

hearings, for the first time in any jurisdiction, the public will have the opportunity to question—

Mr. Deans: That's nonsense.

Mr. Deacon: There won't be any answers, though.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —and to challenge the proposals of Ontario Hydro.

Mr. Deans: That is also nonsense. How does the public become aware enough to ask questions?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The opposition members will make them aware.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Any further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary question to the minister: What happens to the approval in principle given to the programme by the minister's predecessor, the present Treasurer? Does that approval in principle mean it is being withdrawn by this minister or does it mean that the approval is there and that these hearings are simply to take some of the steam off the people in the province who are very concerned about these matters?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, the approvals in principle referred to by the Leader of the Opposition cover projects which are estimated to be required for the period up to 1982. The inquiry announced yesterday by the provincial secretary deals with the period up to 1993 or the decade following. Now, as I understand it, there are five or six outstanding items that were given approval in principle, including the possibility of a site in the riding represented by the member for Rainy River. I might say it's something of a pleasure to receive resolutions of council and of the local unions, the chamber of commerce and service clubs stating that everybody up there wants it, and we will consider that in the next little while. But to answer the member's question specifically those are not cancelled and I will be making recommendations to my colleagues in the next little while, taking them one by one.

Mr. Deans: One supplementary question: Did I understand the minister correctly to say that Hydro was preparing a study of the debt-equity ratio that might be acceptable in relationship to rates? If I did understand that correctly, why is it not a responsibility of the government, rather than Ontario Hydro, to determine what the debt-equity ratio ought

to be and the application of that to rates and borrowing?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, what I said was that in the 1974 rate review by the Energy Board, as I recall reading the report, there was reference made and questions raised about the debt-equity ratio. As a matter of fact, I am meeting at 11 o'clock with the chairman and president of Hydro—to discuss a number of items—

Mr. Deans: They'll all be cleared up by 11:30.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We should be so lucky. The items include the progress that is being made on their internal studies on this.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions, member for Scarborough West?

Mr. Deans: Isn't it the minister's responsibility to look into that, rather than theirs to study themselves?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: That's the Energy Board's responsibility, yes.

HOUSING PROGRAMMES

Mr. Speaker. The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: A question if I may, of the Minister of Housing. The material accompanying the minister's statement indicates that 737 units will be started across the province by March 31, 1975, in the 13 projects outlined. Over how many months or years will the other units be constructed?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, we expect the units to be constructed in the fiscal year of 1975-1976, ending March 31.

Mr. Lewis: March 31, 1976?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: Looking at this rate of building and comparing it to the CMHC projections, are we therefore to expect that the number of units of new shelter accommodation for Ontario this year will be about 80,000 maximum, which is a 5,000 drop from last year and a 30,000 drop from the year before?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I don't accept the fact that the drop in housing will be as has been indicated by certain people.

Mr. Lewis: We were dead on last year—absolutely dead on to the figure.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I think we have finally made the point that more than just the Province of Ontario is involved in housing

Mr. Lewis: I appreciate that.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I think the point has been got across to the federal government, I hope, and to the private sector that they must be involved very substantially in housing in Ontario. In addition, I think we have got the point across to some municipalities who in the past have been reluctant to have housing in their area, that they must assume their share of housing. If we all work together, I am confident that we can achieve 100,000 starts, which I still say is what Ontario should have.

Mr. Lewis: That is what the minister said last year.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: But it is dependent upon a number of factors and a number of people who have not co-operated fully in the past.

Mr. Lewis: It depends on the government's initiatives and investment.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

GRAVEL LICENCE APPLICATION

Mr. Lewis: One last question, of the Minister of Natural Resources, if I may, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Natural Resources has an application before him from a Mr. Sam Manetta for a licence to extract gravel in Pontypool, Ont. Has that application been approved by his ministry?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I have to admit that we get dozens and dozens of applications for gravel pits in the southern part of the province—at least in those designated areas—and I am not aware of this specific one. But I will get the facts and report back to the members.

INVESTIGATIONS INTO DREDGING INDUSTRY

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General, who is the acting Solicitor General. Could he tell us what has been the role of the Ontario Provincial Police in the current dredging problems that exist in this country? Were the Ontario Provincial Police asked to investigate? Were they not asked to investigate, or were they asked not to investigate? Did they investigate? What actually did the OPP do or not do, and why?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, the OPP were not asked to investigate by anyone.

The investigation at Hamilton was conducted by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police as a result of the request of the federal Ministry of Transport.

In the course of their investigation as to many matters—none of which originally contained any criminal allegations—certain material came to their attention, whereupon they immediately contacted our office in this city. They worked very closely with Clay Powell and my ministry from that point on. I have met with the inspector on two occasions.

The Royal Canadian Mounted Police were in charge of the investigation. They confirmed as recently as Wednesday night with me in Ottawa that at no time have they had any communication with any other municipal or provincial police force in connection with this investigation.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary: Is the OPP playing any role now, or has it not been asked to, and the minister feels it is not necessary that it do so?

Hon. Mr. Clement: No, I haven't heard of any role that the OPP are involved in this matter.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: What about the situation involving the dredging of the slip and other facilities for the Tobermory ferry, for which final payment is being withheld on a provincial contract? Did information come from the government of Canada or the RCMP that led the Management Board to withhold funds in that case?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Management Board received advice from our office to withhold payment.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: From the minister's office.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Yorkview.

INQUIRY INTO DUMP TRUCK OPERATIONS

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Would the minister give the House the time frame of the investigation into the dump truck industry, so that those who are wishing to make submissions may go forward with their plans?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I will have to get the exact dates and times on that. I know that things are moving along now and we are getting some submissions in; but

I will get the exact time schedule for the member and present it here to him.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River.

MEMBERS' DINING ROOM

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Government Services related to the Provincial Auditor's report, pages 67 and 68.

Can the minister inform the House why his ministry made a special arrangement with the present caterers in the members' dining room and changed the tendering process that was set out, and which six other caterers turned down because they asked for certain procedures that were unacceptable, and then these same procedures were tendered or given to the present caterers?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, originally when we were establishing the members' dining room within this building, the staff of my ministry developed a tender proposal or a tender document—specification—in order to allow catering firms to submit their tender for the operation of the dining room. These were publicly advertised and, as the member says, few proposals were received that met that specification.

In most cases the bidders wrote back and suggested that they were not prepared to bid on the operation of this under those terms; that they felt the only way they would be interested in operating the dining room would be on a management-type contract.

We did receive some bids that met the specification, and the lowest and most acceptable bid came from the Dineley firm, which operates the cafeteria in the Macdonald block. It was decided to accept that bid.

As we proceeded to develop the facilities, one of the requirements of the tender was that the successful firm would assist in the design and specifications of the necessary equipment that would be required to operate a proper dining facility. But as we proceeded, we became more aware, or rather we felt, that this type of a dining room, because of its very limited usage, because of the very limited amount of hours that it is open, could not be operated on that basis and the decision was made to change it to a management-type contract.

As we had proceeded to this stage with the Dineley firm, as they had put considerable work into developing the facility, as they

could make available to that facility their buying power in buying the supplies for the dining room at the same time as they are buying much larger quantities for the other dining room, there were many good reasons why that firm should be selected and we made that decision, consciously, to enter into that type of a contract. I believe, Mr. Speaker, it was a very good decision.

Mr. Reid: One supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker: How does the minister expect anyone to have any faith in this government when they finally do tender on something like this, and then the government not only ignores those who tender but also the people who would have made a tender based on what was finally resolved? How can anybody dealing with the government have any faith in its honesty or integrity when the ministries just—

Mr. Speaker: Order please; order please.

Mr. Reid: —disregard the tenders submitted to them?

Mr. Speaker: That question is not related to the original question. Did the hon. member for Wentworth have a supplementary?

Mr. Deans: I have a supplementary question but I almost hesitate to ask it. Why was this information about the change in the tendering procedure, after the tenders had been accepted, not made available to the Board of Internal Economy when we were discussing the renewal of the Dineley contract?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Well, in response, Mr. Speaker, that full information was made available in the report to the Board of Internal Economy.

Mr. Deans: That they had changed the contract conditions after the ministry had accepted them?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Yes, this—

Mr. MacDonald: They changed the rules of the game after the ministry had made its choice? That's a remarkable procedure.

Hon. Mr. Snow: As I recall it, this information was made available in the report to the Board of Internal Economy when we were considering this contract a few weeks ago. It was stated in that information how the contract—of course this contract—

Mr. Singer: Oh but that was after it was done.

Hon. Mr. Snow: This contract was entered into before the Board of Internal Economy took over.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: When is the minister going to improve the quality of the food?

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Lewis: We've suffered the consequences of this behaviour every breakfast, lunch and dinner.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Members never had meals this good at home.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member for Windsor West has the floor to ask his question.

MERCURY POLLUTION

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A question of the Minister of Natural Resources, Mr. Speaker: On the basis of the mercury level analysis data released yesterday by the Ministry of the Environment, which indicated that only one fish species out of the 15 in the Lake St. Clair area had mercury levels less than the 0.5 parts per million acceptable for human consumption, has the minister now decided there will be no more commercial fishing instituted on that lake?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, Mr. Speaker. This decision has not been reached.

I have indicated to the sportsmen and to the Lake St. Clair commercial fishing industry that we would be conducting further monitoring during the course of the next few months to ascertain if there are certain species that we could open up to commercial fishing.

We're very cognizant, of course, of the tremendous pressure that is incurred regarding that particular lake from the sportsmen and from the anglers, and we'll certainly keep this in mind when a decision is made.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough.

WARRANTIES ON HOUSING

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations: I wonder if the minister can inform the House on the status of the federally-sponsored home warranty programmes insofar as this province is concerned. This was proposed by the Housing and Urban Development Association of

Canada, and I understand it has been endorsed by the minister responsible for housing and urban development.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I note a degree of concern in the hon. member's question and I think he's justified in being concerned. The Minister of State for Urban Affairs of Canada, Mr. Danson, has been proposing a warranty scheme now for several months. It was discussed by my distinguished predecessor, now the Attorney General (Mr. Clement), and my parliamentary assistant.

A few weeks ago we received a telegram from Mr. Danson requesting a meeting and we immediately responded saying yes. We've been trying ever since that time to find out the date, location and agenda of any such meeting. We now understand that Mr. Danson is leaving the country for a short time. I am beginning to wonder whether or not the federal government is really interested in the house warranty scheme.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Nobody likes them but the people.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, we, as a province, are interested in a home warranty scheme.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We think the purchasers of houses in this province deserve some protection against shoddy workmanship.

Mr. Reid: We suspect it is this shoddy government that is responsible.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We have never received the details of the plan that Mr. Danson has released to the press. I certainly would like to pursue with Mr. Danson or his officials an early acceptance of the scheme.

Mr. Speaker: There are too many interruptions during the question period. I think all members would be happier if—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Reid: He is provocative.

Mr. Speaker: Sometimes these are merely a matter of opinion. Is the hon. minister finished? If not, would he please continue.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, as the alternative to a national scheme—which is what the Province of Ontario has been seeking for

several months—certainly we will have to try to fill that gap. I would like to make one last effort with the federal government to reach agreement on a scheme which will protect the majority of the house buyers in this country. Hopefully, we will be meeting in Ottawa very shortly on that. But in the alternative, we will be studying the problem on a provincial basis to see whether we can inaugurate a scheme shortly.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Huron.

WOOL LEVY

Mr. J. Riddell (Huron): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Has the minister received representation from the sheep producers in Ontario regarding what they consider to be an inequity in the proposed levy on wool, considering that the levy is to be used to promote sheep and sheep products as well as wool? If he has received such representation, what does he intend to do about the inequity?

Further to the question, is the minister aware that the levy on wool amounts to about one-third of the price the wool producer is presently receiving for his wool?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Who put the levy on it?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the fact to the extent that the sheep producers executive came to our office and met with my staff—not with me, with my parliamentary assistant and my assistant deputy minister, with the marketing board officials—and asked for the right to place a levy on either lambs or wool.

They talked about a marketing plan first of all, and to develop a full-fledged marketing plan would have required a vote. They decided in favour of and asked us to implement the legislation—to which this House gave unanimous approval last year, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Including the Liberals.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —including our friends in the opposition, who now criticize us for what we did—offering them the opportunity for a check-off on wool to finance the Ontario Sheep Association.

After the proposal had been debated and discussed in this House and implemented, it required regulation. We announced it in at

least three newsletters that went out. I spoke about it at the Ontario Sheep Producers annual summer meeting at New Liskeard, advising them exactly what we proposed to do. So I don't know why all of a sudden a few of them decided that they didn't want to accept this. Maybe my hon. friend has the answer to that, being a sheep breeder himself.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister is having trouble with communications; everybody says so.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am not sure, but I do know that as far as the local people are concerned and the executive, they supported the move, they supported the regulation, they supported the legislation.

Now I have word that there was some problem, that some of the producers were not in favour of it. I asked that the matter be raised at the annual meeting of the sheep producers association in the Niagara peninsula a week or so ago, and it was. A vote was taken and it went well over 50 per cent—I haven't the exact figure but I think it was about 60 to 40 per cent—in favour of implementing the regulations.

Mr. Gaunt: It was 36 to 27.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Now since that time I have had some representation to me, Mr. Speaker, that there are certain sheep breeders who are not in favour of the regulation, and I respect their wishes. I have not implemented the regulation and I will not implement it until I have had the opportunity to discuss it further with the entire sheep producers executive. But I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that it would be useful—

Mr. Deacon: That's five minutes the minister has taken to say that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —if the sheep breeders would arrive at a consensus among themselves as to what they really do want. I suppose that it is not at all unlike the Liberal opposition, who never do know what they want.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

MERCURY POLLUTION

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of

the Environment about his statement yesterday on mercury levels in Ontario water, in which the minister told us that fish were being monitored and it has been found that the mercury levels were decreasing. Why did the minister not tell us, which is far more important, what the continued monitoring of the blood levels of the residents around these polluted lakes has shown; whether it's an increase, no change or a decrease?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in my statement yesterday, the Ministry of Health was doing that. I think that question should be more properly directed to the Minister of Health.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, if I may Mr. Speaker. I believe that the Ministry of the Environment and the Ministry of Natural Resources—and I recently wrote the Minister of the Environment about this—have findings from the Fresh Water Institute in Manitoba, which is a federally-run institute, on mercury in the blood levels from a number of tests conducted recently. Is he prepared to share that information with the Legislature?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, as I say, the Ministry of Health is doing this and the hon. member would have to ask the Minister of Health regarding mercury levels in the blood of people.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, mercury in the blood levels.

Hon. W. Newman: Yes. I know the Ministry of Health is doing this. I know there has been extensive tests made.

Mr. Lewis: Doing what? Studying the information?

Hon. W. Newman: There has been considerable testing done.

Mr. Lewis: And the minister has no information.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peel South.

WARRANTIES ON HOUSING

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations on the subject of warranties for houses which was brought up a few minutes ago.

Mr. Speaker: It's a new question if the member is asking the minister a question.

Mr. Kennedy: Well, either way. I couldn't see for the noise from across the way, Mr. Speaker. The minister mentioned probable provincial involvement with respect to home warranties.

An hon. member: Question.

Mr. Kennedy: Does he envisage this as being carried out by the province or through the municipalities, because this is a question that comes up continually?

Mr. Singer: I'm glad he asked that question.

Mr. MacDonald: Was that all arranged in caucus?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, all I can say at this time is that we have not received any details of the plan and there is no way we know at the present time how the federally-sponsored plan, if there is one, will work.

However, we do have the Ontario Building Code which we anticipate will be administered through the municipalities. We're now conducting a series of meetings and seminars with municipal building inspectors. It might very well be appropriate to discuss with them, at that time, the possibility of their involvement in enforcing any housing warranty scheme.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

MINING ACCIDENT INQUEST

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. Is the minister aware of the coroner's inquest concerning a recent accident at Canadian Rock Salt Co. Ltd. in which an employee had been killed as a result of an explosion? Is the minister likewise aware that the coroner's inquest found there were no set procedures in that mine for setting off charges, that there was no formal training given to employees and that employees learned only from those most experienced on the job? Does the minister plan to take any action, either against the company or to set some guidelines for the setting off of explosive devices in the mines so that such an accident could not happen again?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, may I first express my thanks to the member for notifying me of this particular situation. I did some questioning within my ministry

this morning and I'm told that the staff and the legal people are waiting for the official transcript of the inquest before determining what action we would take. It does appear, sir, from the information we have in a very sketchy way, that there will be action taken, but somewhat late.

Mr. MacDonald: Hopefully there won't be another accident in the mine.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Carleton East.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RESPONSIBILITIES FOR COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. P. Taylor (Carleton East): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Transportation and Communications today delivered another 11 pages of anti-federal government material. I would like to ask him—

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Shame.

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): Ask the question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The valuable time of the question period is being wasted by such interjections. Order please. Would the hon. member continue with his question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. P. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to disrupt the House, but it is obviously very sensitive on this issue.

Mr. G. Nixon: What's the question?

Mr. P. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Transportation and Communications agree that, contrary to the position he enunciated at great length in this House during ministerial statements on the subject of federal-provincial consultation on communications policy, and particularly with respect to—

Mr. Speaker: Order please, the member is making this a statement. Is that a question?

Mr. G. Nixon: What's the question?

Mr. P. Taylor: Would he agree—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. P. Taylor: Will they hang on; I will give it to them. Would the minister agree

that it is the federal government's position that the provinces are asking for a conference on the basis of transferring jurisdictions at a time when the federal government said it is not that subject that will be discussed but rather the sharing of the administration of the jurisdiction?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I would not agree, because in the correspondence and the discussions that I've had with the Hon. Mr. Pelletier we have discussed the roles and responsibilities of the provincial governments as they relate to communications, and we have asked that the federal-provincial conference deal with that particular matter. I recognize that the federal government has a hang-up on the word "jurisdiction" so we have not even used it. We have talked about the roles and responsibilities of each of the provinces in dealing with this subject.

Mr. P. Taylor: Supplementary: Could the minister say whether or not Ontario is asking for transfer of the jurisdiction over cable television to the provincial jurisdiction?

Mr. Lewis: Why not?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, the Ontario government has said all along that we wanted to have jurisdiction over cable; but we have not said that should be a subject for total discussion at a federal-provincial conference. That position has been laid before the federal government, at the initial federal-provincial conference, as the member well knows. He ran the sound equipment there.

Mr. Lewis: No wonder no one heard anything.

Mr. MacDonald: No wonder there was so much static.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

DISMISSAL OF ORC STEWARD

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations: Would the minister care to make a statement about the government's position arising out of the dismissal of a certain John P. Damien, steward for five years of the Ontario Racing Commission on the alleged grounds of homosexuality?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that this matter would not arise in the

House. However, I'm quite prepared to state the government's position on this.

Mr. Damien has been and probably would continue to be a good and competent steward. It was felt by the racing commission—and I concurred in the opinion—that his position had been compromised by certain contacts that he had made with people who might come under his jurisdiction as a judge and a steward. It is felt by the racing commission—and again I concur in this position—that the position of a steward is such that there should be no suspicion whatsoever of his ability to act impartially and without any outside influences being exerted upon him, and, therefore, it was felt by the commission—and I concurred—that his contract for 1975 should not be renewed.

Mr. Lawlor: Supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: We are beyond the time. The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Clement presented Part I of the report of the task force on legal aid under the chairmanship of the Hon. Mr. Justice John H. Osler.

Hon. Mr. Clement presented the 5th annual report of the advisory committee on legal aid.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves, seconded by Mr. R. F. Nixon, that Mr. W. Hodgson, the member for the electoral district of York North, be appointed Deputy Speaker and chairman of the committees of the whole House; and that Mr. G. E. Smith, member for the electoral district of Simcoe East, be appointed deputy chairman of committees of the whole House for this parliament.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the standing committees of the House for the present session be appointed as follows:

1. Procedural affairs committee.
2. Administration of justice committee.

Committees 1 and 2 combined, under the chairmanship of the chairman of the administration of justice committee, will function as a private bills committee.

3. Social development committee.
4. Resources development committee.

5. Miscellaneous estimates committee.
6. Public accounts committee.
7. Regulations committee.

Which said committees shall severally be empowered to examine and enquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House, provided that all boards and commissions are hereby referred to committees No. 1 to 4 in accordance with the policy areas indicated by the titles of the said committees.

Public accounts for the fiscal year are hereby referred to the public accounts committee and all regulations to the regulations committee.

All standing committees shall report from time to time their observations and opinions on the matters referred to them with the power to send for persons, papers and records.

That there be no duplication of membership among the committees No. 1 to 4 inclusive, or between committees No. 5 to 7 inclusive.

That substitutions be permitted on any committee while considering estimates referred to it, provided that notice of the substitution is given to the chairman of the committee prior to the commencement of the meeting.

Mr. Speaker: It's quite a lengthy motion, shall we take it as read?

Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this motion then pass?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No. It's not my intention at this time to vote against it, but I do want to say something about the committee motion. It is normally extensively debated, and I am rather surprised that it is brought forward at this time.

I want to state quite clearly that we on this side feel that the committee system is not working as effectively as it should. We believe very strongly that the options open to this House to refer bills to standing committee are not accepted frequently enough.

The statistics show clearly that more and more the bills are being examined exclusively by the committee of the whole, rather than in another area where members of the public, interested citizens and groups of interested people who are being directly affected by the legislation, would have a clear opportunity to express their views and hopefully to influence the outcome of the legislation.

We feel very strongly that this is a procedure which has not been adopted as frequently as it should. I think the House leader is clearly aware of the fact that the traditions in sending bills to standing committee were much more closely adhered to in years gone by than they are now. The hon. member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook) has presented statistics to the House that show that only about seven per cent of the bills now get examination outside the House.

The other thing that concerns me is that the committees seem to be exclusively constructed to examine legislation, that only under very special circumstances are they given the leeway to examine into more general areas pertaining to their ambit of responsibility. Things did not use to be this way.

I believe that the concept the government has to the working of the committee system is contributing to the irrelevance of the committee system and to some extent the irrelevance of this House itself.

It seems strange, for example, that we do not have a standing committee on education, but only one to which education bills are referred for the kind of discussion and perhaps amendment that would come forward on specific bills. It's obvious, particularly when the whole community is concerned about the quality of education—

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): No, it is not.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh yes it is—and those matters pertaining to the negotiations between teachers and boards, that such a committee would have been doing excellent service for the Minister of Education—who knows he has had problems in this regard—as a background for the development of legislation which has been so long pending.

It's obvious, as well, that we should be establishing a committee which will have direct responsibility, and which could pass on some of its responsibility to experts in the field, to review changes in prices and costs for those services and goods that come under provincial jurisdiction.

We have discussed this in the past. It is an important subject which surely should be debated more fully than just a cursory examination of an elaborate motion at this time.

I believe the motion being repeated from previous years is simply an indication of the bad faith of the government in not upgrading the committee system into something that can be democratically useful.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, without getting into a long debate about the value of the committee system, there are three things I want to suggest.

To begin with, there was a time in the House when committees were used to examine the affairs of boards and commissions; that was done regularly and seemed to be effective. I can recall it was the practice not so many years ago to have Ontario Hydro, for example, appear before the committee, where we spent a long time with them discussing matters of their internal policy. In addition, as my colleague from Waterloo has said, there were a number of other commissions and bodies of the government which appeared regularly and who were then required to answer for their actions. Of late, this doesn't seem to have been occurring. I don't quite understand why.

A number of us have asked from time to time that matters be referred to the committees, but we have been told that's not the appropriate way. And even in the committee, it is very difficult to get the committee itself to call boards or commissions before it. But when they are called, as was the case recently with the Workmen's Compensation Board, it is of vital importance that the hearings be recorded and that there be a record kept of the things that are said by those people who appear before the committees. The reasons are that there is no point in having the same questions asked over and over again and it would be very easy for people to refer to the record of the proceedings that took place before the committee so that they could determine what the policy of that particular board or commission happened to be at any given time. Not only that, they could refer in years to come to any undertakings that were agreed to by the board or commission with regard to questions asked by members of the Legislature about their functions.

I would like to ask the government House leader that it be a practice that someone be made available or that the equipment be made available to the committees in order that there can be a record kept of all of the proceedings.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Particularly for the Workmen's Compensation Board.

Mr. Deans: Well particularly the Workmen's Compensation Board, but I would suggest, for example, that the whole matter of Hydro expenditures is of such importance to the public of Ontario at this time that

that ought to be one of the first undertakings of one of the standing committees and that there must be a record maintained of the answers given.

Beyond that, it is pretty obvious that there has to be an inquiry by a standing committee into the whole field of housing. I asked in the last session that there be some undertaking by the Ministry of Housing that there be discussion of the home ownership programme. I had a guarantee it would take place, but to this point in time there hasn't been an indication of when and under what conditions.

The other point that we seem to fail to recognize is that the standing committees provide an excellent vehicle for members of the Legislature to hear the views of the public. The standing committee approach, rather than the select committee routine, could have been used over the last number of years—it has been used fairly effectively on at least two occasions—and we should be able, as a standing committee, to have hearings into matters of public concern both here in Toronto in the legislative building and outside of the legislative building in other parts of the province for the purpose of allowing individual citizens to express their grievances and concerns directly to members of the Legislature. I think that the standing committee is an ideal vehicle that could be used to obtain that particular end.

I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that those things simply must be given consideration by the government. We must have a freer rein within committees, and it has to be made clear that it is policy of the Legislature that there be a record made of the hearings before committees.

Secondly, we have to make it clear that it is a policy of the Legislature that all of the boards and commissions, or as many as is humanly possible during any four-year period, appear before the appropriate standing committees. Thirdly, the standing committees must be empowered on their own, as a policy of the Legislature, to conduct hearings into matters which are obviously of public concern; and those hearings need not necessarily be conducted in the committee rooms at Queen's Park but from time to time, wherever the need arises, they could be conducted in other parts of the province for the purpose of allowing easy access for the public to Parliament. I think that if we were to do that, we would make this place much more relevant.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I want to make one brief addition, if I might, in com-

menting on this, and that is the old issue of restricting substitution to those committees that are considering estimates. I am not going to thrash this old straw. The government's position seems to be that they want to maintain continuity. But, Mr. Speaker, you don't maintain continuity by creating a situation in which people are absent. If you permit substitution on all committees, you have an obligation on the person who is officially on the committee to find a substitute.

In many instances there are people who are particularly interested in the topic before the committee that day, and they are anxiously seeking to get on the committee. The result is rather an absurd situation in which sometimes only a third of the people there have the right to vote, because they are the only people who are on the committee; the others are strangers, who wander in for that particular consideration. If the government persists in maintaining this, it's almost a deliberate undermining of the effectiveness of the committee. I simply can't understand it. The government is being mindless in its opposition to this.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I want to add a couple of other thoughts to this. This motion comes like the ritual sun dance at the beginning of every session—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Something like the ombudsman motion.

Mr. Singer: The same kind of speeches are made, and the government doesn't change one bit. The government does not believe in the legislative process. It is just as simple as that. For some peculiar reason—it is a pretty obvious reason, Mr. Speaker—the idea was that we should not sit on Wednesdays so the committees can function. Yet Wednesday after Wednesday, nothing happens around here. The committees are not called. They do not sit. The cabinet goes off and passes new regulations and imposes new taxes by order-in-council. The committees don't know what goes on, and they use this as an approach.

The whole committee system is being abused because this government does not believe in the legislative process. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the time has now come that if the government is going to sneer at the committee system, we should sit on Wednesdays and get the work of the Legislature done. Take the Legislature into the confidence of the government and do not do things, as the government did in the Mining Tax Act and impose retroactive taxes by regulation.

Surely the committee system has a proper function; the committee should not be limited only to doing the work that's sent down to them by the House.

When a minister chooses not to—and ministers don't, that's the new system around here, the ministers don't want the committees to delve into those bills.

Their attitude is: "Let's deal with them up here; let's deal with them up here so eventually we can steamroller them through." "We don't want to hear the public. Why should we?" "We don't want to have those members of the Legislature inquiring into the functions of our departments. Why should we? It's inconvenient. It might be embarrassing." Why go through this ritual of nonsense once a session? If the government is just going to flex its muscles and put through a resolution like this, making substitution difficult and referring the very small percentage of bills to the committee, as my colleague from Sarnia says, we just waste Wednesdays, waste one day out of five working days a week. In that situation the government has to be described for what it is; it's arrogant and it has no belief in the legislative process.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I suppose ultimately the disintegration of the committee system is simply a reflection of the disintegration of this government and the process will come to some conclusion at some time.

Mr. Turner: The member for Yorkview doesn't believe that.

Mr. Young: I can't let this occasion go by, Mr. Speaker, without again asking the House leader if he has any intention whatsoever of changing the terms of reference of a regulation committee so that that committee has some substance and some meaning.

We have had this committee on this motion for some years now. The committee has seldom met. For a year or two it met, until the members became fed up because they were engaged in a completely meaningless exercise. I suppose the only purpose this committee serves is to afford to the chairman his emolument for the year, and I am not sure that even happened last year.

Mr. Singer: That's very important.

Mr. Young: I don't think we even met to choose a chairman; and I suppose, too, that the chairman is—

Mr. Breithaupt: Then they really are falling apart.

Mr. Young: Yes, I suspect the chairman of that committee is accepting money under false pretences, because he has no status and he doesn't do anything.

That's not his fault, Mr. Speaker. I do know that the last chairman of whom I am aware did try to call meetings of the committee function, but the committee members finally in complete disgust refused to come to those meetings because it was such a meaningless exercise.

I wonder if the House leader has some advice as to how this regulations committee might be rejuvenated so that it has some meaning. Certainly the government would have to change the whole term of reference in order to make it meaningful and make it function in this House.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, I share the views expressed by my leader, especially with respect to the use of committees as we have seen this develop in this Legislature over the past few years. It has been our view that more investigative procedures and a better response would take place in dealing with legislation if more legislation was sent to the committees.

As my leader has said, it seems from time to time that the actual functioning of this Legislature is becoming less and less relevant to what's going on within Ontario. We have seen, by the development of regional governments, that very quickly the cabinet is able to get a response to a problem in a certain area by immediately contacting the chairman of the region.

Now that some two-thirds of our population are under this form of government, obviously with the staff that exists in the regional chairperson's office, it is comparatively easy to get information in detail, on a direct basis, through a minister in Queen's Park dealing with that chairman. As a result, the elected members in an area may have very little day-to-day knowledge of projects that are developing in depth within their own regions.

The cabinet has decided to resolve part of the problem of meeting with people and getting to know problems by visiting about the province. On June 11, as I read in the press, they're even going to come to Kitchener, and I certainly would welcome them to our community.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They have a lot of work to do there.

Mr. Breithaupt: The point is that there would appear to be, other than a desire for re-election or whatever partisan purposes one might read into some of the peregrinations, there would, I hope, appear to be a sincere desire to attempt to relate to individuals who are responding by bringing briefs and opinions forward to a meeting of the cabinet or a committee of cabinet when it goes to one of our communities. The attendance may not be large, as that photograph showed of the Hamilton event—

An hon. member: It was mostly empty, wasn't it?

Mr. Breithaupt: Still there is the facility for individuals, hopefully, to be heard by the cabinet. Surely it's just as important to provide a facility through which individuals can be heard by the members of this Legislature. If the committees were functioning if for example a bill such as the travel agents bill had gone to committee, many of the upsets, the ruffled feathers, would not have occurred. Persons would have had the opportunity to comment on a bill at a committee stage.

I see virtually no reason why a bill should not stand on an order paper for two or perhaps three weeks in order to get some feedback, some input, not only from the members but more particularly from the people who are expert or interested in the area and have something to say.

The travel agents bill, and the real estate problem that we saw in section 5 of Bill 55 in the last session, is just another situation which could be avoided in great degree if the committee system was used to better advantage.

My colleague, the hon. member for Downsview, has commented on the Wednesday operation. I suppose one can accept the fact that with cabinet and other particular responsibilities it is difficult to operate on a routine basis with Wednesday sittings. But I do recall, Mr. Speaker, in our last session we were able, on consent—and I think it worked well—to have a Wednesday afternoon used for some that wished to contribute to the budget debate. I would encourage the government House leader to consider this kind of process again during the early weeks of the session, so that the opportunity might come up when time is more readily available for members to contribute to the Throne or the budget debates, in order particularly to get certain views that they have on various subjects made known to the people they represent.

Mr. Speaker, of course in this situation I can't speak for the government back-benchers but I would think, since the opportunities for speaking in the House are often more limited to supporters of the ministry, this would be an opportunity to use these additional days, which a government back-bencher would enjoy rather very much. Certainly the question period, speaking on bills and entering into debates are more likely an involvement of an opposition member the way the system works within our Legislature.

However, there is the opportunity for a government back-bencher to contribute particularly. I think the use of perhaps the Wednesday afternoon idea, at least to make the opportunity available, is something which I would encourage the government House leader to consider.

These are some of the points which I think would show that the views we have expressed from time to time on the inadequacy of the use of committees, and the better development of a more practical approach to involving the members of the House in areas in certain depth, are the kinds of things that we would look forward to.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The committee system, which is only in its infancy with respect to development in this province, is the best device that we have for the interrogating of government. It is somehow far more intimate, far more penetrating, far more searching, far more to the point than anything we can seem to generate here.

In committee not only do we get the widest range of cabinet officers sitting, but with their contingents behind them, and in this way we can come to grips in a very direct way with the issue involved. There is some kind of a veil here, some kind of a floating away when we try to lock horns over an issue in this House. It can be done, but in committee it can be done infinitely better, in my experience.

I want to attack for a moment a myth, a myth generated by the Liberal Party in the province in presenting figures with respect to the number of bills that go to the committee. It seems to me to be neither here nor there in absolute figures how many go; which ones go is the important issue. Does the bill that needs the rewarding scrutiny of committee get there? By and large, Mr. Speaker, they do, overwhelmingly they do.

May I just say another denigratory word with respect to the Liberal Party? In the past six months they haven't been showing up. They may wail and weep and clap their hands, but the fact is that when we get to committee, who is there? I have attended too many committee meetings as the sole member of the opposition interrogating a very tricky piece of legislation. I would then ask for some assistance on some occasions from the official opposition in this particular regard.

Mr. Breithaupt: And the member's own colleagues too, I trust.

Mr. Lawlor: By and large when they do send someone—they know their members who have skill and capability in this regard, and bless them—too often they send a merely token representative who says nothing, sits on his hands and listens all day.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's not right; that's not fair.

Mr. Lawlor: Really, if this party aspires to become—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: —as the polls indicate that they are going to become, the government of this province—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: —then they had better bestir themselves.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I sit in abject wonder when the member for Lakeshore—

Mr. Lawlor: They had better give it a little more rejuvenation.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We are blinded by the member's halo.

Mr. Lawlor: They just might become the government, Lord help us, but the fact is, when they come to office, they had better come equipped—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If the member keeps on supporting the Tories we will.

Mr. Lawlor: —and know what it is all about and have members over there who can stand up and know their competency.

Mr. Breithaupt: We will have more of them than he can remember, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lawlor: They are not going to do that with their present sitting-on-their-hands disposition, I can tell them that.

Mr. Speaker, I have a second minor attack to make this morning, on the press.

Mr. Gaunt: I am going to report to the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) what the member said.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The member for Riverdale won't like that.

Mr. Breithaupt: All the members in the front row of his party should be here to hear him say that.

Mr. Lawlor: We can sit in committee until our eyes grow blue, and mine are only hazel at the moment. Does anybody drop down to visit us? Does anyone ever interrogate us as to what is going on down there?

As has been mentioned here, no record whatsoever is kept of the proceedings, so they are lost. I don't regret that deeply. I don't think posterity will be crying out. But the fact is that on some occasions, and peculiarly often—more often, in my poor opinion, than in this body—matters of significant importance are being lanced in those committees, which are completely bypassed.

I think they're a mine of information. I think it's extremely valuable what goes on there, by and large. Even the acrimony of the debate has another extra little edge to it that makes it palatable to some of us.

What happens in this regard? I heard a member of this House say—and his name shall be unbespoken—"Why would I ever bother going to committee?" He is a brilliant and good member of this House. "Why would I ever show up on one of your committees, no matter what the legislation is? It doesn't get any coverage. It's not taken down. I stay where these matters will receive public attention."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Breithaupt: Was there anybody from the member's front row?

Mr. Lawlor: I admit that's shrewd; it's extremely shrewd in politics. I admit it's cynical. I admit that it's a kind of a lazy man's holiday at the same time. Politics to such members is 90 per cent exhibitionism and 10 per cent hard work. Now, if you go to committee, Mr. Speaker, it's just the opposite, obviously—

Mr. Breithaupt: Give us 10 good minutes.

Mr. Lawlor: —and the question of fulfilling our mandates and really making a contribution to the province will be best accomplished

there. If that is not carried out, then I do think the committees are no use.

Could we please move towards substitutions in a free and open way? Very often, when one wants to go down there, because of particular interest in a problem, one sits there like a mummy looking straight at the ceiling and it doesn't do a bit of good. You can't enter into the debate until everybody else has been foreclosed or has taken the time up and said all the brilliant things you were going to say and have forgotten. Here you are sitting there—and you can't vote, you can't move a motion. Your hands are tied. You may be the only one to understand your own motion, so what are you going to do in that particular context?

What little piece off the end of the government's nose would be involved in making this concession, which for years has been asked for by the opposition over here? Please move in that regard. There's nothing to be gained on the government's side by taking a constructive stand about that tiny matter, and it would open up a great deal of scope to us who go from committee to committee and would like to pop into and come out of particular hearings. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to be lengthy but I do intend to be constructive. May I suggest to the minister that substitution should be free. There is no necessity at all to come along and say, on attending the meeting, that I'm substituting for this and that member. If the Liberal representation on a committee happens to be four members, as long as there are four Liberals there that should be sufficient. There shouldn't be any need for checking on the list to see whether a member happens to be a member of that committee.

Another point, Mr. Speaker, is that the administration of justice committee, for example, happens to have the responsibility of about five different estimates. The opposition representation happens to be four Liberals and three New Democrats. I would suggest in such an instance, if we keep that representation, that at least the critic of the department under discussion during those estimates should be a member of that committee automatically, so that there would be four members plus the critic—

Mr. Breithaupt: And be allowed to vote.

Mr. B. Newman: —who would be allowed to vote and present motions in there.

The social development committee covers six different ministries, and estimates from any one of the six ministries are sent to that committee, yet the representation is four from the Liberal Party and three from the New Democratic Party. I would suggest again that at least the critic of a particular ministry's estimates should be a member of that committee automatically when those estimates are sent down there.

I would prefer, Mr. Speaker, at the very least, to have representation from each of the two political parties according to the number of estimates and then the government party representation could be increased substantially if they wish to maintain the percentage balance in the House. But substitution should be free, and consideration of estimates should always include the critic of the estimates under discussion.

I can recall last year in Education where one of the members didn't have an opportunity to present any suggestions simply because he was not a member of the committee. Those are the suggestions I make, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Carleton East.

Mr. P. Taylor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you, sir, permit a very quick question to the Chairman of the Management Board under this discussion?

Mr. Speaker: Undoubtedly the hon. minister will be replying.

Mr. P. Taylor: When he replies would the minister state whether or not the government would be prepared to refer this matter to the appropriate committee for a full discussion of it where it could be resolved in the interests of the integrity of this House and, in some sense, to help my hon. friend and his party regain some of their lost prestige among the public?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I just want to reiterate the one point about substitution on committees. As the labour critic of this party I found myself in the position on the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act—which the minister is well aware of—of not being able to so much as present a motion.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: If the member had kept his mouth shut, I would have got away with it.

Mr. Reid: I didn't say anything; it wasn't me. But it is a ridiculous situation, as I think the minister is well aware.

The other thing is, I would like to put in a plea to the minister for more opposition representation on the public accounts committee. As it is now the Liberals have two, the NDP two, and the Conservatives eight. With a Liberal member as the chairman of the public accounts committee that only leaves one other member of the Liberal Party able to present motions. If something happens to that particular gentleman—if he has to be in his riding, or if he is ill or whatever—then he is not able to be present at the meetings of the public accounts committee, which probably meets more often than any other committee.

So I would like the minister to take a look at that with a view to increasing the number of opposition members on the public accounts committee.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to speak to this? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I didn't think that the matter would draw as much comment as it did.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It always does.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It doesn't always. But however, inasmuch as it did I think that some of the statements that were made, of course, require reply.

I am a little disappointed in the terms that the member for Downsview used in the course of his contribution. I think that so far as the government is concerned in moving as it has to make the Legislature more independent unto itself doesn't indicate in any area whatsoever that we are endeavouring to be anything but co-operative and as democratic as possible.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It amounts to running the whole show.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I would say too, Mr. Speaker, that some of the points are well taken and the substitution aspect of committees is, of course, very important; it is important to the government as well and I will certainly have a very careful look at it. However, if the matter is left entirely open, as some members have suggested, it is nothing more than a committee of the whole House—nothing more whatsoever. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, on the question of estimates, they are sufficiently well scheduled that any party knows in advance in sufficient time—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh, careful now.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —particularly for the opposition to have their critics there. I don't think that there is much argument there. But there are other aspects of the substitution point of view which I certainly am going to take under consideration.

The question arose about the standing committees being recorded. I have said time and time again in the House that I don't interfere with the function of the committees—

Mr. Deans: The minister doesn't have to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —and surely that's a determination of the committee itself.

Also, so far as the committees sitting on a Wednesday is concerned, I want to tell the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, that again I think that that's largely in their hands. I don't want to dictate to any committee to say they must or must not sit on a Wednesday.

I say in all good conscience, Mr. Speaker, that the function of the cabinet on Wednesdays is indeed a very full one and I believe that the committees can be fully utilized for that day as well, if they so choose to do, but I am afraid that what the member from Lakeshore said applies in some respects and is quite accurate, and also, in regard to the statistics concerned, I agree with him totally. It isn't the numbers that matter; it's the importance of what gets sent there. With that point of view I agree, and I'll certainly look at that very, very carefully.

I am not totally convinced that the reference that the leader of the Liberal Party has made in regard to statistics in the last year is correct, because I think that situation improved somewhat. I must say this, that in the course of the last session the degree of co-operation that was practised among the parties was unquestionably a very commendable one and I really don't see any arguments that can be brought forth about the conduct of that particular function in the last session. I hope that it will continue and I hope that it will improve.

Certainly, where the aspect of substitution is concerned, I have now informed the members that I will in fact be cognizant of the requests. Also, I think that with the change of the function of the Legislature now, the new organization can look more carefully also on the recommendations that are placed before the Legislature where the Legislature itself is concerned. And, of course, where government policy is concerned, the government will have to accept its responsibilities in those areas.

I wanted to answer the member for Carleton East but I forgot what his question was, Mr. Speaker. If you would allow him to repeat it—without the facetious remarks that followed—I'll try and get at it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. P. Taylor: Will the minister refer this matter to the appropriate committee for full discussion of it and work out the—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, I will not.

Mr. P. Taylor: Well that's wonderful.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): What about the regulations committee?

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that a select committee of 13 members be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient dispatch a list of members to compose the standing committees ordered by the House, such committee to be composed as follows:

Mr. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton), chairman; Messrs. Allan Beckett, Carruthers, Deans, Havrot, Henderson, Maeck, Newman (Windsor-Walkerville), Nuttall, Stokes, Villeneuve and Worton.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT INCENTIVE AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. W. Newman moves the first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Pollution Abatement Incentive Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MEDICAL DATA BANK ACT

Mr. B. Newman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish a Medical Data Bank.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to establish a medical data bank in which would be stored in computerized form medical histories of persons in Ontario who wish to participate in such a data bank. Such records, Mr. Speaker, could be of vital assistance in the case of accident or sudden illness when the patient's personal physician is unavailable for consultation. Also, details of medical histories

would be immediately available to physicians and hospitals when a patient moves to another city or changes doctors.

The proposed data bank, Mr. Speaker, would be operated and maintained by the provincial Ministry of Health and every public hospital would have an outlet for the medical histories of persons using the hospital.

Written consent of the person concerned would be required before the record was stored in the bank and the medical history could not be removed without the written consent of his or her legally qualified medical practitioner.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, participation in the use of this data bank would be on a volunteer basis only.

GOOD SAMARITAN ACT, 1975

Mr. Haggerty moves first reading of bill intituled An Act to relieve Persons from Liability in Respect to Voluntary Emergency Medical First Aid Services.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, the short title would be the Good Samaritan Act, and the purpose of this bill is to relieve persons from liability in respect to voluntary emergency first aid assistance and medical services rendered at or near the scene of an accident, or in the case of a sudden emergency.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I want my first words to be those of commendation to her Honour the Lieutenant Governor for the effective and charming way she fulfilled her duties on Tuesday of this week in reading the Speech from the Throne. I was quite surprised that the hon. member moving an address in reply was critical of me for saying that the speech was—what was the phrase?—bankrupt of leadership and ideas.

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): Just ideas.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is strange, you know, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member in moving the humble address in reply would be under the impression that any of the shortcomings of that speech had anything to do with the gracious lady herself.

The thing that interests me is that the Conservative caucus could meet up there in the Hyatt Regency, with all of the luxury, all of the good food and drink that the party or somebody could buy them, and they could sit idly by and say: "Yes, Bill, that is a good speech." Surely they have shirked their responsibilities as private members of this House when they would allow the government to put in those empty phrases in the mouth of that charming lady. Now, we know that she has within her competence all of the powers of government.

It concerns me very much indeed that the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. J. A. Taylor), in moving that a humble address be sent to Her Honour, would come forward with such a fatuous comment when the responsibility for that speech lie directly with his own leader. I trust his leader consults with him and the other members of his caucus from time to time. Why else were they up there at the Hyatt Regency? Had they gathered only to examine the second report of the Gallup poll?

It seems incredible to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Conservative caucus would have shirked its responsibilities to the extent that it would have allowed such a speech—empty of leadership, empty of concept, empty of direction, empty of programme—to be put before this House and to be put forward by our honoured Governor in her first Throne Speech. It is a matter of concern to me, and perhaps this is the best place to refer to it, that the position of the Governor should in no way—in no way—be reduced in its importance. I feel that the government more and more is using the position of the Governor to perhaps remove some of the sting of the opposition to the programmes that they have put forward.

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): What sting in the opposition?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I can remember very distinctly attending, for example, the inaugural meeting of the regional government of Oxford. Her Honour was asked to attend and she delivered an excellent speech; no doubt she had some assistance from her appropriate ministers in preparing it, but that is their responsibility and obviously it is hers to follow their advice. But one thing that I felt was

substantially out of place was that there is a clear understanding in that community, as in every other one where regional government has been imposed, that not all of the citizens and taxpayers think it's the greatest idea that has come down the road. In fact, many of them are substantially offended at the increased costs and the reduction in the influence they have on their local government by these bills. To have the Governor make her speech, as she does most effectively, and then be required to sit and listen to the Treasurer of the day get up and in most acrimonious terms indicate his views of anyone who opposed the view, certainly, in my view, does nothing to strengthen the office of the governorship.

Mr. L. Maeck (Parry Sound): The Leader of the Opposition has said that for the last four years.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I say that once simply to indicate to the government that they should be careful of their procedures in involving this gracious lady and this high office in the matters of — let's say the establishment of acceptance of their policies.

I am concerned as well that the speech did nothing to provide leadership in the areas that are concerning our taxpayers, the people, the residents of this province, let alone the members of the Legislature. It was nothing but bland platitudes on unemployment, inflation, on the problems of housing, on the growing problems of labour relations, teacher negotiations, the development of the north, the development of a plan for the Province of Ontario to bring our growth under some rational control. It was an incredible abdication of leadership and, in my view, a further downgrading of the once great Tory governing party and the emphasis of the evil days it is falling on under the leadership of this Premier (Mr. Davis).

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): And all six government members who are here shake their heads.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is interesting that the chortles and interjections come from that mighty band called the Tory rump—

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Loud noises from the rump.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —perennially waiting for some kind of an appointment—

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): And perennially getting nothing from the opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —always waiting to get over into the government side so that they too, I suppose, could vamoose when anybody not supporting the government has anything to say in this House.

Mr. Breithaupt: Lots of interjections.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I suppose I would be falsely modest if I didn't think that at least this occasion is worthy of some attention by the government and when I look across there —what are there, 74 Tory members?

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Six of them there now.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —it goes down week by week but I can count and I can easily count about 55 empty blue seats. If it were not for the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch) over there, it really wouldn't be worth coming in at all; at least she dresses up the visual portion to some extent—

Mr. Maeck: It indicates the value of what the member has to say.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —and I won't refer to what the Minister of the Environment (Mr. W. Newman) does to it.

Mr. S. Lewis: Is the provincial secretary going to take that sitting down? Does she want me to send this Hansard to Laura Sabia?

Hon. M. Birch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): Please.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is a sexist comment if ever I heard one.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It certainly is.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I am very much concerned that in fact the discussions in this Legislature are becoming more irrelevant than they ever have before. Now, of course, Mr. Speaker, you may say what I may be about to say is irrelevant, but I will tell you that there are many people in this province who are deeply concerned at the lack of programmes, not only in the Speech from the Throne—not everyone is aware of that yet and they may not be—

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Forty-two per cent.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —but certainly they are aware of the lack of thrust of leadership that this government has failed to bring forward in the last months and years.

Mr. Maeck: Let the member tell us about all the programmes he has put forward.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: My hon. friend, the member who has moved that a humble address be sent to the governor, is interjecting, but he—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: No, that was me.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —seems to forget that in in the four years that he has been supporting his Premier, his party has lost four by-elections; his batting average is zero. I wish ours had been 1000, but after all three out of four is not bad. I don't feel badly about that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: In the absence of the Premier, who about this stage usually gets up and says, "Well, by-elections are an occasion when the people get a chance to express their dissatisfaction with the government without risking any change." I would say that he takes perhaps some false comfort from this, because while he is, I know, a student of history, he seems to forget that Les Frost never ever lost a by-election, he won them all. And the only ones that John Robarts lost were the ones that were unwinnable, like the one in Brant. I would say that the Premier's position in saying that by-elections—

Mr. MacDonald: It ain't true. They lost South Renfrew and then they gained it in the next by-election. Let's keep the record straight.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh, well, if we want to go into all those details.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, let's keep the record straight.

Mr. Breithaupt: Whistling in the dark.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Middlesex South, that's true. But I believe that the Premier's satisfaction in saying, "Well, governments always lose by-elections" is simply misplaced. But he is right when he says, "The only poll that really counts is the one that is conducted on election day." I agree with him; I wholly agree with him in that, because that's the defence I used when I was defending second place. I think that all of us—

Mr. Breithaupt: He is quoting an authority.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —are aware that while the polls stimulate interest, enthusiasm, concern in some quarters—

Mr. Lewis: I should think.

Mr. MacDonald: Also puffery.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —they are simply an indication of what the political temperature happens to be at that particular time, and that these things obviously change.

That's what politics is all about. That's why we raise matters in the Legislature. That's why the Premier perambulates with his cabinet, that's why he travels to Italy, that's why he goes on "This Country in the Morning" with Judy LaMarsh. Perhaps this programme has been completed by now because probably he would enjoy that more than listening to more direct criticisms of his programme.

But the polls are there. I don't want to say that I'm surprised at the strength they show for the Liberal Party. Let's say I am gratified and deeply interested, that my supporters are certainly gratified, deeply interested and enthused because they show that there is now a clear 12-point spread of leadership for the Liberal Party ahead of the Conservatives, and interestingly enough, the NDP is just where it was in 1971, only down a point.

There are many things, of course, to humble the people who lead the polls. Let's say the fact that among people under 30 the NDP leads, and there is a close division between the NDP and the Liberals there, but it appears that the voters under 30 have left the government party almost completely. The Tories hardly show on that graph. The initiatives that were part of Conservative governments over many years, with Mr. Frost and Mr. Robarts, have somehow been lost and certainly they have not been regained in the speech that was presented to us by Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor on Tuesday last.

Some of you may recall the Speech from the Throne, or perhaps it was the budget, just before the election of 1967. There were those who were saying that the Conservatives were old and tired, that Robarts was a loser, that in fact he somehow hadn't grasped the leadership magic that had been passed on to him by Les Frost. But some of you may remember the government programmes that flowed out of the Speech from the Throne and the budget then. Home Ownership Made Easy, the development of wild rivers, pro-

grammes for the north, a full range of tax credits—there they were. And in fact the system is supposed to work like that.

If there were not opposition to the government they would presume that they were doing perfectly. As a matter of fact, even when there is opposition this handful of valiant people feel that they are doing perfectly. Even this morning there were two separate instances to programmes enunciated that were the best, I think, in the English-speaking world. Have they got something better in eastern Europe, or something like that? I don't know. But it's a very strange thing that opposition coming forward in the community doesn't stimulate this government to some action other than—well, what have we got?

The Premier says, "A serious lack of communication is the only problem we have. The people do not understand our programmes." Yet when I read the weekly newspapers and the dailies in my community, the government is in there with at least one major display ad.

We were interested to see that even the Provincial Auditor is concerned that \$3.2 million has been spent without a tender and without even a contract to put forward the government's programme. My God! If the government has a communication problem why doesn't it get somebody that can help it? Why doesn't it institute a tendering programme and maybe it can find a good advertising agency that will give it some help. This strange commitment to Dalton Camp Associates' president Norman Atkins of \$1.8 million spent there specifically is maybe one of the government's problems. Just because he was the chairman of its election campaign in 1971, the government feels it has some special commitment to him. Well, he is letting the government down because the Premier himself says that government problems in communicating are really what is setting it back in the public opinion polls.

When one reads the ethnic press—which I read regularly in at least 30 languages—one finds that once again the government advertising agency is going full steam ahead. There is the picture of the Premier—it used to be John Yaremko and now it is Bob Welch riding around in that big black car, expressing his views of concern and support to each one of those groups. There is the money week by week put forward in those newspapers. The Premier travels to Italy and still his support drops in the community of Metropolitan Toronto, where there are 800,000 and more voting people of Italian extraction.

The cabinet gathers itself together each Wednesday, and travels across the province, so that they can indicate that this is an open government ready to listen to the people. I would think they are getting a little sick of it because we read the accounts of the direct criticism and the inability of the cabinet to respond in any positive way, other than to give it "careful consideration." I would suggest to the cabinet ministers present—and I guess there may be three here—the Minister of the Environment wants to go but he doesn't want to leave the front row empty—

Mr. Breithaupt: He has been looking around too much.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, he is getting a little uneasy. It will be interesting to see what happens as this speech goes on.

An hon. member: He has just promoted himself.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I have some special comments to make for my good friend, the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacBeth), who has just moved into the front row. If he had minded his P's and Q's a few years ago, he might have made it into the front row in some other capacity.

The Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Rhodes) isn't here. One of the major defences that the government brings forward against the Gallup poll is to say, "Well, okay, let's just laugh it off because it really is very funny and it is not going to last for long." They say, "Who is our best laugh artist? It has got to be good old Bumpy Rhodes, the Minister of Transportation and Communications."

The minister makes a statement in which he says the Liberals are like lizards—not ordinary lizards, my friends, but Australian lizards. I don't know what the concept there is, whether he is trying to win the Australian vote or lose it, but he says we are like Australian lizards.

I couldn't help but think, as soon as I saw that, that he leaves himself wide open, because I can remember appearing on Liberal platforms with the hon. gentleman. I can remember when he moved the nomination of a Liberal candidate in his own home town. I suppose, if we have to equate him with some member of the Tory zoo, he has got to be a chameleon because he can change colours just about as conveniently as the Minister of Labour.

Hon. J. P. MacBeth (Minister of Labour): Just maturity.

Mr. Singer: Why is the Minister of Labour blushing?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: At least, the Minister of Labour is not a dinosaur like the rest of those lizards and, believe me, they are heading for extinction. That's a point that the government shouldn't forget.

Mr. Breithaupt: An endangered species.

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact, he is a dinosaur, but amiable.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The member for Scarborough West is not equating him with George Meany again?

Mr. Lewis: Well, why not?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, I don't know, I think the two of them, running labour matters in the North American continent—

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): He is not a meanie, he is a nice guy.

An hon. member: The Minister of Labour is a lot younger.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is the Premier, I suppose, that one has to look to for the defence of the Tory party as it crumbles from its positions of eminence which have been so well underpinned by the Premier's predecessor.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That's wishful thinking on the Leader of the Opposition's part.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: My friend says it is wishful thinking. Where the wishful thinking comes in is when the Premier, going up to the Hyatt House, comes out and makes a statement to the press in which he says, "Public opinion is a pendulum and it is swinging in our direction."

Mr. Breithaupt: It sure is!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, that's some pendulum; that's some swing. Because that very day he had to be informed the spread between the Liberals and Conservatives had widened to 12 per cent. It was interesting that he said, "I know when the swing started back." He wouldn't say exactly; he glared at the Globe and Mail reporter and said, "You should know too."

I presume that's when Fighting Bill came out to defend Ross Shouldice, one of his fund-raisers. I cannot help but think that his association with that loser, Ross Shouldice, isn't doing him any good and it's not doing the Minister of Natural Resources any good or any of the rest of them because it

is just an indication that the "big blue machine" is going on as it always has looking for the oil that it is going to have to use to buy another election.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of National Resources): That is the member's opinion.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I was interested, also, that the former Treasurer who is now the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. White) in charge of the re-election of the government—what a lost cause that is—introduced legislation yesterday requiring the control of funds for election purposes. The bill was introduced previously. I would have thought that his statement on the introduction of that bill would have been considerably fuller than it was, because it's an important piece of legislation. It means—if it is adhered to in spirit by all political parties and enforced rigorously, as I have no doubt it will be—that we are in a new political era. The bill is by no means perfect—we are going to have amendments to put to it—but I do consider it a piece of landmark legislation. I suppose, if you look for its antecedents, you can look—

Mr. Singer: There the Minister of the Environment goes.

Hon. W. Newman (Minister of the Environment): I have a meeting to attend.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: All right. Is he going to talk to the Hope township people about that dump? Is that the one he's going to meet about?

Hon. W. Newman: Is that a question, or is that a comment?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We'll ask about it very soon.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The member is on the side of the angels.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Anyway, I was talking just briefly about the election expenses legislation which, I believe, has got to be seen as landmark legislation. It is legislation that can be stronger in its final form than that which is introduced but which, I believe, is extremely important.

Its antecedent goes back to the discussions in this House of the so-called Fidnam affair. So I suppose, as is often the case, these rather ugly incidents do have some valuable outcome in the long run. We can recall the evidence that Fidnam had given \$50,000 to the Tory funds last time; that Moog had given \$35,000 to the funds last time. Presumably that will not happen again unless

money has already been contributed, and is sitting in barrels somewhere in the cellar of Tory headquarters waiting to be sliced off like cheese to buy another election.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Remember John Winemeyer?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is the thing that concerns me. The Premier is, of course, the main defence of the Tory party. He sees a swing of the pendulum but, in order to show that he is not depending on simply his own magnetic personality, as was the case in 1971, he looked at the Speech from the Throne and decided that he would not expose his flanks, or anything else and said practically nothing. He called for the appointment of an "ombudsperson" as he so laboriously named the office. Of course, you are aware, Mr. Speaker—and my colleagues are prepared to make you aware repeatedly—that that particular legislation has been forthcoming from our party since—what was it?—

Mr. Singer: Since 1965.

Mr. R. F. Nixon:—since 1965. But the Premier has been making other statements lately.

In speaking to the Ontario Municipal Electric Association, he was talking about regional government and the concerns that everyone has about that and he said, "There will be no more regional governments." Before he could finish his statement the enthusiasm of the people from across the province at that meeting interrupted him with loud cheers and applause. Being the careful man that he is, it was necessary for him to complete the statement at the end of the applause and he said, "at this time."

I think it is clear that if—and God forbid—the Conservative Party should be re-elected to power in this province, there will be regional government imposed from one end of the province to the other. This will be a catastrophe for the taxpayers and, even more important, it will be a catastrophe for those people who believe in effective local government. Those who believe the Conservative concept of regionalism simply accept that old and certainly incorrect assumption that bigness is efficient, that bigness is effective, that bigness serves the people better.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if a Conservative is elected in Prince Edward-Lennox that even that famous county will be regionalized—and the people down there had better take that into consideration when they look at the alternatives that face them in the next election.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That's right; that's right.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would suggest that if the Conservatives are re-elected, and God forbid, even Chatham-Kent would be regionalized. And that is an area where the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) himself, now that he is back in the saddle as the chief planner, the chief regionalizer, the chief energy spokesman, the chief negotiator with the various governments of Canada, the chief adviser to the Premier, and perhaps the chief threat to the Premier's position, he is the man—he is the only man—who might protect Chatham-Kent from regionalization.

There is something ironic there since he was the author of the concept and it was under his direction and power that regional government has already been imposed on 60 per cent of our taxpayers, who are now carrying this additional and unfortunate load.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Now the Liberal leader is developing new Conservative policies.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Where is the Liberal leader going?

An hon. member: Just hang on, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Is that a statement of policy?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I made some comments about the only direct promise that came from the Speech from the Throne, and that was for the appointment of an ombudsman. There was also a reference to some changes in agricultural policy, which I would like to deal with later in my remarks.

I have had an opportunity to examine the speech carefully and the Premier, I suppose because he has made some errors in the past, has been careful really to promise nothing. I think he's wise to do that, because his speeches from the Throne previously have been a record of broken promises.

In the 1972 Throne Speech the government promised implementation of the Toronto-centred region plan. Nothing was done and the plan has now been discarded. Everybody that I've talked to, and certainly my party, is very much concerned about the decentralization of growth away from the Toronto-centred region. The very name of that plan at the time gave the rest of the people of the province the concept—correct when we see the programmes evolving—that Toronto is the centre of the universe in the mind of this government. They seem to believe that although their attempts have been frustrated to direct growth elsewhere, this is

really something that they can accept readily since it is the way the universe would unfold, as someone else might say in these circumstances. The Toronto-centred region plan was a promise, but its development has been frustrated by the government's own policy and it's now in the discard.

In the same speech we were promised a system of offtrack betting facilities that never materialized, to be administered by a provincial government board that was never established.

Also in the 1972 Throne Speech the government pledged to seek further means by which housing construction could be encouraged. That year they underspent their housing budget by more than \$54 million, about \$47 million of which was allocated for home ownership programmes.

The promise of that year of initiatives to increase exports of Ontario-grown agricultural food products must ring hollow in the ears of many of Ontario's farmers. In the absence of any provincial government assistance, for example, the pork marketing board has recently had to act independently and at their own expense to establish trade with Japan even though our Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett) is even now down in Los Angeles consorting—let's say carrying out discussions—with movie stars and others in the establishment of our trade with that other jurisdiction.

The list of broken promises from the 1973 Throne Speech is even longer. The government spoke of preservation of our physical resources as an urgent requirement and promised land use controls where agricultural lands are concerned. There is still no policy for the preservation of agricultural land. Development companies are still permitted to buy good agricultural land, as Bramalea Consolidated Development has recently done, north and east of the city of Brantford in some of the very best farmland anywhere. This was carried out at the same time that Ontario Housing holds a full 1,000 acres to the west of the city which has simply been left in the land bank without any development programme at all.

It's interesting to note under those circumstances that the threat is more or less put to the various governments in Brant county that until they are prepared to ask for and accept the Conservative government concepts of regionalism there is no way that that 1,000 acres of Ontario Housing-held land is going to be developed. The facilities for servicing it can be extended with reasonable costs and with reasonable ease, with co-operation be-

tween the governments involved. And still the government holds that threat, almost a blackmail threat, over the municipalities saying, "Nothing can be done as long as you resist regional government."

The government itself continues to destroy prime agricultural land with projects like the Bradley-Georgetown hydro line that was approved without even the pretence of public hearings and now has been specifically exempted from the additional hearings that should have been called under the direction of the royal commission appointed yesterday by announcement of the policy secretary.

Also in 1973—we are talking about government promises that have been unfulfilled—the government promised to ensure the preservation of the Niagara Escarpment. Today they are on the verge of approving development plans for a resort community of 7,500 on the escarpment near Collingwood, despite concern among members of the watchdog Niagara Escarpment commission and many others. They have never moved toward paying anything to those landholders whose values have been reduced by any of these actions. The 1973 Throne Speech promised further legislation on the disposal of solid waste which has so far amounted to a ban on pull-tab tops on cans and nothing more.

The minister outside the House made some announcement yesterday that within a year pop companies had to do something about disposable containers or they had to re-introduce refillable containers but there has, in essence, been a promise made that has not been fulfilled.

The government promised a still non-existent noise abatement programme in co-operation with municipalities. In the absence of province-wide noise regulations, municipal governments still pass their own bylaws and there was one very weak and ineffectual approach to that at the last session.

The promise to encourage more effective planning at the local level has been broken many times through arbitrary provincial government interference in local planning matters. I am going to be talking about these super cities that are envisaged by the former Treasurer, but in his comments and statements about the new cities that he hopes and expects to be built in the Haldimand-Norfolk area, he clearly said that he would not allow locally elected officials to stand in the way of his concepts for development. But the 10,000-acre industrial park assembly in Edwardsburgh township was assembled without any consultation with local government, as

were the two new town sites assembled in Haldimand-Norfolk.

Legislation to establish the North Pickering Development Corp. was passed last month about one week before the Durham regional council even had an opportunity to present its views to cabinet.

This whole idea that has been a part of Throne Speeches in the past, having to do with effective planning at the local level, has been worse than a charade. It has been a substantial attempt, a deliberate attempt, to mislead those local officials. The government of the day is prepared to ride roughshod over those rights and this is something that the people are not going to put up with.

The integrated community housing programme that was mentioned in the 1973 Throne Speech was a failure and has now been replaced by the Ontario Housing Action Programme. We get two or three of these programmes every Throne Speech and, frankly, I regret that there was nothing more specific mentioned in the speech this time, because we feel that the present programmes are totally inadequate and I am going to be dealing with that more fully further in my remarks.

The speech also promised in 1973 a forest management programme including the regeneration of cutover lands. The statistics available from the ministry itself show clearly that there has been no attempt even made to fulfil that promise in the Speech from the Throne.

It was also in the 1973 Throne Speech that this government promised a new intermediate-capacity transit system to help meet the transportation needs of our larger cities. That misguided scheme collapsed last year, but not until the West German government had the wisdom to withdraw its financial support.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I was rather concerned when the president of the corporation that has had and still has the responsibility for the magnetic levitation alternative, indicated that the government was still substantially interested in its development and the research that would lead to its development.

I feel that we should stop throwing good money after bad in this regard and that it is a shame the government has continued to have some expenditure directed in that way. We are still faced with bills from that ill-fated venture. The Canadian National Exhibition has billed the government for something close to \$1 million for the trees they

cut down to make way for the monorail system which has since been abandoned.

Finally, I refer to the legislation with respect to negotiations between the teaching profession and the school boards that was promised in 1973 and has still not been enacted, even though that promise was repeated in the Throne Speech a year ago. Since the government, and particularly the Premier, is very sensitive when anybody uses the words "integrity" or "incompetence"—he doesn't like to be criticized on either of those matters—I feel that since those Throne Speeches that have been directly this Premier's responsibility, it is important and necessary for the people to understand the commitments that were not fulfilled.

The 1974 Throne Speech also promised proposals for further development of a comprehensive health plan. Nothing was done. Provisions for the mandatory use of automobile seatbelts were never introduced, although we are now spending \$650,000 to persuade people to buckle up.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Do the Liberals want them?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Where do they stand on them? We believe that seatbelts should be used, that it is the responsibility of the government to see that they are used.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Does the member want the wearing of them compulsory?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: This kind of waste of money is typical of a government that has lost the will to lead and the will to govern and is going to be defeated on the basis of that loss.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: The member would be doing better if he weren't here.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): He should have stayed in bed this morning.

Mr. Singer: They'll probably love him in Prince Edward-Lennox for a while.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The speech further promised a legislative programme concerning family law and clarifying the legal rights of married persons, only one part of which was introduced and even that was never proceeded with, despite the Attorney General's commitment—and I quote him from Hansard—"to proceed with it later on in the session."

A further promise, a revised Planning Act, has never been presented; as far as we know,

there isn't even any work going on with it. If that Planning Act were brought up to date, the powers that urban centres must and should have to establish and fulfil their own planning goals would be clearly understood and clearly a part of the law, and not subject to the interference that has played a number of urban municipalities.

A further promise was a closer partnership with other levels of government in the area of housing. That has been all but destroyed by the intemperate attacks of the Minister of Housing (Mr. Irvine) on municipal governments, particularly concerned about growth, and the federal government's housing agency.

A further promise of new accommodation and staffing regulations for daycare facilities created so much confusion and bitterness when they were announced that they have not been enacted as yet.

Limitations and controls on outdoor advertising have never appeared.

Twice we have been promised an environmental review procedure which once again, in response to questions today, the Minister of the Environment has said is not forthcoming.

This record of unkept promises and unfulfilled commitments is one of the reasons that Ontario has lost confidence in this government's integrity. In the circumstances, perhaps it is best that the 1975 Throne Speech contained so little. The chance for disappointment is much less.

I feel that this is an occasion when we should review the commitments and promises of the government since the member for Peel North (Mr. Davis) took over the Premiership in 1971. I feel, in conjunction with that, it is interesting and useful to note the changes in our budgetary commitments during that period of time.

To go back to the year which resulted in the election of our present Premier to his high office, John Robarts, as leader of the government in those days, presented the House through his Treasurer, Charlie MacNaughton, with a budget that gave us a \$150 million surplus. That was the last time we have seen any black ink at the bottom line of the provincial budget since the present Premier has been associated with the premiership. Even in those days, the Treasurer, Mr. MacNaughton, was making statements about the problems that might face us if careful direction were not part of the financial planning.

You will remember he talked about a fiscal nightmare, Mr. Speaker. I will tell you we have a fiscal nightmare now, because in the budget presented the deficit—and those are the words of the Treasurer himself—was predicted to be \$792 million this year but something called the net cash requirements was predicted to be \$1.068 billion.

I think it's interesting to note that the Speech from the Throne this year referred to the fact that the public debt had been reduced by a substantial amount this year and last year. Once again, I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the people of the province have been seriously misled if they read those words and pay any attention to them. We have come from a position, when the Premier took over the reins of office here, where we had a \$150 million surplus in that year, the last year of Mr. Robart's responsibility, to this year where we are going behind \$1.1 billion.

Much of that money is borrowed from the government of Canada, from the teachers' superannuation fund, from the superannuation fund from the public service and sources such as that, where by order in council those moneys are simply transferred to the consolidated revenue fund and the interest payments, inadequate though they are, are established once again by order in council. Any government that does not think that that is a commitment, a public debt, a trust, and does not report it that way surely is in serious problems with those people who have in the past conveyed their confidence to it.

I will tell you this, Mr. Speaker, that any company that got into the employees' pension fund and transferred it to their own funds for their own use would find themselves closed up and before the courts in short order. It could well be that with the resources of this province those funds can and should be used for public purposes, but surely they should be accounted for in such a way that the people are not being misled into the clap-trap that came from the Speech from the Throne associated with the refunding of our public debt. Our public debt at the present time—and this is our net debt—is \$3.694 billion. This does not include the additional debt for which we are responsible that has been incurred by Ontario Hydro. This is the net debt with nothing to offset it.

Treasurer White, before his retirement, was saying: "Suppose we look at our highways as being offsetting assets. Then that net debt would not look so bad." We can't accept that argument. You can't sell the highways, Mr. Speaker. I suppose Garfield Weston would buy them from us and set up toll gates or

something if we let him, but that concept is absolutely ridiculous. What does a government tax and spend money for, if it is not to provide services, such as highway programmes to provide employment? For the Treasurer to try to set that up as some sort on an offsetting entry into a debt of \$3.694 billion is ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, I set out to compare our position now with what it was in 1971 when the Premier assumed his present office. The net debt in the last year of John Robarts' responsibility was \$1.3 billion. The net debt has increased in the four years of the Davis administration 165 per cent, and still they tell us in the Speech from the Throne that our debt is being retired by payment. It's seriously misleading and I feel that it is offensive, certainly to the members of this House and the taxpayers.

Besides the net debt, of course, we have a substantial debt which does have offsetting ingredients as far as the books of the province are concerned. But I think the best way to look at our commitment is to see what gross interest payments must be made in the name of the Province of Ontario. In John Robarts' last year, \$305 million—no mean amount—was required for our debt and interest charges. This year, 1974-1975, we will be paying \$682 million in interest alone. The interest payments have increased in the four years of the present Premier's stewardship by 124 per cent.

I bring those facts and figures to your attention, Mr. Speaker, simply to balance the statements that we have been subjected to in the Speech from the Throne and by the ministers as they, day by day, get up in their places and talk about the excellence of the performance of the government. I would say to you that the performance has been seriously inept, that the administration has been weak and costly.

There has been serious overlapping in responsibilities and duplication of services. We have continued with a cabinet that is top heavy in its administrative responsibilities, and ramifying into the regions of this province with more and more public servants and more and more staff facilities which are making a mockery of any attempt to control provincial expenditures. Ontario is falling behind in all of these important areas, and they are matters of concern to us all.

One part of the 1975 Throne Speech that cannot go unchallenged is the assertion that Ontario will continue to fulfil its accustomed role within the Canadian nation. In fact, all the evidence indicates that under this ad-

ministration Ontario is falling seriously behind. Where once we were the keystone of Confederation, in many areas—fiscal, economic and financial—we have now become the millstone. We're not pulling our weight in the economy, in food production, in house building, in education, not even in urban transit. Despite our tremendous natural advantages, despite our rich resources of people, of land, of mineral wealth, the government has been unable to maintain Ontario's hard-earned position of strength and leadership.

I want to draw to your attention specifically, Mr. Speaker, those various areas that I have mentioned and compare them with the development of Canada in these three to four years, and with the other provinces, our sisters in Confederation.

First, in unemployment, the proportion of unemployed workers in Ontario's labour force has jumped 21.7 per cent during the past two months, compared to a 13.3 per cent increase Canada-wide. Ontario's unemployment rate is going up almost two-thirds faster than the national rate. In British Columbia and Nova Scotia the unemployment rate has been dropping. In Newfoundland and New Brunswick it has been rising only half as fast as in Ontario, and in Quebec the rate of increase in unemployment is only one-third the increase in unemployment here. Those are the facts available.

In exports, the value of Canadian exports increased 58.6 per cent between 1972 and 1974. Ontario's exports were up by only 34.1 per cent—only three-fifths the national rate. We're the richest province in Canada. Since Confederation we have prided ourselves in leading not only our sister provinces—but most of the American states in the development of our economy. We are now growing at only three-fifths the national rate. Nova Scotia's exports are increasing twice as fast as Ontario's and Newfoundland's exports value is growing at four times our rate. Ontario's share of total Canadian exports has declined from 45 per cent in 1972 to 43 per cent in 1973, down to 38 per cent last year. This is what has happened in the period since the present Premier has assumed the responsibility of office.

Although provincial consumer price comparisons are not readily available, Statistics Canada in its survey of prices in major cities reveals that since this government took office in 1971 consumer prices in the Ontario cities of Toronto, Ottawa and Thunder Bay have been going up about 11 per cent faster than those in Halifax, and about 12 per cent faster than the prices in Regina—for two specific points of comparison.

The cost of food in Thunder Bay has been rising nine per cent faster since 1971 than in Edmonton or Saskatoon, cities of approximately equal size. Since last October food prices in Ottawa have risen more than twice as fast as those in Winnipeg, and 40 per cent faster than the food prices in Saint John, NB.

Also since last October, Toronto's house prices have been rising 18 per cent faster than the national average, and accommodation costs in Ottawa are going up more than twice as fast as in Vancouver, a city with great growth problems itself. In the last two years in Thunder Bay the cost of houses has increased 16 per cent more than in Montreal or Saskatoon, and 29 per cent faster than in Halifax.

A comparison in wages and salaries: In 1972 the average weekly wage in Ontario was 5.70 higher than the national average. By last October, that gap had decreased to \$2.89 more than the national average. Canadian wage rates are rising more than 12 per cent faster than our provincial wages. Quebec's average weekly wage is increasing almost 23 per cent faster than Ontario, and in British Columbia wages are going up 26.5 per cent faster.

Members may say, "Well, why do we want wages going up faster than in the other provinces?" I would say to them that I have already indicated the costs of living in this province are going up faster than in the other provinces, that we have in the Speech from the Throne been informed that Ontario is maintaining and strengthening its traditional position in the economy of Canada, and I am simply here, Mr. Speaker, to say that statistics say that statement is wrong, that under the leadership of the present government since 1971 we are falling behind, and falling behind more seriously as each month goes by.

In agriculture, there were 127,000 fewer Ontario farms in 1971 than a decade earlier, a loss of more than seven farms every day. Between 1961 and 1971, Canada lost 1.7 per cent of its farm acreage. Ontario during that period lost 14.1 per cent of its acreage, eight times the national average. If that rate continues, Ontario's supply of arable land will disappear completely before the Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell) celebrates his 90th birthday. A recent government publication called "Trends in Ontario Agriculture" reports as follows—these are just extracts from that publication:

Feed grains—a fallen acreage; tobacco—a fallen acreage; apples—acreage decreased be-

tween 1951 and 1971 in all regions of the province; peach production—characterized by a declining acreage. The pattern for pears was similar, a 20 per cent decrease in acreage. Both the acreage and production of plums and prunes has declined significantly from 5,992 acres to 2,063 acres. Both the acreage and production of raspberries have dropped off in all regions; strawberry acreage—down 40 per cent.

Vegetable crops—acreage dropped by 20,000 acres, off 15 per cent. Rutabaga acreage has declined 50 per cent; tomatoes—the most important vegetable crop grown in Ontario—acreage is about one-half what it was in 1951. The number of dairy cattle in Ontario has dropped steadily since 1956, from more than a million head to 755,000 head. Between 1966 and 1971, Ontario milk production dropped by 3.7 per cent.

Ontario's share of Canadian beef production has declined steadily over the past 15 years by 5.8 per cent from the early 1960s to the period 1970-1974. During the same time Ontario's share of Canadian hog to the period 1970-1974. During the same of poultry meat production dropped 9.8 per cent. If we had maintained our 1960-1964 share of Canadian beef production, there would now be 70,000 more beef cows on Ontario farms, enough for 1,400 operations of 50 head each.

In education, Canadian universities will award 12.4 per cent more post-graduate degrees this year than three years ago. In other words, the level of expansion in education is going on across the nation at a substantial pace. But in Ontario, the increase is only about one-third the national average at 4.2 per cent. Ontario's share of Canadian post-graduate degree awards has dropped 7.4 per cent since 1971.

Across Canada, the pupil-teacher ratio has been improving. That is, more teachers for fewer students, giving rise to quality and excellence in education. This pupil-teacher ratio has been improving across Canada so that today there is an average of one more teacher for every 71 elementary and secondary school students than two years ago. During the same period in Ontario, class size has grown larger and there is now one fewer teacher for every 73 students than in that same period.

Once again, rather than maintaining our leadership in Canada we are depreciating in the essential area of quality of education.

In urban transit, after May 1, Toronto will have the highest transit fares in Canada

—40 cents cash or three tickets for \$1. In Montreal, the only other Canadian city with a subway system, there is a 35-cent cash fare or three tickets for 90 cents. In Vancouver and Winnipeg, cash fares are 25 cents.

As a result of the Toronto fare increase, the TTC's passenger increase this year is expected to drop to four per cent from the previously projected 12 to 13 per cent. Between 100,000 and 120,000 daily transit riders are expected to return to their cars because of the fare increase, adding some 80,000 daily automobile trips to Toronto's already congested streets.

The policy in that regard is in turmoil. It was interesting, a few weeks ago, to hear the Minister of Transportation and Communications say that he was going to recommend to his colleagues that the Spadina Expressway was going to be paved to Eglinton Ave. I was interested to hear the Premier say that he agreed with this position—the policy that our party has had consistently since 1971. But still they have done nothing but allow the transit fares in Toronto to go higher than in any other city in Canada.

In housing, we are faced with the incredible fact that the province with the highest credit rating possible—we hear that frequently—has the third worst performance record in Canada for housing starts in 1974. Two provinces, Newfoundland and Saskatchewan, actually increased their housing starts over 1973, but not the province with the triple-A rating. Here, housing starts dropped 22.6 per cent, one-third worse than the national average setback.

For the past two fiscal years, this province has underspent its housing budget. In fiscal 1973 they underspent by \$54 million and in fiscal 1974 by \$49 million, a total of \$103 million of hoarded housing funds in just two years. This past fiscal year the rental housing budget alone was underspent by \$20 million.

This seems incredible when we are subjected to the statements from the Minister of Housing day by day, blaming the municipalities on the one hand and the federal government on the other, both of whom must share responsibility and blame. But he is blaming them when we, as a province, the richest in Canada, are prepared to have the Legislature vote money and then not even spend it for the programmes for which it is designed.

The amount of money spent on home ownership programmes has actually dropped since the advent of the new Ministry of Housing. It's dropped by 12 per cent from

\$110 million in fiscal 1973 to less than \$97 million in fiscal 1974.

We all want government costs to be cut, but one area which must be excepted from that concept is the area of housing. Certainly people in our communities, taxpayers and the members of this Legislature are prepared to support government initiatives which are going to make money, programmes and initiatives available in order to build houses and turn around a downward trend that has plagued this province more than any other province in Canada.

If you realize, Mr. Speaker, that the expenditures in 1973 were \$110 million and now, in 1974, they're only \$97 million, when we add to this the effects of inflation, it's clear that we are making haste backwards in the housing area in a situation that is certainly a crisis and has been for two years. What possible excuse is there for the government's appalling housing record in the face of our serious shelter needs?

In 1973, the Comay task force reported, and I quote, "The dominant need of 300,000 or 400,000 families in Ontario is for housing they can afford." Recently, a study commissioned by Metro Toronto social services and housing committee revealed that in this city for the first time since the Second World War some families were actually homeless. The incidence of home ownership in this province is declining and the rate of decline is substantial.

For all practical purposes, home ownership is denied to all but the top 40 per cent. Families unable to acquire equity in their own housing remain highly vulnerable in the housing market. They spend their working years adding to their landlord's equity and not their own. In present policies, if these policies are pursued, the benefits of pride of ownership and equity buildup will be denied to an ever-increasing proportion of our people.

Already a near majority of Ontario's residents are tenants—over 40 per cent—and find themselves in a marketplace characterized by scarcity and high rent. They are becoming well organized and vocal, effectively making their case for security of tenure and protection from excessive rent increases.

We have proposed fundamental changes in the Landlord and Tenant Act to put some substance and some strength into the law by establishing municipal rent review boards that can subpoena witnesses and documents and require landlords to justify rent increases. The Liberal housing critic, the member for

St. George (Mrs. Campbell), will be introducing private member's legislation on the subject during this session.

But the thing that concerns us is that in this province we have the natural resources, the lumber, the building materials for housing, probably more so than any other province in Canada. We have land which can be serviced for building and we have a labour force that is presently seriously under-employed. It seems to me with those three ingredients the government of the day can be and must be seriously faulted for not bringing forward a programme which is going to meet the needs of the citizens of the province for housing or, at least, turn around the dramatic downtrend in housing starts. This downtrend has taken us from 110,000 starts in the year when our housing ministry began to just over 85,000 starts projected for this year.

Mr. Singer: Shame.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: This government, instead of servicing land as at least a beginning, has decided to bank it. Their own figures show that 90,000 acres are presently in the land bank, controlled by Ontario Housing by the new Ontario Land Corp. and by other government agencies. These land-banking activities are not in any way coordinated with municipal planning or development priorities. In fact, there are no cases that I'm aware of where the purchases of these lands have been in conjunction with the local planning system. Certainly Kitchener-Waterloo and the whole Cambridge area are one example and the purchase of 1,000 acres in my own area near Brantford is another.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Malvern is another.

Mr. Singer: So is Milton.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Their 10,000-acre industrial park in Edwardsburgh township was created without any reference to the several thousand acres of vacant, serviced industrial land already assembled by municipal governments in eastern Ontario. There are more than 4,000 acres in the nine largest cities east of Toronto.

Mr. Lewis: It is an awful price to pay for ego.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I can't help but feel that the acquisition of these lands has been the result of the inflation of the ego of the former Treasurer, who is now the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. White) in charge of the re-election of the government. The con-

cepts that he has used in acquiring these lands are completely undemocratic. They have not been subjected even to the kinds of control that the cabinet itself should have been exercising.

In the continued absence of a provincial land-use plan, a broad concept for growth and development, this government's land-banking activities are no more than disruptive meddling in the plans and priorities of local municipalities. This interference is most evident in the new town assemblies, two of which have been proposed, without any consultation, for the Haldimand-Norfolk region. Like magnetic levitation trains, they are a spectacular attempt at solving a very ordinary but difficult problem. In practical terms, they are a waste of public funds and an intrusion into local autonomy.

Throughout Ontario there are many communities with considerable growth potential to provide accommodation for an increased population now and in the future. The time will surely come when new communities must be established. I remember Paul Hellyer—whom we have been listening to for a great many years with his many interesting ideas—talking about satellite cities, as a result of a review of housing needs that he undertook when he had that responsibility some years ago, and saying that undoubtedly the time will come when new communities must be established.

But believe me, Mr. Speaker, in communities such as the ones I represent and the ones in your part of the world, there are substantial reasons to expect growth to take place on a community nucleus already established. After all, those communities already have sewage and water systems. They already have schools with room in them. They have recreational facilities and arenas, and when people move in there, their kids can go over to the arena and get on a hockey team. The churches, God knows, have room in them for more people. These

communities are served presently by roads and railways, railways that can be expanded into commuter service if they are within reach of urban centres.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is more logical, it is more practical and economically feasible to encourage these existing communities to expand and to assist those now wanting to expand, rather than develop new townsites.

Now, it is true that some communities should not grow more and some do not want to grow more. But I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the government is wrong in assuming that the communities, the municipalities of the province, are not looking for additional planned growth.

Many of the people at the local municipal level have simply lost heart that they will ever get support from the provincial government on approval for their locally submitted plans of subdivision. They feel, most of them, that the approvals are so detailed and with services so expensive and so complex, that any further growth must be in the major urban centres.

Mr. Speaker, I have not yet completed my remarks, but with your permission, sir, I would like to continue them at a later date, convenient to you, sir, and the House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will resume the debate and we will hear the balance of the hon. member's remarks.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1 o'clock, p.m.

ERRATUM

No.	Page	Col.	Line	Should read:
2	18	2	42	had set \$16.7 billion and this year \$23.8

CONTENTS

Friday, March 14, 1975

Pafco Insurance Co., statement by Mr. Handleman	55
Pollution abatement, statement by Mr. W. Newman	55
Housing programmes, statement by Mr. Irvine	55
Federal-provincial responsibilities for communications, statement by Mr. Rhodes	57
Task force on legal aid, statement by Mr. Clement	58
Awards for advertising work, questions of Mr. Winkler: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer	59
Standard Tube Co., questions of Mr. Clement and Mr. MacBeth: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Deans, Mr. Lewis	60
Pickarel fishing season on Lake Nipissing, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Reid	61
Ontario Hydro spending, questions of Mr. Grossman and Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Deans	62
Housing programmes, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Lewis	64
Gravel licence application, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lewis	65
Investigations into dredging industry, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Singer, Mr. R. F. Nixon	65
Inquiry into dump truck operations, question of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Young	65
Members' dining room, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Reid, Mr. Deans	66
Mercury pollution, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Bounsall	67
Warranties on housing, question of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Turner	67
Wool levy, question of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Riddell	68
Mercury pollution, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Burr, Mr. Lewis	68
Warranties on housing, question of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Kennedy	69
Mining accident inquest, question of Mr. Bernier, Mr. B. Newman	69
Federal-provincial responsibilities for communications, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. P. Taylor	70
Dismissal of ORC steward, question of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Lawlor	70
Reports, task force and advisory committee on legal aid, Mr. Clement	71
Motion to appoint standing committees, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	71
Motion to appoint select committee re standing committees, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	79
Pollution Abatement Incentive Amendment Act, Mr. W. Newman, first reading	79
Medical Data Bank Act, Mr. B. Newman, first reading	79
Good Samaritan Act, 1975, Mr. Haggerty, first reading	79
Debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. R. F. Nixon	79
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. R. F. Nixon, agreed to	92
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	92



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, March 17, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MARCH 17, 1975

The House met at 2 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to announce to the members of the House that in the east gallery today there are 65 students from the Queensmount Senior Public School in Kitchener, under the direction of their principal, Mr. Jack Bean. They are visiting the Legislature along with a number of other classes from that school over the next several weeks, and I'm sure the members would wish to welcome them.

Hon. R. Welch (Minister of Culture and Recreation): Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to introduce to my colleagues of the Legislature, a delegation of very fine ladies from the city of St. Catharines, members of the Progressive Conservative Women's Association of that municipality.

Mr. J. Yaremko (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, seated in the west gallery are some 31 students from St. Lucy's Separate School in the company of their teacher, Mrs. Bradwell from the great riding of Bellwoods.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S YEAR GRANT

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech stated that the government intends "as a deliberate policy" to encourage "greater opportunities for women," and I'd like to advise the House today that the government is providing the Ontario Arts Council with an additional \$150,000 for new cultural projects directly related to International Women's Year. This additional money, together with \$50,000 which the council has already allocated from its own funds, is intended to encourage wide recognition and support of the role of women in the cultural life of the province.

Since it announced its initial appropriation of \$50,000 in February, the Arts Council has received more than 200 inquiries from interested artists, sculptors, writers, performers, film-makers, dancers, playwrights, choreog-

raphers and others suggesting projects directly related to International Women's Year. At that time the council proposed grants up to \$1,000 to artists; \$3,000 to performing groups; and \$2,000 for the administrative costs of any group co-ordinating cultural programmes for International Women's Year.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the council through its chairman to suggest ways that this additional money can enrich this programme and assist other innovative ways of recognizing the role of women in the arts. I have suggested that he consult groups, including the Ontario Council on the Status of Women, the organizers of the Festival of Women in the Arts this summer, and the Ontario Councils on Multiculturalism and on Franco-Ontarian Affairs among others, to invite their suggestions and to ask them to encourage artists and performers familiar to them to consider original undertakings related to International Women's Year.

This programme by the Arts Council is part of the extensive involvement of my ministry and its agencies to recognize the role of women in the cultural and recreational life of Ontario. Many members will be familiar with the "Women in Science Day" at the Ontario Science Centre earlier this month. Both the Art Gallery of Ontario and the Royal Ontario Museum are preparing special presentations on the contribution of women to arts and science.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): When is the election?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Later this year the historical and museums branch will be erecting plaques to honour a number of women.

Mr. Lawlor: A little tidbit for everybody now.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I would like particularly to mention the late Charlotte Whitton whose contribution to public life in Ontario is recognized and applauded by all of us.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): That will certainly help.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): That will be really good for women's lib.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Who wrote this stuff?

Hon. Mr. Welch: By my own hand.

Mr. Lewis: The minister has to be kidding.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention our concern about women in sports and recreation in Ontario and the efforts we are making to assist them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: It is true that the accomplishments of some of our women athletes have brought world acclaim to Ontario—athletes of the stature of Barbara Ann Scott, Glenda Reiser, Beverley Boys and Abbie Hoffman, to name four—but we are aware that there is still great undeveloped potential in athletics among women and an imbalance in the participation of women in recreation activities.

As a preliminary step, we have assigned a consultant to work with the sports governing—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Did the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. White) mastermind this? Is this today's meeting?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —bodies which have activities specifically for women to increase participation and upgrade the level of training facilities. In this regard, we have made a special grant to the Ontario Ski Council to be used to upgrade women skiers particularly in northern and northwestern Ontario where Laurie and Kathy Kreiner, two members of Canada's World Cup team, received their early training.

Mr. Speaker, these are particularly appropriate, I'm sure that the members of the House would agree. I do hope members pay attention because we have some very—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What does the minister mean? We are hanging on every word.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —we have some very fine women here from other parts of the province and I have been trying to impress upon them the courtesy that is usually extended in the House from the other side.

Mr. Martel: When did that happen?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Particularly by the member for St. Catharines.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, these are particularly appropriate areas of recognition by the government and our ministry because women have long enjoyed a high level of equality and recognition in the visual and performing arts, literature and in other cultural activities and in sports where talent and energy and creativity are the principal measures of stature and worth.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): That's what is wrong. The minister has the right portfolio.

PUBLIC HOUSING FUNDS

Hon. D. R. Irvine (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House that I have received a verbal commitment from Hon. Barney Danson, Minister of Urban Affairs—

An hon. member: Better get it in writing.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —that will increase Ontario's allocation of public housing funds by \$30 million for the year 1975-1976. While we are very pleased with this additional allocation, I must point out that it still falls far short of the funds we require this year in the vital area of social assistance housing.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We are getting used to that too little, too late speech.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Originally we requested an allocation of \$130 million for provincial projects, plus \$20 million for Metropolitan Toronto senior citizen housing. This would, we projected, allow us to build 2,000 family rental units and in co-operation with Metropolitan Toronto 8,000 senior citizens' units.

When the allocations were first announced late last month, we found we were allocated a total of only \$50.4 million for social assistance housing. This would have allowed us, Mr. Speaker, to build only 2,000 senior citizens' units, including those in Metropolitan Toronto, and approximately 500 family units. With the additional \$30 million, we will be able to build another 1,500 to 2,000 units depending on how the funds are divided between senior citizens and family units.

While this is a great improvement, Mr. Speaker, it still gives us only half the number of units which we require and deem necessary for this coming fiscal year. We have, however, an additional commitment from Mr. Danson to review the budget allocations before the end of May. We hope to convince him to release more funds for public

housing at that time, which will allow us to build more units which we deem are necessary for Ontario. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

SECONDARY SCHOOL DROPOUT RATE

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask the policy secretary for human resources—is that the member for Scarborough East's title?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Social development.

Mr. R. F. Nixon:—social development—in the absence of the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells), if she is aware that the ministry or the policy secretariat associated with education has any kind of a review of the dropout rate of students in the secondary schools across the province that would indicate that the record of Toronto, with a dropout rate this year of close to 25 per cent, is a pattern that is being experienced by the school boards right across Ontario?

Hon. M. Birch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): **Mr. Speaker,** I am not aware of the pattern developing across Ontario, but I am aware that there has been some misinterpretation of what "dropout" constitutes. I understand that the event of a grade 12 student dropping out and going to community college is sometimes interpreted as a dropout. The Minister of Education will give the member further details when he is here.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Since I think many people in the province were deeply shocked at the statistics that came from the Toronto boards, would the minister undertake to give a review of the statistical situation having to do with dropouts from our school system, since in fact it clearly indicates that the students themselves are dissatisfied with the quality of education that we are providing?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: **Mr. Speaker,** I am sure the Minister of Education will have a report to give to the House.

Mr. Lewis: Has the provincial secretary discussed that at the policy secretariat level—the situation in the high schools which this dropout report simply confirms but which surely was becoming evident throughout the province?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: This current situation has not been discussed yet. It will be discussed this week at the policy field meeting.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition?

NIAGARA ESCARPMENT RESORT DEVELOPMENT

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A question of the Minister of Housing: Has he given his approval to the application on behalf of a private developer for the establishment of a 7,500-population community on the Niagara Escarpment? Is this decision basically his, or does it lie with the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), or is the government simply accepting a recommendation of the commission associated with the control of development on the escarpment?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: **Mr. Speaker,** this matter, I believe, was brought to the attention of the members of the House by the Leader of the Opposition on Friday morning. I am delighted he has asked me the question so that we can endeavour to bring out the true facts of the approval.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, I believe, ignores the fact that since February, 1973, the Beaver Valley official plan designated approximately 1,250 acres—actually it is 1,248 acres—for a resort development at this particular site. What we have had before us in the last few months and brought before me for approval is a development occurring over an approximate acreage of 288 total acres. I have approved this development, subject to equal amounts or larger being taken out of the development area and have done so by way of letter to the planning board and to the members affected.

I want to bring out to the members of this House that the Niagara Escarpment commission gave us its approval in writing of this particular development. At no time do we go against the wishes of the Niagara development commission or the aims of the Niagara Escarpment. So, I believe, **Mr. Speaker,** now that the Leader of the Opposition has all the facts, he might agree that the approval was appropriate.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary, having to do with the appropriateness of the approval: Did the minister undertake to consult with those people who are very strongly opposed to the concept—people such as the Federation of Ontario Naturalists, the largest single group of ecologically minded people in the province, whose president said, and I quote: "A town of 7,500 is as compatible with that superb natural environment as a stockyard is with the centre of a residential area"? Did he consult with them or, in fact, was the de-

cision made for him and dictated to him by others?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, let's review how development is agreed upon and how the official plans, amendments and zoning by-laws are approved. They are approved after there has been prior consultation with those in the area. When the telegrams came to me, and there were two, suggesting that they were not in agreement with this development, it was at the very last minute, if not past the last minute. They had ample time before to bring their objections before those people who are responsible for the agreement to this development proceeding at this particular time. Although I did not in the last week contact those who have indicated their disapproval, I have talked to some members of the Niagara Escarpment commission and have assured myself that the majority are still in favour. There may be a minority, which I think it is fair to say happens in all cases. We cannot totally agree on any development.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary, just following that point: Is it not true that there were a significant number of the Niagara Escarpment commission who oppose this development in toto and that there were a number of others who approved it only reluctantly because of the commitment which was made prior to the formation of the commission, but that, in fact, if the minister was to ask them to review it now, again in the light of the commission's mandate, the project would be turned down?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I think that's a supposition that the leader of the NDP—

Mr. Lewis: Why doesn't the minister try it? Why doesn't he try it?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —is bringing forth today.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: According to the chairman himself. The chairman himself says that.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Let me tell the members this right now, there is no way that I am going to go back to the Niagara Escarpment commission or any other commission on every individual project that comes before us.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on. This is a major project.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: If they send us a resolution, Mr. Speaker, and it's in writing, I think that's good enough, even though the member apparently doesn't believe what the commission does.

Mr. Lewis: No, no, no. I am saying the commission did it reluctantly and that the minister should take them off the hook.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): A supplementary of the minister: By whom was the environmental study as to the impact on the environment done, or was there any study done regarding the impact on the environment of this municipality on the Niagara Escarpment?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, all developments have to go through the Ministry of the Environment and other associated ministries that are affected by a land use development. As to the name, I cannot give it today. What I would say is this, that the development was taken into consideration on the basis that there are three phases and after the first phase has been completed, if it is decided after that the proposal should not be carried out, as has been indicated, to a total of 200 and some acres, well then we can review it at that time. But the information that I have is that it met with the approval of the Ministry of the Environment.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary if I may—one further supplementary: Leaving aside February, 1973, and what occurred then, does the minister himself believe as he looks at the project objectively that it fits the mandate for the Niagara Escarpment and the Niagara Escarpment commission as it was set out for us in this Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, if I had felt that the development met totally the aims of the Niagara Escarpment commission then I wouldn't have requested that a similar amount of acreage be reduced from the overall development in that area.

Mr. Lewis: So the minister himself has qualms about it?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: That is why I asked that the total amount of acreage be reduced.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister wasn't deeply troubled, like the chairman of the Niagara Escarpment commission? He was not deeply troubled by it? The chairman of the Niagara Escarpment commission is quoted as saying they were deeply troubled by the decision.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, there are many days in the Ministry of Housing that I am deeply troubled and that could have been one of them.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Maybe not enough to do any good.

Mr. Lewis: He is superficially troubled almost all the time.

DORE WRECKING CO.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Government Services: Does he feel that his new-found dedication to the concept of awarding tenders to the lowest bidder is appropriate in the award of the tender to the Dore Wrecking Co. of the United States for the wrecking of the Hamilton Psychiatric Hospital? In view of the fact that this American company is now forbidden from operating in the state of Colorado because of the death of two workers, that the company has been fined \$10,800 in California for finishing a demolition project eight months after the deadline and that it is a company on whose behalf the Zurich Insurance Co. in the United States had paid out one-third of all the claims of the American demolition contractors, does he still think it is worthwhile accepting their contract or their tender under those circumstances?

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): How did they get on the approved list?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I don't know what the hon. Leader of the Opposition is referring to when he refers to some new-found policy of awarding tenders to the lowest bidder.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I've always thought that the minister wanted to do that when it was possible.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Every year, Mr. Speaker, my ministry calls tenders on several hundred projects of one size or another.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: And the government awards the contracts to whomever they want.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order please.

Hon. Mr. Snow: These tenders are now listed, Mr. Speaker, and have been for the last two years anyway, maybe three, in the annual report of the ministry, listing as well all the bids that were received. In the odd

instance in which a contract was not awarded to the low bidder, there is an explanation in the annual statement of the ministry as to why the contract was not awarded to the low bidder. I don't know whether there were any in the statement I tabled a couple of months ago or not; there were, I know, one or two during the year before.

In the particular case the hon. member for Brant mentions, tenders were called on two wrecking contracts, one in London and one in Hamilton. The Dore Wrecking Co., which I might mention is a company licensed to carry on business in the Province of Ontario by my colleague, the Minister for Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman), was the low bidder. They were some \$58,000 lower than the third bidder. The second bid, which was somewhere in between, was disqualified because the company had not enclosed a certified cheque with its bid, so the bid was informal.

The firm was thoroughly checked out by my ministry, with the Workmen's Compensation Board and other people, and found to be in good standing. They have carried out demolition contracts in the Province of Ontario at other locations.

Mr. Lewis: Maybe they'd be better here than there.

Hon. Mr. Snow: We were assured by the firm, and we have it in writing from them, that local labour, local subcontractors, local equipment suppliers will be used, and that only their supervisor will be an employee of the American company as such. Taking all this into consideration, Mr. Speaker, I felt it was totally appropriate to award the contract to the low bidder and save the taxpayers of Ontario \$58,000.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: The minister then was aware of the record of this company in the United States when he awarded the contract, is that so? The record of debts, the fact they are disqualified in one state and the fact that one-third of the insurance payouts from Zurich, which insures the American demolition contractors in general, goes for payments demanded from this particular company?

Mr. Deacon: And they may have trouble getting their insurance too.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of the matter to which the hon. member refers involving the Zurich Insurance Co. The fact a company has had an unfortunate accident on a job and had an injury, I don't

think should disqualify the company from bidding; although none of us, I'm sure, want this to happen. I was assured by my staff this company would, and we have it in writing from them, adhere to all the rules and regulations of the Workmen's Compensation Board and the Construction Safety Association of Ontario on this demolition job.

Mr. Breithaupt: Supplementary.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I might also point out that on the London contract, Mr. Speaker, although the hon. member didn't mention it, that the firm that was the low bidder on that particular job—I don't recall the name at the moment but it was a London firm—there were some question asked regarding that contract as to whether the firm that was low bidder was actually a demolition contractor and was capable of doing the job. I was assured by my staff that it was and as a matter of fact we awarded the contract; the firm moved in on the job and it is, I understand, nearly completed now very much ahead of schedule.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, if I may: By checking with the Workmen's Compensation Board one assumes that this company has done previous jobs of the same kind in Ontario. Otherwise the check would be meaningless; there would be no safety or accident record to monitor. Is that therefore the case?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I understand the firm has carried out demolition contracts in Ontario, in both Sault Ste. Marie and Thunder Bay, to mention two locations where I believe it has done work.

It was suggested, shall I say, by the wrecking contractors' association that this firm was not in good standing with the Workmen's Compensation Board. I had this thoroughly checked out and found that this was not the case: the firm has carried out work in Ontario and as far as Workmen's Compensation Board is concerned it is in good standing. Of course, like any other contract, before we would pay the final payment on any contract we get a certificate from the Workmen's Compensation Board, stating that the contractor is in good standing and that all fees and assessments have been paid.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. Breithaupt: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to inquire if, when the circumstances are that the ministry does not have what we might call a track record of the firms which may be bidding for these jobs, there are additional requirements made with respect to

insurance and bonding to protect the province satisfactorily where a new party is successful in obtaining contracts?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are. Of course, we have no regulations which say that a contractor which has not worked for the ministry before cannot bid on a job. In that way, we would be limiting competition and no new people would be able to enter the business.

In this particular contract there is no bond required as there is a substantial certified cheque. This is a ministry procedure with demolition contracts because they are usually of short duration and rather than ask for a normal five or 10 per cent bid bond or certified cheque with the tender, we ask for a much larger deposit and we hold that deposit until the contract is completed. In this case I believe the low bid was something in the neighbourhood of \$158,000 or \$160,000 and the certified cheque we have on deposit from the contractor is for \$150,000, so I feel that adequately protects us.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? The Leader of the Opposition? The member for Scarborough West?

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S YEAR GRANT TO ONTARIO ARTS COUNCIL

Mr. Lewis: Yes, could I ask a question first of the Minister of Culture and Recreation? Could the minister explain the irony to me of having the Ontario Arts Council consult with the Festival of Women in the Arts about how the money he has announced should be apportioned when the Festival of Women in the Arts—this is the group at 21 McGill St. here in Toronto—has been trying to get the minister to give it a grant this year for some considerable time without any response from the ministry or from those who might give grants from other ministries in an effort to have the \$25,000 it seeks from the federal government matched provincially? Is the minister saying that that now will be done?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, if I may refer to the statement—and certainly the statement was made in consultation with the group to which the member makes reference—we are adding \$150,000 to the \$50,000 which the Arts Council already has. We asked the Arts Council to make some determinations with respect to the method of its disbursement and, in doing so, to consult with the group to which the member made reference.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, is the minister going to make a grant to the Festival

of Women in the Arts and is he ever going to tell it about it?

Hon. Mr. Welch: It is not a separate grant; it is the grant to the Arts Council of Ontario and that council in turn will consult with the group to which the member makes reference as far as the disbursement is concerned. The money I am talking about is, in fact, part of that particular programme.

Mr. Lewis: The original \$50,000, is that incorporated in that discussion as well?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes. It is a total of \$200,000; the \$50,000 which the Arts Council already has plus this \$150,000 I announced today.

Mr. Lewis: Is the minister prepared to indicate whether he is going to give a grant in excess of \$1,000 or \$2,000 or \$3,000? A more inconsequential grant to a large group cannot be imagined in International Women's Year. Is the minister prepared to give some support to the request from the group with whom he is consulting?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had made that point quite clear. We have an arm's length arrangement with the Arts Council to make sure that good judgement is exercised, as far as I'm concerned. How could they begin to address themselves—

Mr. Lewis: It's at arm's length all right. Nobody is getting anything.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —to what I've asked them to do until they've had some assurance of the funds which they now have to date? They now have \$200,000 as of today.

Mr. Lewis: They have been asking for months. They had \$50,000.

Mr. Singer: They will have four times the inaction now.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for St. George have a supplementary?

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Is the minister aware that in this particular programme planning is for the recognition of the whole festival in May? Why does he put so much more trust in women to be able to handle the situation and planning without funding than he does in men?

Hon. Mr. Welch: That's a value-laden question. I don't know that my statement would lead anyone to that particular conclusion at all.

Mr. Lewis: That is true. The minister trusts neither sex, in our experience.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions? The member for Scarborough West.

EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN IN GOVERNMENT MINISTRIES

Mr. Lewis: It's kind of an interesting day. I have a question of the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet—there he is.

Mr. Breithaupt: In the wings.

Mr. Lewis: As he saunters towards his seat, since we're paying such homage to International Women's Year today, can he enumerate the ministries to which apparently, 16 women have been appointed to pursue affirmative action programmes?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge at the moment, I think we've done this in all of the operating ministries.

Mr. Lewis: In all of the operating ministries. That's fine. That's interesting.

May I ask the Minister of the Environment about the senior woman consultant whom he brought on to pursue an affirmative action programme in his ministry? Exactly what has been done, what changes have been made and what alterations in employment patterns and income have been achieved?

Hon. W. Newman (Minister of the Environment): I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I don't know exactly what the hon. member is talking about. Is he talking about the woman who is working up in our office?

Mr. Lewis: Does she work in the ministry office? I don't know.

Mr. Breithaupt: Why did the member for Scarborough West ask him then?

Mr. Lewis: I was just told it's in every operating ministry. That's a good point. It was suggested to me why did I ask the Minister of the Environment. As his colleague indicated to me, apparently there has been a woman brought on to the Ministry of the Environment staff at the senior-most level to work out an affirmative action programme in his ministry. What has happened?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Who is she? What does she do?

Hon. W. Newman: We have a woman within our ministry who is working on that programme within the ministry.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, and what has happened?

Mr. Stokes: What does she do?

Hon. W. Newman: That's a good question.

Mr. Lewis: Why doesn't the minister pull the flip tops? That's a real good programme he has going.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, she's a very capable person.

Mr. Lewis: Is that the full explanation?

Mr. Breithaupt: That's an affirmative answer. Maybe I can ask the Minister of Labour—why does he have his head down?—since it's the appropriate ministry in every sense, what is the woman involved in the affirmative action programme in his ministry? What exactly has been achieved? What plans are under way?

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): The woman who works in his office.

Hon. J. P. MacBeth (Minister of Labour): Somebody suggested it was Mrs. MacBeth, Mr. Speaker. But Ethel McLellan is in charge of our senior women's service branch. She heads it all up, followed by Mrs. Marnie Clarke who heads up the Women's Bureau. Then there's a Crown employees group that the Chairman of Management Board is in charge of. What else does the member want? These women are active in trying to promote the cause of women, not only in the government but throughout the entire province.

Mr. Deans: In the Ministry of Labour?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: They're trying to bring about the equality that all of us feel should be theirs. If there is something specific that the member is asking about, it has gone over my head, Mr. Speaker. I'll listen for it to come down to earth.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): It has gone over the minister's head. It usually does when it concerns women.

Mr. Lewis: Mrs. Ethel McLellan and Marnie Clarke are quite separate from the subject at hand. There were apparently—although no one can find anything out about it—16 women appointed to 16 operating ministries in government designed to pursue affirmative action programmes. Who are they? Which ministries? What are they doing in this ministry?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, they are, as I understand it, Crown employees. They are working through the management group that the Chairman of Management Board (Mr. Winkler) heads up and are going to bring equality for women throughout the government services.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. Lewis: I just want to ask the Minister of Revenue, is he aware of such an appointment, and what has happened on the affirmative action front in his ministry?

Hon. A. K. Meen (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, we have been giving every opportunity to women to seek advancement in the ministry and there have been a number of such appointments.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): A very affirmative answer.

Mr. Lawlor: He only deals with money.

Mr. Lewis: Is there someone specifically appointed in his ministry?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Yes, there is, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: Who is that?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I can get the name for the member.

Mr. Lewis: He can get the name for us? Thank you very much.

Mr. Martel: It is International Women's Year.

Mr. Cassidy: Boy, consciousness-raising is needed over there.

Mr. Lewis: Maybe they should strike some more plaques.

Mr. Speaker: Further questions?

Mr. Lewis: I'm not going to pursue this absurdity, Mr. Speaker, but these appointments were as neat a piece of tokenism as has ever been made to divert public attention.

Interjection by an hon member.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, this statement is even worse. Even the member for Bellwoods (Mr. Yaremko) paled as he heard the minister read it.

DAYCARE FACILITY AT QUEEN'S PARK

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Provincial Secretary for Social Development what has hap-

pened to the daycare facility in Queen's Park, which was promised at least half a dozen times by everyone from the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Brunnelle) to Ethel McLellan, whose name has been mentioned here this afternoon?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully request the leader of the NDP to refer that question to the Chairman of Management Board.

Mr. Lewis: To the Chairman of Management Board? On day care?

Mr. Breithaupt: He needs some care.

Mr. Lewis: On night care perhaps, but that's absurd.

All right, to the Chairman of Management Board: What has happened to the process of daycare arrangements, much of which was talked of and documented before the Council on the Status of Women, which would be established at Queen's Park as a model to the province?

Mr. Singer: Has he taken it away from the provincial secretary?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, we have assessed the situation as it has developed down the line. We've inquired and we've endeavoured to find out what the use of the facility would be. I've searched for available space and I will be making an official statement about this in a few days.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, isn't it true that the project has been killed, that there is no intention to proceed with a daycare setting in the Queen's Park complex itself, and that that decision was made approximately 10 days ago?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is not really quite so.

Mr. Lewis: Not quite so?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: As I say, the answer will be clear in a statement very shortly, with the backup material.

Mr. Lewis: Oh yes. What does "not really quite so" mean this afternoon? That it was killed or it wasn't killed? What does "not really quite so" mean?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It was not killed, but I will make a statement in regard to the policy, because I'm responsible for it.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It was just mutilated.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. Lewis: No, I think that will do.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

TASK FORCE ON LEGAL AID

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General. In view of the fact that his ministry has had in its possession this report from Mr. Justice Osler for the better part of four months—

Hon. J. T. Clement (Attorney General): It might have gone by mail.

Mr. Singer: Yes, well it is dated Nov. 29, so one must presume that Mr. Justice Osler knew the date on which he was submitting it. It is fair to attribute that much intelligence to a judge of the Supreme Court. Could the minister tell us just when we are going to get some pronouncement from the ministry as to which of the recommendations are going to be adopted, the process by which it is being examined, why it has taken so long and why there was a denial a few weeks ago that the ministry was even aware of what was going on in this report?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the report itself was dated Nov. 29. As I understand it, it came into the ministry's hands a few days following that date—

Mr. Singer: Three and a half months ago.

Hon. Mr. Clement: It was sent out immediately for printing, and we received it back during the short session here in late January or early February. I think the hon. member inquired about it at that time—

Mr. Singer: Yes, and the minister said he hadn't seen it.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Oh no, we said it was at the printer's office, and I indicated to the hon. member that I was expecting receipt of it very quickly—

Mr. Singer: Yes, a second time when the question was asked.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Clement: We did receive it possibly some four weeks ago and then filed

it in the House last Friday, I believe. Now, we are taking a look at it very carefully, because there are some recommendations in there that are going to have tremendous impact on the public, the legal profession and the courts in this province.

As a result of those studies, we will make certain recommendations to government as to whether all or any or none of the recommendations will be implemented. I say this seriously, and I think the hon. member would agree, that the impact of that study is going to be rather lengthy, and there are items that we are going to have difficulty in assessing, i.e., costs.

We have to take a look at the financial impact if all of the recommendations of Mr. Justice Osler were carried out. But I am not going to stand here and suggest that we are going to be ready to come forward to the House with it in a week or 10 days' time, and I don't think the hon. member expects it within that time frame. Realistically, I think it probably will be later in the summer before we can make recommendations to the government for implementation.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, would the minister not agree—and without denigrating the importance of a careful study of this report—that it gets a little foolish when a report sits in the ministry for four months and then the study begins?

Hon. Mr. Clement: I cannot indicate that the study is beginning now that we have the printed form. I just don't—

Mr. Singer: It hasn't begun yet?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Oh, I'm just indicating the opposite. It may well have started some weeks ago following Nov. 29—I can give the hon. member the exact day they started studying it if it has that much importance to him—

Mr. Singer: I'd like some action on it.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Well, I'll tell the hon. member he is talking to a party of action when he looks across at us.

Mr. Singer: Four months—

Hon. Mr. Clement: Well, would the hon. member indicate that Nov. 29 to today is four months?

Mr. Singer: December, January, February, March.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Oh, that's four months?

Mr. Singer: Three and a half months—give me two weeks.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Then his mother must have carried him for 15 months.

Mr. Lewis: That makes a lot of assumptions too.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

ASBESTOS PROBLEM

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): A question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker.

In view of the evidence presented to the minister some weeks ago from the University of Toronto, linking the inhalation of asbestos to lung carcinoma, is he now prepared to accept the cases of ex-employees of Johns-Mansville who died of carcinoma of the lungs for compensation payments to their widows and specifically the one case which he was presented with at that time, namely Frank Sypher, which the minister said he would report back on?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for High Park sent me a note on Thursday, I believe, in connection with the Sypher case. I told him I didn't have the information. I followed it up this morning. It is still under review, and I hope to have a report for the House on Monday or Tuesday in regard to it.

Each case will be regarded separately in terms of evidence, of course, so if any one case is reviewed favourably it doesn't necessarily mean that all cases will be.

Mr. Lewis: That's what is wrong with those people over there.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: In any event, this case is still under active review and I hope to have some word by Monday or Tuesday of next week.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary: In view of the overwhelming evidence linking inhalation of asbestos with carcinoma of the lung, should there not be a general ruling brought down for ex-asbestos workers who develop carcinoma of the lung covering them in terms of compensation?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, that's a medical opinion upon which I am not prepared to pass judgement at this time, or make comment, but I hope that I will have some

statement eventually on it from the Workmen's Compensation Board.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: In view of the fact that the employees at Johns-Mansville have asked the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Health (Mr. Miller) to increase the safe level of the number of asbestos fibres in the air, does the minister have that under active consideration and will he accept their proposal to increase the safety margin?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, naturally we want to increase the safety margin as much as is reasonable and practicable, but the standards are set by the Minister of Health and that question would have to be directed to him.

Mr. Reid: Is the Minister of Labour not going to make any recommendations?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Any settlement which he sets, we will be glad to carry out.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Health has answers to some questions.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: We are spending a lot of time on supplementaries, I might point out, today in general and we're not getting back and forth to the other members who wish to ask the main questions. We'll allow one supplementary on this one.

Mr. Bounsall: A supplementary to the minister: Has he been asking for and collecting from the Workmen's Compensation Board data on the asbestos problem as it relates to those workers in the construction industry who have been installing it over the years?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Workmen's Compensation Board is trying to collect some information; I have asked for it. It is not that easy because people in that field do not necessarily stay in one job in one location and it is going to be difficult for the board to try to collect any worthwhile data, but I have asked it to give us what help it can.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Health.

URANIUM COMPOUNDS IN DENTURES

Hon. F. S. Miller (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, during question period on Feb. 4, the member for Sandwich-Riverside (Mr. Burr) asked if I would inquire whether uranium compounds are in use in dentures in Ontario. In February, 1974, there was a report in the journal of the British Dental Association that uranium oxide was being incorporated in porcelain used to make artificial teeth by some manufacturers. The element was to cause fluorescence—I suppose in the dark—and thus improve the aesthetic quality of the teeth. The amount of uranium oxide was considered by the British researchers to present a potential hazard to dental laboratory workers but not to dental patients.

The faculty of the University of Toronto has been consulted and has stated that as members of the international dental standards committee they're taking steps to bar the importation into Canada of artificial teeth containing uranium oxide. Manufacturers of artificial teeth in Canada and the USA use other ingredients to achieve the desired aesthetic results.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): A supplementary on this: When the minister mentions that the British researchers thought the hazard might be to the workers making the teeth, is he not confusing that with the National Radiation Protective Board which says the exposure hazard was to the wearers?

Hon. Mr. Miller: I am repeating the information I was given. I find it very difficult to believe that it could hurt the workers if it didn't hurt the wearers because I would think one is in contact with it a lot more as a wearer than as a worker. It just doesn't seem to strike a reasonable tone to me and yet that is the information we were given from those researchers. However, in either case, I don't think one should allow that risk to exist in Canada.

ASBESTOS PROBLEM

Hon. Mr. Miller: The member for Sandwich-Riverside, in the question period of Feb. 10, asked if x-rays and other precautions and concerns were being shown to the workers at the Holmes Insulation plant at Point Edwards. This company has been sold; it has discontinued the use of asbestos and moved to a new location.

Employees of the company began receiving chest x-rays in 1956 and re-examinations were

conducted at intervals of 18 months. In addition, an x-ray unit was available at intervals of 4½ months for the purpose of x-raying new employees and any others who, in the opinion of our staff, required repeat examinations.

Tests of lung function were begun on a routine basis in conjunction with the chest x-ray programme in 1971.

Former employees who are still employed by the present company will continue under surveillance.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sarnia.

MURRAY TRAVEL SERVICE LTD.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, through you to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. In connection with the bankruptcy of Murray Travel Service Ltd., can he tell me what investigations the ministry is undertaking, especially in the context of those people who have deposited funds for the purposes of their March vacations?

Hon. S. B. Handleman (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, it hasn't come to my personal attention but I can assure the member that we will be looking into it now that he has drawn it to my attention. I should point out, of course, that the Travel Industry Act has not yet been proclaimed and therefore there is no protection under that particular legislation. However, we will be looking into it now that it has been brought to my attention with every hope that perhaps those people who have made deposits can be protected in some way or another.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

HOME PROJECT IN HAMILTON

Mr. Deans: A question of the Minister of Housing. Did the Minister of Housing make representation to the federal minister of housing with regard to the evaluation placed on the land under the most recently completed HOME project in the Hamilton area? Did he receive any answer with regard to their eligibility to receive the \$500 grant?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I did bring to the hon. minister's attention the fact to which the member refers, that the upper limit is not high enough in regard to Hamilton, and possibly in other places too. We haven't received a definitive answer from the

minister, but hopefully we will, whereby the levels will be increased sufficiently in more areas than one, as I have concern, as he has, as to the relative amount of the upper limit at this time. We have not confirmed with the minister as to the \$500 grants. The legislation, as I understand it, is proceeding.

Mr. Deans: Supplementary question with regard to the land values: Will the minister review the method of assessing the values of the land with an eye to attempting to provide land at something less than the \$150 to \$160 per month rental levels that have been established in the Saltfleet development? Renting land at \$150 to \$160 per month is not much of a bargain.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Well Mr. Speaker, I think that's a judgement which only the member himself can make. I feel the purchasing of land in the past has been a very good investment by the Ontario government through the Ontario Housing Corp.

Mr. Deacon: At the expense of the home buyer.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: If we did not have the land, purchased at a relatively low price at the time, we wouldn't be able even now to offer that rent. The rents could be a lot more.

Mr. Deans: But it's \$160 a month for land alone.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: With the prices of today, those leases pertaining to the HOME lots are in my opinion very low compared to what they might be. Therefore I say that the particular rent to which the hon. member is referring is quite legitimate.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Waterloo North.

NURSING HOME BEDS

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Health: How does the minister justify his allotment, I think it's about 3.2 nursing home beds per 1,000 population, especially in an area such as the Waterloo region where there are waiting lists at every nursing home within the region?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, the provincial guideline, I think, is 3.5 beds per 1,000. That was an estimation of need, not a proven indicator, because of course until it became an insured benefit no one could be certain what the real needs would be.

We have been increasing the number of nursing home beds pretty fast. We have 25,000 right now. We have about 3,000 under construction right now. Apart from that, there are between 10,000 and 12,000 beds in homes for the aged in Ontario where people are receiving extended-care OHIP benefits. So in fact we have almost as many nursing home beds available for patients in Ontario today as there are active treatment beds.

Now in any given area we try to weight the number of beds against the age of the population, because after all the primary people using them are those over 65. This isn't always an indication because in some parts of rural Ontario people tend to stay at home, tend to stay active and therefore under-utilize them; so in the final analysis we try to tailor the licences to the waiting lists. It is not always an easy thing to do and I can assure members that the demand will continue to outstrip the supply, because people are leaving homes and coming into the institutions once the facilities are made available.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury East.

FOG IN SUDBURY AREA

Mr. Martel: A question of the Minister of the Environment: Is there, or does his staff consider there is, a vapour plume which escapes from the cooling towers near the iron ore recovery plant in Sudbury which in fact is leading to the fog which has once again come to the fore at Inco?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I asked specifically last week for a complete and comprehensive up-to-date report on that as of last week so I could have a good look at it.

Mr. Martel: Well could I ask a supplementary, Mr. Speaker? Was there a ministerial order considered, after three of the minister's investigator's went in, to curtail some of the work involving the cooling tower?

Hon. W. Newman: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, but we are looking at it. It's a very strange phenomenon, it's very hard to work out. I have asked for a complete, up-to-date report on it; and I have asked our people to go in and look at it again as of last week.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River.

STUDY OF METRO TORONTO

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Chairman of Management Board in regard to the Robarts inquiry: Apparently the Robarts inquiry is taking on 13 consultants;

Can the minister tell us what the budget is for the Robarts inquiry? Is it an open-ended thing or is it going to spend great sums of money like the committees on post-secondary education and the cost of education?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, there was an initial allocation—I don't have the figure in mind right at the moment—in regard to the responsibilities that have been assigned to him. But I believe we will give him the staff he requires to do the job that's been placed in his hands.

Mr. Reid: May I ask a short supplementary: Does the government have any control over these kind of inquiries, regardless of who is running them? And would the minister care to make comment on a Metro Toronto official's comment that the information is already there and these studies are largely redundant?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I don't accept that. I just simply say to the member that, yes, we do have some control, and we have a continuing reporting and monitoring system.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

SEAFARERS' INTERNATIONAL UNION

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, to the acting Solicitor General: Inasmuch as the federal government has now turned down all requests from this government to take action against any problems on the waterfront involving the SIU, what if anything is the Ontario government going to do specifically about the hiring hall, and about the "do not ship" list, and the violence in the SIU halls?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, the position of the Ontario government with reference to the SIU matters, if I may describe it in that way, still remains the same.

My predecessor communicated with the federal government, pointing out some of the problems, some of the crossing of provincial boundaries, the fact that it was an international type of situation, and that the federal Department of Labour would be the correct vehicle with which to undertake such an inquiry. And, for reasons which I am not privy to, those requests have been rejected.

I believe the Solicitor General's ministry in this province has already undertaken the prosecution of some five individuals for specific instances, I think, of types of assaults. We will continue to prosecute any crimes which are brought to our attention, assuming that the evidence warrants it, if confined

within the Province of Ontario; because we simply cannot extend beyond the provincial boundaries to charge anyone. And I'm not suggesting that the member has suggested that.

We can see that it's more than province-wide in scope, and therefore we feel we have absolutely no jurisdiction. The head office of the union, as I understand it, is in Montreal; and there are records which should, perhaps, be made available to law enforcement agencies. There is no way that we as a province can obtain them.

Mr. Shulman: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: We are well over our oral question period.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

SAFETY COMMITTEES ACT, 1975

Mr. Haggerty moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the Establishment of Safety Committees.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to allow labour to have some input in safety matters in industry throughout the Province of Ontario, and I hope that it will reduce the number of accidents in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

Before the order of the day I will recognize the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Mr. Speaker, as the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick, and this being March 17, and before any other attempt to encroach on my responsibilities in representing the Irish in this Legislature—

Mr. MacDonald: What are his credentials?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —I'm sure that they would all join with me in wishing for all of those of Irish ancestry in this province the very best of everything. On a more serious note, I am sure that they would also join me in a fervent prayer that long before the next

March 17 all those in Ireland will find a lasting peace.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege in relation to an article that appeared in Saturday's Toronto Star, entitled "The \$15-million Mouth," dealing with the information and public relations services of the government. Although it is a minor thing, I would like to just state that in the article I am quoted as saying that the government, in reply to my question on the order paper, deliberately misled the Legislature. I think that was possibly a misunderstanding of what I said, sir. In fact, I did not say that they deliberately misled the Legislature. I think the way the answer came out is just another example of their sloppiness and inefficiency.

If I may speak on a supplementary point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, we have discussed this as a question previously, but as a question of privilege, whether in placing a question on the order paper, a member is entitled, if the question is answered, to have the question answered in the way the question was put and if he is not entitled to complete an accurate information in regard to that question?

Mr. Speaker: It has always been my understanding that the minister, or whoever it is in the ministry, answers the question in his or her own way, and the content has nothing to do with Mr. Speaker, I am afraid.

Mr. Breithaupt: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I recall that at the time of the debate entered into with respect to the proposals on redistribution, it was my understanding that within 30 days of the end of that debate the report would be returned to the House, presumably to be acted upon eventually in the form of an Act to amend the Representation Act or a new Representation Act.

I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, since those 30 days expired while the House was not sitting, whether you can advise us if this report has been received by you, or if it is expected, so that members can know the likely result and when we would be able to see the final submission made by the committee appointed on redistribution.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, Mr. Speaker can answer that. He was provided with a copy of the report on either Thursday or Friday of last week and he forwarded it on to the appropriate ministry.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If I might rise on a point of order, wouldn't Mr. Speaker think

that if he has been provided with a copy of the report, it should then be forwarded to the members of the House?

Mr. Speaker: Well, I was instructed to send it to the minister who I think was going to pilot it through the House, and I understand that was—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Who was in a position to instruct you, sir?

Mr. Speaker: Well, I received the report from the commission in the person of the Clerk of the House.

Mr. Bullbrook: On the point of order, do you not receive that report as our Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: That is quite true, but it has to be put in a motion; somebody has to do it. I receive it and pass it on for action to be taken.

Mr. Bullbrook: I realize that. Did you never give consideration, sir, that it might be distributed to the various members of this Legislature, or at least the leaders of the party or the House leaders of the party?

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): In the fullness of time. There's lots of time.

Mr. Deans: May I make a comment on this? Perhaps it will help clear it up; doubtless it won't—

Mr. Bullbrook: No, but I—

Mr. Deans: It is the same point.

Mr. Bullbrook: I want to say this on a point of order, if I may: Nobody is for one moment not recognizing the government's right and responsibility to pass laws. The government might accept the report or not accept the report, and then we will debate the bill. I am interested in the report, and so is my leader.

Mr. Deans: I agree. May I ask whether in fact the report took the form of a bill?

Mr. Speaker: I can't answer that accurately. I glanced through it. There was a description of the—

Mr. Stokes: Did it look like a bill or a report?

Mr. Speaker: It looked like a bill. Everything looks like a bill. Anyway, the machinery is in motion—

Mr. Bullbrook: No, that is not good enough.

Mr. Speaker: I will check and see what else should be done. It was my understanding that it was going to be presented to the House in a formal fashion by the ministry from here on.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I am repeating the point, but you have not really responded to the point. The report was made to you as Speaker of the House, not as a servant of the government.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right.

Mr. MacDonald: Therefore, are you going to present that report to the House so that we can take a look at it, irrespective of what the government does? Then we will take a look at it, when the government does.

Mr. Speaker: I will check on the proper procedure and let you have a report tomorrow.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Might I further, on a point of order, suggest to you with respect, that there really isn't anyone in the position to instruct you in these matters. It must be a matter of your judgement as our representative, and we have every confidence that you will make the right judgement.

Mr. Speaker: I'll report further tomorrow. Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(continued)

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I spoke extensively on Friday last on matters of deep concern to my colleagues and myself in the Liberal Party; and I would say also of deep concern to the people in the Province of Ontario, without regard to their political affiliation. They have expressed a feeling that any expectations associated with the Speech from the Throne have not been fulfilled and that there has been no programme of leadership brought forward by the Lieutenant Governor in speaking on behalf of the government.

I see that the attendance in the House today is very much as it was on Friday. I recognize, sir, that in this House we all have a right to speak, but I suppose we do not have a responsibility to listen. I do, however, feel

somewhat affronted by the fact that when I did speak on Friday I was responded to by five cabinet ministers, or at least people in their employ. As nearly as I can tell, not one of the five cabinet ministers who responded was in fact in the Legislature. As a matter of fact the only one who was here was the Minister of the Environment (Mr. W. Newman) and he squirmed around so long that he finally had to leave for reasons unknown.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is an indication that the government is so top-heavy with their public relations writers and their so-called research experts that they simply let them do their work for them. They sit under the gallery, or they listen to the speaker somewhere and then they turn out some sort of a press release which is designed, I suppose, to rebut the criticism which is put forward in the Legislature in a democratic, and I hope a healthy way. It may be critical but at least it's responsible. The thing that concerns me is the irresponsibility of the government, which absents itself and then through these people, able though they well may be in their own right, responds to the comments, criticisms and alternative suggestions that come from the opposition.

It's so interesting that four of these press releases came out immediately. On reading them I found them completely fatuous, particularly the one from the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), who has scrambled out of here already. It's interesting to note that the government spends \$15 million a year on public relations experts and that the Minister of Agriculture and Food alone, the man with his feet firmly planted in the soil, would spend \$1.3 million in order to put his message across to the people of the province. It seems totally and thoroughly irresponsible that they would vacate their democratic responsibilities in such a thoroughly reprehensible way.

Hon. D. R. Irvine (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Does the minister spend more?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: On a point of privilege, I ought to say.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Privilege?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Privilege?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I would like the hon. Leader of the Opposition to know that the statement that was released by myself was entirely with my concurrence. I prepared it because I felt that the statements made by

the Leader of the Opposition were totally irresponsible—

Mr. Bullbrook: That is not a point of privilege.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —were totally non-factual, and certainly were not ones that I would expect to come from the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Let the minister state his point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: I didn't hear all that was said, but I believe the hon. minister was correcting a statement which he felt was wrong; which he has done.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): It was his own statement.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I don't think he really corrected it, Mr. Speaker. He said the statement had his concurrence and that's what I said. Somebody wrote it and said: "What do you think of this, boss? And he said: "I don't think it's harsh enough. I want you to tighten this up a little bit. Take a few shots at Nixon and we'll release it."

I don't even think they're getting their money's worth. When one reads those statements they are completely fatuous, off the point, irrelevant; and so defensive as to be almost amusing.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: They don't get their money's worth unless they earn it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: As a matter of fact I'm told by my extensive acquaintanceship in the press gallery—they are all here listening to me as members can see—that the representative from the Ministry of the Environment phoned and said: "Listen, we are going to send you a rebuttal so don't go away and keep your pencils sharp"; but it never arrived. So it seems to me that the Minister of the Environment, who once again has had to absent himself—

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): Well that should tell the member something.

An hon. member: He's writing his rebuttal.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —ought to look into his public relations staff because they are really not defending him as effectively, perhaps, as one would think the \$15 million spent in this regard would justify.

I really do not feel personally affronted that those people are not here; I know they

are busy. The Premier (Mr. Davis) had a date with Judy LaMarsh, and who can turn that down? I know how persuasive she can be, and he is a busy man. I would think all of those ministers are very busy. I don't know what they do. They must have a variety of responsibilities.

Mr. Turner: The member would never know.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But when we see the mess this province is in, we wonder just what they do other than contribute to the downfall of the Conservative Party, because that's what's happening.

Mr. Turner: That would be beyond the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: When I completed my remarks on Friday, or when the hour of adjournment came around, I had been listing, Mr. Speaker, for your edification sir, and I think you were as interested as anyone was, the failures of the government, particularly in the four years that the present Premier has held his high office and heavy responsibility. I listed for you, sir, the many areas of provincial responsibility and endeavour where our position, let's say as the cornerstone of the Canadian Confederation, has not been maintained. I think perhaps I would just pick up my comments by pointing out to you, sir, what has happened financially, fiscally, in the Province of Ontario since 1969-1970 and 1970-1971 when the present regime took responsibility.

The total expenditure in 1969-1970 was \$4.3 billion; the expenditure this year is \$8.8 billion, up 108 per cent. I cannot help but recall to your mind, sir, and perhaps as a candidate in the last election you took some enjoyment from this, that during the election campaign of 1971 the Premier of the day, through the then Treasurer Mr. MacNaughton, utilized the undoubted abilities of the experts in the treasury to so-called cost the election programme of the Liberal Party and of the NDP. They did this in a way I feel led the government to prostitute the responsibilities of those people.

For example, in bringing the cost forward they said if the NDP were elected it would mean an increase, I think it was of \$3.7 billion. The Liberals, and I suppose they thought they were treating us kindly, they said would mean \$3 billion extra.

Now there was no thought in their mind, when they saw the indications that we were concerned in taking over a larger share of the cost of education, that this would obvi-

ously mean a reduction of the costs to the local property owners and therefore no new cost whatsoever. When we talked about the premium costs for our medical insurance at the time, obviously the people do not get Medicare free, either when it is paid for under taxes or when it is paid for by the premium system. It was a thoroughly reprehensible order and directive that went from the Premier, or the Treasurer of the day, ordering such a review.

Now I want to say something more about that, because even in the fashion, irresponsible as it was, to conjure up this kind of fiscal bogeyman to frighten people into staying with the old tried and true Tories, the worst they could say about the Liberals was that the election of the Liberals would mean an increase in the cost of government of about \$3 billion.

I simply ask you, Mr. Speaker, to look at the figures? The budget that year, in 1969-1970 was \$4.2 billion; this year it is \$8.8 billion. Even from 1970-1971 the increase is \$3.68 billion, which would say that in fact they have far surpassed their worst frightened comments that were supposed to be directed at us.

I think you should also recall, Mr. Speaker, that in that last year of John Roberts' responsibility we had a surplus of \$150 million. Anybody who talks about a surplus now is considered to be a hopeless reactionary.

Even that great Conservative—and an unreconstructed Conservative—who is presently the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) is always chortling about the possibility of anybody suggesting that we don't spend any more than we earn. This year, under his direction and his predecessor's direction, we have a budgetary deficit of \$792 million and something called a net cash requirement of \$1.16 billion over our revenues. That is what has happened in the four years of the stewardship of the Premier and his succession of Treasurers as they go through that particular mill. The net debt—and this is the thing that concerns me—

Mr. Singer: There goes the Treasurer.

Mr. Bullbrook: We've just lost him.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Don't run away.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: In 1969-1970, it was \$1.4 billion and now it is \$3.7 billion. After the Treasurer gets through with it next month one can be sure we will be going behind by another billion and a half dollars.

I think probably one of the best ways to look at it, however, is our interest commitment, which in 1969-1970 was \$305 million—a substantial cost of credit no doubt—and now it is \$682 million, as I said on Friday, without taking into account our fantastic commitments and guarantees on behalf of Ontario Hydro.

I also want to reiterate the seriously misleading concepts which have been brought forward by the government, even in the Speech from the Throne, when it says it has reduced our public borrowing. In so doing, it has added to our debt \$680 million owing in premiums to the Canada Pension Plan; \$287 million owing to the teachers' superannuation fund, which it put into the consolidated revenue fund simply by an order in council; \$138 million of the municipal employees retirement fund; for a total cash requirement beyond our revenues of \$1,147,000,000. For the government to say it is reducing our debt is simply cooking the books in the worst William Aberhart-Wacky Bennett tradition.

It is thoroughly dishonest, thoroughly misleading and certainly will not be accepted by the electorate of the day. I was hoping the Premier would see fit to attend this afternoon, even briefly; he may be in yet, who knows? One thing I wanted to bring to his attention is that obviously the people are not accepting the statements from him and the government of the day on the excellence of their record of achievement. All one has to do is read the Jan. 22 issue of the Daily Times of Brampton serving Peel region. The heading is "Times Election Poll Shows Davis May Have a Fight on His Hands." It says:

When the undecided vote is not included the percentage of committed voters looks like this: Liberals 45.8 per cent; Conservative 30.6 per cent; NDP 22.6 per cent.

Mr. Singer: What riding is that in?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is in the riding which will be called Brampton.

Mr. Singer: Brampton? Really?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Brampton. It goes on to say, and I quote from the newspaper in the Premier's hometown:

If the poll is indeed an indication of how the election will go, it shows Premier Davis is in deep personal trouble with the voters.

I would say that while he may sit back with that urbane smile on his face and say

the polls don't mean anything, I would predict—I have been talking to the Liberals in the area and there are a lot of them, I'm telling the House. They are very democratically organized and if they nominate—

Hon. S. B. Handleman (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): All five of them.

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): All seven or eight.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —the person I think they will nominate, the Premier will have a chance to apply for a job as a transit consultant in Chicago or Montreal or some place like that. I am predicting that he is going to be personally defeated.

Mr. G. Nixon: The member is not elected yet.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The people out there don't like regional government. We have Hazel MacKellion running — not in that riding but standing for a nomination nearby.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The Liberals are welcome to her.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I'm telling members that in the region of Peel it's going to be a clean sweep for the Liberals. I am making that prediction.

Mr. G. Nixon: Hurrah.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to complete my remarks, that are directed toward the serious problem of—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Those members hang around in here in case the Premier comes in and says: "My, aren't those loyal people? They should get a job of some sort."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They are the only ones in the Tory party that are not getting any perks.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I just wanted to say something further about housing. The Minister of Housing is extremely sensitive. He will be coming out with some further rebuttals as soon as he talks to his hired public relations people who can assist him.

I feel very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that we are in this position where we desperately

need housing. It is in serious short supply in every community that I am aware of. We happen, in this province, to have the raw materials in abundance. Those people in the lumbering industry are suffering a somewhat serious decline in their business because nobody wants to buy this material. We have the building material here in great supply and it is one of our major exports. We have the tremendous need and God knows we have land. We do not want to use the class 1 and 2 agricultural lands, but we have land for development; and, Mr. Speaker, we have a serious level of unemployment even in the construction industry itself.

Why couldn't we bring all of these things together; that is, the material, the demand, the workers, the undoubted strength, economically and fiscally, of this province and the government of Canada to meet the needs which are so apparent?

Instead of that, we find that our housing starts are down 22 per cent to something of a rate of 85,000 a year. Before we even had a Ministry of Housing it was 110,000 a year.

This must concern the minister as much as it does me. In this province we need serviced land, we need affordable housing and we need jobs. Surely it is not beyond the capacity of this government to put these elements together and devise a practical, workable plan to build houses that are within the financial means of Ontario citizens.

We are tired, and the people of Ontario are tired, of the succession of schemes touted by this government with great fanfare—I must say the present minister is not as good at headlines as many of his predecessors but he tries—and within a few months these schemes prove themselves ineffectual. None of the programmes—not the HOME programme, not OHAP, not the integrated housing scheme—addresses the fundamental problem of municipal financial inequities. Local councils throughout the province are erecting barriers to moderate-cost housing because the servicing costs would further increase property taxes. Just last week the Newmarket Era editorialized, and I quote:

York regional council has a number of things to weigh before deciding whether to throw it's support behind Ontario's crash housing programme. First, it must establish the financial implications. If, as council has been told, deficits created by this type of housing will be long-term burdens on York's taxpayers, Mr. Irvine will have to improve his offer of a three-year offsetting grant.

There is no point in the Minister of Housing continually berating the local municipalities. They are victims of the horse-and-buggy tax system that forces assessment planning upon them and that this government has refused to change. Nor is there much point in his complaints that federal funding is insufficient, when his own budget has been underspent by \$103 million in the past two years.

The other thing that concerns me, of course, is that his main initiatives are only applicable in regional government areas. In my own area, when the mayor of a town phones up and says what about a housing programme, they say, well it doesn't apply to you because you're not regionalized.

It certainly concerns me. We will have a chance for the minister to extend his OHAP moneys, let's say to the community of Paris, Ont., where it has specifically been turned down after the mayor requested it. The minister could find out about that if he chooses to.

I want to refer, Mr. Speaker, to the serious situation that has arisen regarding the Ontario Housing Corp. We are deeply concerned with the unbusinesslike methods of this corporation, the acute slowdown in its public housing programme, the rent supplement programme, the poor performance in senior citizens' housing and its unspeakably inept land dealings, and I refer to the South Milton assembly, which was debated extensively earlier this year, where it was indicated that \$4 million of unearned profits were made by landholders holding land for about six months.

Mr. Singer: And more will be made.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We have seen, Mr. Speaker, that a number of employees in the top levels of Ontario Housing Corp. have been under indictment for accepting bribes. Some have been found guilty and some have pleaded guilty. We have attempted time and again to have the minutes of Ontario Housing Corp. made public documents so we can find out how they do business; and in each case we have been stopped.

I believe the function of Ontario Housing Corp. is seriously impaired by the lack of confidence it has across the Province of Ontario in the methods of business administration that it is using.

I feel that Ontario Housing Corp. has outlived its usefulness, particularly since we now have a Ministry of Housing which was established with the concept of bringing public policy to bear on the problems we face in this particular field. I believe that Ontario

Housing Corp. functions should be assumed by the Ministry of Housing to ensure full accountability to this Legislature. The housing function is too critical to the well-being of the people of this province to be left to the discretion of a board of directors that in fact acts as a buffer between the corporation and this House.

No, Mr. Speaker, I gather from certain discussions among the whips that we are not under tremendous pressure to proceed with this debate this afternoon. I am not sure just what the disposition is, but with your permission, sir, I have two other subjects I want to deal with briefly.

The one has to do with northern development, which was not referred to in the Speech from the Throne at all. I want to say to you, sir, that we in the Liberal Party believe the north has suffered economically for too long. They have an alienation that has been the result of the inadequate policies of this government. We have seen that certain elements in the north are even talking about secession; a concept which certainly I and my colleagues in this party do not support in any particular. But we do believe that specific steps must be taken in order to meet the needs of the north.

We believe, for example, that the board of the Northern Ontario Development Corp. must include all of the elected members of the north without regard to their political allegiance. We believe that old-fashioned political patronage has held up the development of the north for far too long and that this, in fact, would make a forum where that could at least be put out of the picture once and for all so that the northern elected members will have more to say about the utilization of funds for northern programmes.

We also believe in this party that there must be a programme accepted in this House that is going to make the cost of living equal between these two parts of the province. We believe that a government that can equalize the cost of beer can also equalize the costs of the other necessities of life in the north. We think we should implement a northern tax credit so that people earning their income in the north are going to have at least this medium whereby the cost of living can be equalized. We believe gasoline tax in the north should be reduced, since anyone who has travelled there knows the tremendous demands, not only in time and inconvenience, but in cost for that sort of transportation.

We have discussed previously the requirement for additional highways. I believe that the present Minister of Transportation and

Communications (Mr. Rhodes) has made a strong commitment as well, and we will certainly be looking for some evidence of that, particularly in this election year. We hope that they do something more than get their surveyors out, even in the Thunder Bay area. I am glad to see the member for the area is here today to nod and give his assurances that we are going to have something more than surveys.

I do, however, want to speak about one last topic, and very briefly, but perhaps it's the most important of all, Mr. Speaker. It is the concern that people are feeling with the release of the report on the Toronto Board of Education that the drop-out rate in this city is approaching 25 per cent this year. Unfortunately, the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) who is in his seat now, was not here in question period when it was explained by his policy minister that those figures were inflated because some of the people dropping out from grade 12 continue their education by going on into community college. I felt that was a very weak and insufficient response to a situation which must be extremely significant for the Minister of Education, as it is for everyone else.

We should know, surely, whether the dropout rate indicated by this statistical review in Toronto is the same in the other communities across the province. The minister shakes his head. His policy minister said this was not known, since no review had been done. But I do know that we must have a statement in this regard, because I cannot understand why, in the city of Toronto, there would be a dropout rate approaching 25 per cent, if it is not as high, as seriously high, in the other communities.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Can I just say this, Mr. Speaker? I would just tell my friend that we have had a provincial task force on school dropouts at work on this problem. They are surveying in depth 38 boards in the province. Their report will be ready towards the end of this year. They're doing a very detailed survey, including personal interviews of people who have dropped out. I think this report will be very helpful and meaningful, but until it's ready I can't give him any more details.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): When was the task force appointed?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Oh that task force has been in operation for about six or eight months now.

Mr. Singer: Nobody tells the policy minister?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Certainly she would know, but we have many things ongoing.

Mr. Ruston: The government is ongoing. It is going right out!

Hon. Mr. Wells: As my friends are aware, the problem of dropouts is not a new one. The phenomenon became apparent about a year ago. I think my friend has mentioned it in his speeches before. This task force is doing this job in a very thorough way, and doing it in depth with 38 boards in this province.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes; well what we want really, and I would think it would be on an emergency basis, is somebody to review the attendance statistics across the province next week and to tell us at the end of next week what the dropout rate is across the province. In other words, how many people were registered in September and how many people were registered at the end of February?

After all, the ministry has got one of the largest and most expensive computers working here. Why don't they push the button and find out about that?

I suspect that the present problem of dropouts is far different than it was a year ago when it concerned us. We've been talking about dropouts in this House since I was first elected back in 1962 and 1963, when the minister's predecessor, the present Premier, was concerned about it. We were talking then about giving alternative types of education, and much has been done in that regard. But right now, I would suggest to you Mr. Speaker, that this enormous, shockingly high rate of dropping out is caused by the loss of confidence in the students themselves that there is sufficient quality in their education to warrant their continuing that education. I am concerned with that very matter.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is the one thing that doesn't show.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: And there are those people in the community, and I hope the minister talks to some of them, who are equally—

Mr. Bullbrook: The Premier is responsible.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Has the Leader of the Opposition read the report?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What report?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The one thing it doesn't show is a shocking lack of confidence in the school system.

Mrs. Campbell: It should!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why are they dropping out?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Let the member read the report and he will see.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Minister of Education is going to express some personal concern about this, because in my view the loss of confidence in the quality of education is quite a new thing. I believe that it first came forward about a year ago, and that it has been escalating and snowballing around this province until even the minister is talking about the teachers getting back to the three Rs. You know it really is offensive that he would say that, since it is under the direction of his own ministry and his predecessors that they got away from it in the first place.

Some hon. members: Right.

Hon. Mr. Wells: What is offensive about that?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It was the inadequate leadership that came from his ministry that has resulted in the fact that the students in the secondary school system of this province are reduced, let's say in the study of French language, to about 34 per cent. I'm sure he has a report on that, but so far nothing has been done. We've read about the excellent report by Bob Gillam and the others. The minister takes a lot of credit for appointing those people, but he put that whole problem on ice for two years; now he's got the report and he's doing nothing about it.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that this 25 per cent dropout rate does not reflect the old perceptions of the problems of dropouts. It means that the young people are losing confidence in the school system, just as their parents are, and they are simply abandoning it. They are doing alternative things which many people think may be just as effective as continuing in a school system that doesn't give them a core of subjects. It does not provide them with a basis of education that is going to enable them to go into the work force or even come out into the community as anything resembling an educated person. They go on to university; they have to take remedial English; they have to take remedial arithmetic; they have to take remedial basic science. Even the minister him-

self has said that he would not require English as a requirement for people going to further education.

The students have lost confidence in the system. Look at the teachers. Look what has happened to the teachers in this province over the last two years. The present Premier came out of the Ministry of Education after almost a decade in that responsibility with a tremendous reservoir of respect and goodwill from the teachers, the trustees and the people concerned with education. Somehow he and the Minister of Education have lost that reservoir. There is no goodwill remaining. There is nothing but that loss of confidence on the part of the students and the parents, and the deep concern of the teachers that has led to the kind of confrontations that the minister seems to revel in.

The trustees themselves feel powerless to make decisions. They are frustrated. They cannot make decisions that must be their responsibility democratically. One minister in the government says the ceilings are going to be phased out. The Minister of Education reverses that and says no, sir, they are going to be made more potent, if anything. We really don't know what the minister is doing, but our observation is that he has also lost the confidence of the trustees. There are those who are prepared to say, "To hell with the ceilings, we are going forward to fulfil our responsibilities and provide quality of education." The minister doesn't know whether he is going to penalize them; he doesn't know whether he is going to punish them. All he says is that he will make a statement in due course.

The universities are very concerned with their level of financing as well. Some of them are talking about going into the public market and borrowing.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): He sounds like Chretien and what he is going to do with the federal civil servants.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would just like to know if the member has read that dropout report.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, Mr. Speaker, it surely is the least thing—

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): He hasn't read it.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): The minister has terrible problems in his system regardless of the dropout report.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Listen, what are we paying him for?

Mr. Ruston: Keep a little order here, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It certainly seems to me that the government of the day, rather than announcing without consultation and without notice that the funds for post-secondary education are going to be as seriously inadequate as they are, should have entered into five-year financing and planning in this regard. People then at the university level with responsibilities might kick about it and complain about it, but at least they would have ample time to make the kinds of decisions that are necessary.

The taxpayers are not satisfied. The Premier tries to make much of his ceiling policy, but you know as well as I, Mr. Speaker, that this has had nothing to do with controlling the cost of education. The Ministry of Education has gone forward by \$50 million in building its own empire without hiring any teachers.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Where is that \$50 million?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That \$50 million is being spent in the ministry's so-called regionalizing programme where it hires facilities in all these communities. It hires people at elevated salary levels and puts them in those offices as some sort of local panjamdrums in charge of education. They can't make any decisions. All they do is make nice speeches at the opening of schools and say, "On behalf of the minister, who is very concerned about this community, we are glad to give you this school," or some other clap-trap.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The Leader of the Opposition is always talking about decentralizing.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister is the one who is wasting money in education. It is not the school boards at the local level. He is the one who is going into this regionalizing type of procedure which he tries to pass off as putting decisions back into the community. If he wants the decisions in the community, give the decision-making powers to the local school boards.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Is the Leader of the Opposition saying we should close those regional offices?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would say to you that this 25 per cent dropout statistic, this shocking statistic, simply brings into focus the fact that the students have no confidence in the system, that teachers are thoroughly disillusioned and are in a position

of confrontation with the minister and any representative of the government; that trustees are frustrated and have no power; and that parents are heart sick about the situation. Even the minister must talk to a lot of his friends who are saying, "I wish I could afford to put them into private education." Look at any of the private schools and there is a waiting list there.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No.

Mr. Lewis: That is exactly right.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is not right.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): It is so. The minister's own officials are saying that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The universities have not been fairly treated. We do not object to any programme that is designed to control costs, certainly not after the last decade when there was absolutely no limit on any expenditure in education, none whatsoever, during the days when the present Premier was riding high as Minister of Education. Now, things are different. But, surely, if we're going to have a programme of reducing costs, it's got to be in such a way that those people in the universities and community colleges can plan for it in advance and not have to undertake the chaotic procedure they're subject to at the present time.

I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that education is the most important responsibility this House bears under the constitution of Canada. While we can be directly critical of many of the ineffective policies of the government, and we can be personally critical of the bad administrative practices of many government ministers, but the failure in education, in my view, is the most serious failure of the Premier himself. He was the master builder of the system. He built into it the expectations and the costs which now apparently cannot be supported.

Any efforts made by this government to restore confidence in the situation that I have described will certainly be supported by us. We feel that the government has seriously misled the people of the province. We feel that it cannot be corrected without a change in government, and that's what we're here to accomplish.

I'm glad to see that the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. White) is back in his place—

Mr. Singer: The one in charge of elections.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —because it is incomprehensible, as far as we're concerned, that the

government would choose to bring down a Speech from the Throne such as the one we heard last Tuesday. But it all comes into focus when the suggestion is made that perhaps the former Treasurer wrote the speech. It may be that he's the person who has been given the responsibility by the Premier as his chief minister in charge of re-election of the Conservative Party. Maybe he said: "Okay, John, you write the speech. You tell us how to do it because I'm very busy with other things." He's got to go on "This Country in the Morning" and things like that.

I sometimes think the former Treasurer must have come here on an unidentified flying object. I don't know where he came from, but I suspect it was Saturn. I feel that somehow or other he has been programmed to sort of make the noises that a sensitive human person makes but somehow his judgement has been flawed and his programme is somehow inept.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: The Leader of the Opposition is unreal.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If there is anything on the organizational side that is going to contribute to the downfall of the Tory party, it is the Minister without Portfolio who is being paid \$7,500, in addition to his ordinary indemnity by the taxpayers, to reassure the election of this party.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Less five per cent.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would say that the whole idea that the former Treasurer was in charge of that Speech from the Throne rings true, because there is something about that speech that sounds like him. All of the platitudes are there, and there's the sharp idea that we're going to make a dramatic announcement every day. I noticed in Norman Webster's column that today's dramatic announcement was going to be from the Minister of Culture and Recreation (Mr. Welch). We heard that.

Mr. Lewis: It certainly was.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We understand the Premier is up tomorrow. He hasn't been in the House for the last two days, so it will be interesting to hear what he has to say tomorrow.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Was the Leader of the Opposition here for the last two days?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Maybe he'll table the redistribution report. What do you bet that's

going to be the dramatic announcement for tomorrow? We'll see.

Mr. Turner: Tell us about it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I'll tell you this, Mr. Speaker: I believe the former Treasurer will agree with me when I say that speech was the worst Throne Speech ever read in this Legislature since 1944, when George Drew wrote a speech that was designed to be defeated. That's the kind of speech this is.

Mr. Renwick: There were worse ones before that.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: What about the Throne Speech in 1935?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: One would almost think that the minister is in charge of defeating the government rather than trying to save their bacon. They won't be defeated with their top-heavy majority; there's no doubt about that. There is no doubt they won't be defeated here, but they will be defeated in the province when we go to the polls this year. The sooner we go the better. Make it this spring. Make it this fall. Make it any time.

Mr. Breithaupt: Make it today.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The longer the Tories stay in office, the more their policies are burying the party. They are heading for defeat, and we are going to defeat them. We are confident, not so much that it's time for a change after 32 years of Tory rule—

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The leader of the Opposition is suffering from sunstroke.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —but it's time for a change after four years of the present premiership.

Mr. R. F. Nixon moves, seconded by Mr. Deacon, that the motion be amended by adding the following words:

That this House regrets the failure of the government to enunciate a programme to moderate the combined effects of unemployment and inflation on our people and the economy; the lack of a housing programme that will significantly reverse the downward trend in housing starts; the absence of a clear commitment and programme to stop the waste in government spending caused by duplication of services, overlapping of government jurisdictions and bad administrative judgement; the absence of action to improve general labour-management negotiation procedures, which

have been so detrimental to our economy and to the work force; the failure to enunciate a programme for the retention of agricultural land in production with compensation for landholders affected; and therefore that the government no longer has the confidence of this House or the people of Ontario.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Hasn't changed for a long time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Sounds even better when the Speaker reads it.

Some hon. members: Carried.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Send that off to Ottawa.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Would Ottawa approve that?

Mr. Lewis: You read that with conviction, Mr. Speaker, understandably.

An hon. member: Who is next?

Mr. Lewis: I follow the member for Hamilton Mountain. I wouldn't miss this for the world.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Would the leader of the NDP read it with the same conviction?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton Mountain.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I convey through you, Mr. Speaker, the very best wishes to Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor as she continues in her very fine manner her role as the representative of the Crown in the Province of Ontario.

To you sir, Mr. Speaker, may I say how pleased I am at your appointment. It is not only an honour to the people of Northumberland as recognition of your legislative abilities and contribution to this House, but it is also good to see that a fisherman of note now occupies the position of Speaker of this House.

I've listened with interest, Mr. Speaker, to most of the comments of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and I am particularly concerned about some of the allegations and inferences made in his closing remarks regarding the school system of this province.

Week by week of late I've been aware of comments made to me by students with whom I come in contact who are attending the post-secondary institutions across this province. It is interesting that they are say-

ing to me how lucky they are, how glad they are that they are residents of Ontario because of the wide scope of opportunity offered to them here in Ontario as opposed, say, to the financial stress and burden of similar students of their position in the United States and other jurisdictions.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Sounds as if he is in the dredging business.

Mr. J. R. Smith: One of the comments made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition that was of concern to me was the criticism of the regional offices.

I'd like to remind the hon. members of this House, sir, through you, that 89 per cent of the grants from this government go directly in the form of administrative grants to the local boards of education; and I think that's very important. Also, 3.7 per cent of the budget is for ministry administrative purposes. This also includes the cost of the schools for the deaf and the blind and the regional offices.

As I have gone to various parts of this province, particularly the more distant areas of northwestern Ontario, on behalf of the Minister of Education, I have become very conscious of the role being played by the regional offices in places like the Lakehead and Thunder Bay, or those down in eastern Ontario, at Kingston and so on. I think those in the educational field at the grassroots level of education would be the last ones who would want to see these offices closed. They are on a flat-line budget. They have had no increase, the same as the ministry's administrative cost this year. They are on a flat-line budget and they are doing a very admirable job.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. J. R. Smith: We go into places like Fort Frances and see people from the district office in there conducting workshops for the classroom teachers, and then a few weeks later I had occasion to be in the lobby of this very building and saw a group of children with a Portapak, recording the experience of visiting this building. I inquired as to where they came from and it was from a rural school at Sturgeon Creek near Fort Frances. That very same regional office at Thunder Bay carries on work in some of the more isolated settlements, such as Nakina. For just a portion of that 3.7 per cent we see breakthroughs in some of the more isolated communities.

On the subject of Nakina, I think a real bouquet should be given to the regional administrator, because in that town he was able to bring together the separate school and the public school and convince them of the merits of building a joint community school. This is, I think, a very interesting innovation. It has application, I know not to every situation but it is worthy of every support to see how it works out. The people in Nakina, through this joint venture, have many added features built into their school of which they are very proud.

Seven point three per cent of the ministry's budget is in transfer payments and various research facilities such as OISE, educational communications and television and so on. While I think it is very easy to stand up and to be very critical of education and say how bad the schools are, the more I go into the classrooms of Ontario the more I am impressed. Indeed, I sat recently with three headmasters from Hamilton; one was a principal of Hill Park, the other of Sherwood Secondary School and the other one was from one of the large secondary schools in the east end of the city. They had been visiting, as part of the Ontario Headmasters' Conference in Montreal, classrooms in the secondary system in Montreal and they said that while that system was very proud of its pupil-teacher ratio, from their personal observations and their humble opinion the schools in Hamilton, and the conditions and what was happening there, were so much superior. That's what I get when I go to other places.

As for those who are so critical of the schools, I always ask them, "When were you last in your local neighbourhood school?" Indeed, I hope the forthcoming Ontario Education Week in April will provide an opportunity for everyone to get into the local secondary school and see what really is happening. I think there is a lot we should be proud of in our educational system. It's pretty fine.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne, although very brief, stated at the end:

The government of Ontario holds every confidence that its legislative programme in this session, together with the budget, will contribute substantially to the improvement of the provincial economy, strengthen the security and well-being of our people, and give incentive to every citizen in Ontario to pursue active, productive lives upon which the continued prosperity of our province ultimately depends.

I think this was the keystone of that very brief statement. In this regard, the well-

being of our people, most of us as members have undoubtedly been very busy lately assisting constituents in filing their federal income tax returns, and one return of which I have made a mental note was of a widow lady who had a very small, modest home on Hamilton Mountain.

I think it has been a key thing with this government to keep people in their own homes as long as possible. Her municipal taxes were \$363 and by filing her Ontario property tax credit form, she received \$180 for the shelter credit; 10 per cent of her taxes, \$36; \$110 as an old age pensioner; and \$27.72 rebate on her retail sales tax, which amounted to \$353.72. Believe me, that's the kind of help I like seeing the people get who really need it the most. In fact, she had a differential on her tax bill of \$20.

Recently, one of the members of the Hamilton city council said the province should assume all the cost of education. Perhaps we shouldn't have any more total blanket programmes, handing out money to everybody. There should be more and greater continued emphasis on assisting those who really need the help, assisting people so that they can stay and live in their homes with dignity and pride.

The Minister of Housing certainly has one of the most difficult portfolios in his ministry. There are great demands and many influences on the housing programme and construction in the province which possibly could be beyond his control. In the region of Hamilton-Wentworth we have seen hundreds of lots come available through the Ontario HOME programme. Although there has been criticism of some aspects of this lottery scheme, nevertheless I stand behind the basic idea of a HOME lottery. We saw when it was given out to private individuals or contractors on proposal calls that some people tried to circumvent the programme by devious means. Many of them have been investigated by the police and prosecution is pending, and it didn't work out.

I am also very glad to note that the Minister of Housing has initiated a marketing research survey. I hope with the comments of the hon. members that the results of the survey will be used to revise and improve the HOME lottery programme. The one very unfair aspect of the current Saltfleet lottery is that a person with one child is eligible to qualify in the lottery for a four-bedroom home. Yet a couple with three children presently living in a two-bedroom home under crowded conditions, as many are in my riding, are now precluded from entering as

they presently own a dwelling. To me, this is wrong and something should be done to open it up again so that these people can have a chance to participate in forthcoming lotteries.

Major and very sizable grants have been made to the city of Hamilton, and were very well received by our good mayor and council, for the OHAP programme. Here again, not too many in my riding live in such dwellings, but there are many other areas in this city to the northend where there is great need to improve the housing stock of the people, their sanitary drains, their eaves-troughing, their roofs and all the basic things so they can stay in their homes and not be forced out by speculators or by the costs of home repairs. This is really great, because too long we tried urban renewal and the end result isn't all that impressive. Sure, we have a new Civic Square with a luxurious indoor shopping mall and all the other attributes. We have new secondary schools and new public schools on the north end of Hamilton, and we have some new row housing in the north end.

There is still far too much open land left from those urban renewal demolitions that hasn't been put back into providing single-family or row housing on some form of shelter for the people who lived in that area. We've been knocking down too many dwellings because we thought they were substandard or too small when, in fact, they should have been rehabilitated and upgraded. I think in other areas of the world, particularly in Wales, for example, much of the emphasis is being placed on the rehabilitation of existing dwellings, the conversion of them into multiple dwellings or putting in amenities and facilities to make them homes again.

We see here in Ontario, particularly in Hamilton, a real step forward being made to assisting the homeowners, those on low incomes, in providing them with the wherewithal to stay in their own homes. The old saying "Home, sweet home, there is no place like home", I think, is the key.

I would hope the minister would press Central Mortgage and Housing to conclude the agreement for the immediate redevelopment of Mohawk Gardens on Hamilton Mountain. This assemblage of wartime houses has been a centre of controversy for many years, ever since its relocation. The engineering firm of Moffat and Moffat, I believe, was appointed to work with the local community association which is a very worthy organization called the Sherwin community association. Agreement was reached by the tenants, by the executive of the asso-

ciation, by the community and everyone to go ahead with the programme but now it would appear that red tape is stalling it. I would hope that later this year we would see the development get under way so that these people who presently live in housing which truly isn't up to good enough standards might be provided with an opportunity for better housing and shelter.

I was surprised at the Leader of the Opposition berating this government over its senior citizen accommodation because indeed in our municipality that is one of the foremost visible projects—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): He didn't do that now.

Mr. J. R. Smith: —or endeavours of this government.

Mr. Haggerty: He didn't berate any senior citizens homes in Hamilton.

Mr. J. R. Smith: No, he said, Mr. Speaker, through you to the member from Fort Erie, that there was a need, that many areas did not have enough senior citizens housing. I can only speak for my own area and we certainly have not enough but we see that we have 2,000 and there are approximately 800 presently under construction.

Mr. Haggerty: More than his share.

Mr. J. R. Smith: One of the really good things is that the location of many of these new buildings seems to be a consideration. Ontario Housing Corp. has taken into consideration bus routes and proximity to neighbourhood stores, churches and other facilities. I am very pleased that a 245-unit building is under construction at Hamilton Mountain because one of the real beefs of our seniors has been that if they are fortunate enough to be offered senior citizen accommodation, often they have had to move down into the city away from their centre of life, their family and so on, into an area of the city in which they really do not want to live. The minister has been very sensitive to the requests of the people and I am glad to see this.

Related to this very same thing is that I would hope Ontario Housing could put in some small amenities. For example, one of the real problems in some of these homes is a simple thing like ironing boards. I think at present none of the units has an ironing board built into the wall. It sounds a very trivial thing to raise here but nevertheless to a person who has a handicap or is very elderly, it's a real problem and apparently it

is one of the major obstacles in many of these units.

Similarly, the need is there in some of the larger complexes. I have asked the Hamilton District Health Council to investigate the provision of some kind of clinical assistance or help in the form of nurse's visits or regular visits by a family practitioner interested in geriatrics and preventive medicine and so on to some of these centres on a regular basis. At present they are advised, if there is an emergency, to call the local hospital which, in turn, usually advises them to get either an ambulance or a taxicab and get to the emergency unit at the local hospital. I think there is a great deal more to be done in the form of preventive medical assistance and social assistance on the spot.

Similarly, I would agree in part with the Leader of the Opposition about the need for more nursing home beds. I know that from my own experience in Hamilton and particularly on Hamilton Mountain. Here again, representing the geographical area of Hamilton Mountain, representing almost approximately a third of the residential community, we find that we have only one nursing home. So here again, when seniors become forced to find this kind of accommodation, they are very, very limited in their scope.

If they're fortunate enough to get into the local home for the aged in its bedcare wing, they are indeed very fortunate. Or they can go to a private nursing home. But the bulk of them, almost 95 per cent to 98 per cent of these facilities, are in the lower part of the city. This causes a real problem for seniors because their friends can no longer get to visit them; they have to make bus transfers and so on; they're away from their family. To be very blunt about it, the air is much better on the mountain; it's important for their health that they be there just to breathe the air on higher ground.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Is the member suggesting the air is less pure elsewhere in Hamilton?

Mr. J. R. Smith: Exactly. The air in Hamilton has improved a great deal in the past seven or eight years under the various ministers of the environment; it's getting better all the time. But it's always been better on the mountain, and I suppose it always will be.

Now, on nursing homes, we definitely need more beds in Hamilton. The assessment placement agency is indeed a real breakthrough in the form of nursing care home care. I would like to say to you, sir, that I hope that other members will push in their elec-

toral districts or communities for an assessment placement office. This agency in Hamilton has a full index of all nursing home beds and facilities—everything in the region. They work in co-operation with the patient, the family physician and the various agencies and homes to provide fine places for these people. Such a thing does not exist even in this so-called progressive city of Toronto.

I think those who are critical of this government should be very cautious. There's the saying, "If you live in a glass house, don't throw stones." Our sister province of Quebec has had a very long-established Liberal government. I think one of the tragedies of that government has been its neglect of its senior citizens. As people in eastern Ontario will tell you, Mr. Speaker, Quebec has neglected its senior citizens' housing, and there is no nursing home insurance programme available for seniors in Quebec. It would be interesting to know how many Quebec senior citizens find themselves in Ontario nursing home care—I've heard it said that there are many who have members of their family in that position; they have them move into Ontario so that when they have the residency requirement here they can qualify for our benefits.

During the estimates of the Ministry of Education a great deal was said about the need for better French-language instruction for English-speaking students. In particular, the hon. member for Sudbury East, I know, had a great number of very valuable comments to make on this very important issue. I've made it a point to try and see firsthand some of the French immersion programmes, and I would agree with him that the concept is really good.

Counties such as Peel and the Ottawa board and so on have French immersion programmes, and I would like particularly also to mention the programme of the Protestant school board of greater Montreal where I think approximately 5,000 elementary students are presently participating in immersion programmes. There they have two opportunities to enter a programme on a voluntary basis. From K to either grade 3 or 4 it is total French immersion. After that, from grade 4 to 8 it's on a percentage basis where they go back into the English-language programme. When they reach grade 7 they have the option of attending for one year a total immersion grade 7 programme in an all-French-language environment.

One of the keys to the success of any form of French immersion programme is motivation. This motivation has to come

from a number of places. Leadership has to come from the local board. The motivation has to come from the parents and from the student, and, of course, I think it has to have basic application to the place where the child is living. In other words, does he or she have an opportunity to speak to people at the bus stop, give directions to someone in the French language on occasion? Do they have an opportunity to ask somebody, a neighbour or someone, a question in French and so on?

Unless there is a motivation and a genuine and practical use available to the student, and obvious to the student, I don't really see much point in it. That's why I am beginning to question some of the federal government's bilingual programmes and the millions and millions of dollars that are being spent to try and make everyone in this country bilingual.

I feel it is an impossibility, because everyone is not motivated to learn French; nor should people be forced to learn a second language if it is against their personal choice or wishes.

In the matter of education as well, only last Wednesday the Minister of Housing and the Minister of Education were attending a social function in my constituency. As a purely coincidental thing, several of the members of my association had as their guest a young lady from Attawapiskat, who was a graduate this summer of the ministry's teacher education course for native teachers at OTEC campus at McMaster University in Hamilton. She asked to say a few words and bring greetings from the people of Attawapiskat. Then, in quite an unsolicited manner, she made a very, very definite statement of appreciation to the Minister of Education for his concerns for native education and for what the ministry is doing in the form of training of native teachers and the curriculum.

This was really an encouraging thing to see a visitor from the far north bring such words because, indeed, sympathy with the native people is very, very strong here in southern Ontario, and so much more can be done and should be done to assist these people.

The matter of the environment, which the hon. member for Thunder Bay mentioned, is quite naturally a major issue in an industrial city such as I represent. We have seen vast improvements made in the air quality. I notice the Metro Toronto radio stations now always give the pollution index ratings on a daily basis for both Toronto and Hamilton; and it is sort of a pleasant interlude for a

change from the hockey scores—to sort of see who is ahead.

Now, those hon. members who had opportunity last year to visit Dofasco could not help but be impressed by the air cleaning devices and facilities that have been installed—very sophisticated equipment that has been designed, manufactured and installed by the Canadian Westinghouse Co. at the Hamilton Dofasco plant.

The Minister of the Environment announced last Wednesday that they are going to install in Hamilton Harbour—and heaven knows it is going to need it by the time the full inquiry of the Hamilton Harbour has been completed—an aeration device to try to get more oxygen back into Hamilton Harbour.

I would hope, if it is feasible, that similar units should be installed in Cootes Paradise; because that area will quickly die if there should be further effluent from the sewage plant in Dundas. Cootes Paradise is a very famous wildlife sanctuary. The ecological balance of wildlife, plant and marine life in Cootes Paradise as is greatly threatened. Perhaps the new aeration programme has great prospects and could bring a new life to that very, very beautiful and unique part of Hamilton-Wentworth.

I would also ask, through you, sir, the hon. Minister of the Environment to see that Hamilton gets a good refund on the major investment it has made on the SWARU, which is a waste disposal incineration programme. The city has pioneered this. Indeed, it has been a forerunner in all of North America in developing such a programme. And now that the province has embarked upon providing similar facilities for the more backward other regions surrounding southern Ontario on a very good cost-free basis, I think Hamilton deserves recognition in a monetary fashion for the vast amount of money it has expended for its SWARU programme.

Similarly, I would like to commend the minister for the programme for the Niagara Escarpment Commission. Already we see that they are taking a very active interest in the escarpment through our region. I am very anxious personally to see a goodly portion, or a major portion, that is, of the Allarco properties on Highway 403 and Mohawk Rd. acquired for a provincial park. In this age of energy conservation, it's almost pointless from a traffic point of view, with the congestion on the roads going north, for people in southern Ontario from the major cities there to have to battle their way north to get fresh air and a place to stretch their legs and enjoy the fresh air and sunshine. Here the Allarco

property in Hamilton has been designated as that and provides an ideal opportunity, along with Fifty Point Park, to provide for a mini-provincial park right here where the people are. Parks for the people. It's going to be an expensive business but I think it has a top priority and should be acquired.

During the opening ceremonies of the House, we saw a great deal of disturbance in the front of the building—and I must say that Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor conducted herself very well through all of that—by people who were upset and I could say agitated by policies and actions of the Workmen's Compensation Board. Although I do not condone their actual method, I cannot help but say that perhaps there is cause for further improvement in the procedures of the Workmen's Compensation Board.

The new chairman of that board has worked very hard, I know, to improve things, but from personal experience I still find that claims are taking too long to be processed by the various levels of the board. Work persons have to wait too long very often for their money. I don't like to be critical because on so many occasions the councillors there, the claims officers, have expedited and assisted in claims, but it's just the volume which is so heavy. Although they seem to have increased their administrative quota there, I think we can still get greater results and greater productivity in processing the claims. Something should be done so that this backlog doesn't build up.

One of the real problems is that the Workmen's Compensation Board has yet to decentralize and open up field offices. The new chairman has promised me faithfully that he is going to open an office in Hamilton sometime this year. That promise has developed into a statement that regional office is going to be opened in Hamilton. I would like to say, sir, through you to the Workmen's Compensation Board that they shouldn't delay any longer, because if they do open a regional office it's going to take longer to get the personnel and a whole programme lined up.

There's an immediate need for an office to serve the workers in the city of Hamilton. Why should people in Hamilton have to phone long distance and pay at their own expense for a call to the city of Toronto where the board's office is? It's perfectly ridiculous.

Everything is provided here for the people in Toronto. The telephone lines are open. They can walk here. They can get there on the streetcar. Everything is provided for people in this large city but we're forgetting

the workers out there, the workers in the other large cities and the small towns, villages and farms that surround these other large regional centres, such as Hamilton, Ottawa and so forth. There's a real need to have a place where people can go and get the red tape straightened out.

Just imagine, if you can, Mr. Speaker, the problems that arise when an immigrant worker who has a very limited education and a limited ability to read English, let alone speak it, is confronted with a letter asking for all kinds of information from his employer, from his physician, from his specialist and so on. What does he do and where does he go?

I find, as a local member, that an increasing amount of my constituency caseload is being taken up by workers who are having difficulty having their claims processed by the Workmen's Compensation Board. If they were to open up some of these facilities as soon as possible, not only in Hamilton but in other areas, perhaps something could be done. The people best off when it comes to using the services are indeed those who belong to some of the major unions, such as the United Steelworkers, Local 1005, who have great people who look after their members whenever they need the services of the board. They represent their workers and their members very well indeed, but there are countless others who are not members of Local 1005 in the broader community who need similar services.

Her Honour made mention of the need for greater protection and help to law enforcement agencies and the general public so that our cities and streets will remain among the safest and most secure in North America. Certainly one of the hallmarks, one of the finest things about living in Ontario, has been the safety of our streets and communities. Perhaps it is one of the reasons why people from our region no longer feel comfortable about the idea of having to go across the border to visit Buffalo.

In fact, Buffalo used to be one of the major attractions for people in southern Ontario for many things. Today people are very wary and very cautious, and nobody goes there from Canada or Ontario unless they have specific reasons to visit friends or relatives or some business appointment. They are afraid to go. They are afraid of being mugged, of having their car damaged or scratched or bumped. They are afraid to walk on the streets.

We don't want to see this kind of situation creep across the border and up into Ontario.

We see it in other communities, and it is a concern of our people that our streets are safe and that the people of this province are safe in their homes. All of us are concerned about the inroads revealed by the crime investigation in the Province of Quebec. We see the tentacles of organized crime spreading and we abhor it. We are also concerned about the petty crimes, such as purse snatching, break-ins and vandalism, that are at the other end of the criminal scale.

I hope the minister will take into his confidence those in the law protection services, those who walk the beats, who drive the cars and who answer the complaints and calls from affected citizens, as well as those in the various social agencies. Something has to be done to tighten up on the bail procedures, the remands, the backlogs in our courts, the people put out on probation and so on.

The Minister of Transportation and Communications made a statement recently about the break-ins and the serious vandalism in his offices in the east end of Hamilton by a group of juveniles, I believe, who were out on either probation or bail. It is certainly most discouraging for the law enforcement officers who apprehend these individuals.

I would like to see more money put into local police forces for prevention and the upgrading of their facilities and so on.

I would also like to see the various police commissions expanded, where the request comes from the regional municipalities. Indeed, I feel that our Hamilton-Wentworth Police Commission should be expanded. A very fine group of gentlemen, including the mayor of city, are currently the police commissioners, and we are proud of our police force. Nevertheless, now that it looks after the region of Hamilton-Wentworth, enlarging that board by perhaps two or three could do a great deal to give broader representation to the whole community.

I think a very positive and worthy request that has come from the community is one by the Hamilton-Wentworth Council of Women, who are currently canvassing the members of this assembly from all parties for their support for the appointment of a woman to the Hamilton-Wentworth Police Commission. I think this is most worthy and commendable and I would hope that before long this can become a reality. They bring a new dimension and a good contribution to the commission.

One of the really good announcements of the government, although not contained in the Speech from the Throne, was the an-

nouncement by the hon. member for Lincoln that Ontario is now going to have a sports and recreation lottery. People in my area have long been fed up; they have the distinct impression that far too much money from Ontario is being siphoned on a regular basis into the Province of Quebec to assist their various programmes, talking of the Quebec provincial lottery. Similarly, in the western part of the province, hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of dollars is being siphoned off into the neighbouring Provinces of Manitoba by participation in their provincial lottery.

Needless to say, according to the Prime Minister of this country, there is still a very considerable amount of money being transferred from Canada, of which Ontario is the largest component, to the Republic of Ireland for the Irish Sweepstakes lottery. The moneys that can come back to the community for cultural and recreational pursuits are tremendous. We can keep the money here for our own people. I know that various communities are already putting forward ideas and proposals for portions of the lottery fund, and this afternoon, sir, I would like to put a word in for a major allocation for the people of Hamilton-Wentworth.

Already a great number of meetings and consultations have been conducted by the board, with the president of Mohawk Community College, on the idea of constructing a major sports and recreation complex at the Fennell Ave. campus of Mohawk College. This is a tremendous campus facility and although located on the mountain, it has easy access to the major mountain roads; namely, the Queen St. hill and the Claremont access. So, in effect, its geographic location makes it almost the central hub of the whole region, and to the south it's easy travelling up Dundas and Ancaster, Mount Hope, Caledonia and so on. We would like to see the proposed complex include both swimming and diving facilities of Olympic specifications.

Although the total planned facilities and the respective specifications vary according to the several alternatives which the Mohawk College board has developed, the facility would benefit Mohawk College greatly by its student use of these facilities. Its recreation course students, working with the Hamilton recreation committee, could make tremendous use of it.

The basic facility which would appear to meet the minimum needs of both the community and the institutions, including the

psychiatric hospital, would currently involve construction costs of approximately \$3 million. I feel this large expenditure of funds could be justified, because there is a real need for this facility. It would do a great deal also to upgrade the already enviable record that Hamilton-Burlington swimmers have on an international scale and also to provide a facility for people who no longer can enjoy swimming facilities of Hamilton Harbour and have very limited access or practical use, because of the coldness of Lake Ontario and the distance of the Lake Erie beaches from our city.

Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Council of Churches, through the heads of the local major churches of the Province of Ontario, recently made a submission to the Premier of this province for us to match dollar for dollar all contributions made by Ontarians to agencies involved with international or Canadian development aid programmes. These involve the Canadian Save the Children Fund, Oxfam, UNICEF, Catholic World Relief, or the Lutheran programme, that of the Mennonite Church, the Primate's World Relief, and so on.

Already the Province of Manitoba is involved in a matching dollar for dollar programme and I think this not only stimulates and encourages the agencies involved to raise more funds from their constituencies and the community, it also is a manifestation by the government of the province of support for what these funds are doing. In turn the dollar for dollar match by the provincial government becomes \$4 with the matching grants of the federal government, and so a \$1 contribution grows into \$4 for development aid.

We live in a very affluent part of the world. Indeed it has been said a great deal lately that 75 per cent, I believe, of the immigrants to Canada come to live in Ontario. Is there any wonder? Is there any finer place to live? Every time I leave Ontario, I come back and say, this is where it's at. How lucky we are. Speak to the immigrants who come here from everywhere. No wonder their aunts and uncles and cousins all want to come and live in Ontario—because of the wonderful way of life which we enjoy and the other benefits that we receive here.

I think we have a commitment as a people, as a nation, to those of the third world. Although we are in an age of inflation and we all have problems with that, those in the underdeveloped third world are having even greater problems. We are very richly blessed with agricultural products here in Ontario

and it encourages me greatly to see that the Minister of Agriculture and Food has already in this past year made good grants of Ontario beans, I believe, to Cyprus and to other problem areas of the world. But we can do far more and I hope that the current programme of assisting those in the third world being conducted by the Council of Churches will in time, and before too long, gain the support of the majority of the members of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned earlier, the difficulty that those of us in southern Ontario have now in reaching the wilderness areas of Ontario because of congestion on the roads. Also the high cost of gasoline prevents many people from travelling great distances; it's a consideration they now must make.

One thing that I can never really understand is why the Minister of Transportation and Communications will not embark upon a feasibility study for the extension of Highway 6 into northern Ontario—into the vacation land is what I'm really talking about. For the life of me, I can't understand why at present all the traffic from Windsor, from the Niagara Peninsula, Buffalo, Niagara Falls, western New York, is funnelled and eventually ends up on the Queen Elizabeth Way and then up Highway 400 to the vacation area for southern Ontarians. It is a tremendous congestion and cost problem. Surely this traffic could be diverted north over Highway 6 and then north beyond Guelph; it would do a great deal to take the pressure off those other very important road links.

Secondly, I hope that this province will, with all the muscle and wisdom it has, strenuously fight in the courts and before the Canadian Transport Commission the attempts being made by some parts of the trucking industry to open up trucking on Sunday in the Province of Ontario. This is the one day that the motorists of this province have the roads to themselves for family enjoyment and pleasure and relaxation. Those of us here in southern Ontario for the rest of the week tolerate the trucking industry on our roads. We know that they pay a very high rate of taxes. We know they are very important to the economy and are a lifeline of our economy with the jobs they provide but for this very reason also it would be a threat to the whole life style of our people if Sunday trucking were to become a reality.

Not only does it cause an increase in the traffic on the roads on Sundays, the truckers who drive these trucks have to work on Sundays. Then there are the countless tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, of people in Ontario who would then be obliged

to work on Sundays to see that these trucks are loaded and unloaded. Then all of the industries, even smaller industries perhaps, should be working seven days a week so these trucks can be loaded and so on. There is the whole servicing of this very vast and important industry. We, as a government, should take a very definite stand to see that commercial trucking does not become a reality in Ontario. One thing I would like answered is why already on the Queen Elizabeth Way, I have noticed between Toronto and Hamilton on Sundays—afternoons in particular—transporters are visible. Why are they not being taken off the road? We see them on the road already and it just seems to be the tip of an iceberg that's ready to surge up and overwhelm us as a people. I think it's a very, very dangerous thing. It is certainly a step backward and I hope the minister will do everything possible to see that this does not occur. I am encouraged that the city of Hamilton is taking a very strong stand on this and is going to be represented at the hearings to oppose Sunday trucking.

We in Ontario indeed are fortunate, when one looks at other parts of the globe, with the stable government we have and a basically stable economy.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to share this with the hon. members. We don't have enough humour from time to time and it was reported in the Hamilton press the other day—I hope the member for Riverdale will forgive me for saying this but it is really said in good faith and a sense of good humour—that Major Brown at the annual meeting of the Hamilton-Wentworth Salvation Army related the story of how a member of that very fine organization approached his captain one Sunday morning at the local citadel in London's east end and said, "Captain, how should I vote in the general elections next Monday?" The captain replied, "Of course, sir, the Salvation Army is apolitical. I can't say, but I will give you a hint. Should you come to the citadel next Sunday morning the opening hymn will be, if the Conservatives win, "Praise God from Whom all Blessings flow." Should the Liberals win, it will be "God moves in a Mysterious Way" and if Labour wins, it shall be, "Oh, God, our Help in Ages Past."

Mr. Speaker: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, initially I would like to state to you that the leader of my party had made arrangements on Friday last with the House leader that he would participate in this debate on Tuesday afternoon and has made arrange-

ments along that line. Since the House leader is always anxious to expedite the business of the House in his own inimitable way, he asked some of us if we would co-operate with him and, of course, in my case, being a person who is co-operative and who is also anxious to see the business of the House expedited as the House leader is, I agreed I would at least deliver part of what I had to say in this debate this afternoon.

Mr. Renwick: The party is dedicated to co-operation.

Mr. Young: So here we are on another session. First of all, as I start my presentation, Mr. Speaker, I want to say, as others have done and will do, my word of congratulations to you on being appointed to this high office—I think perhaps it's the first opportunity I have had to do this officially—and to say that we are pleased with the way in which you do the work of the House.

We are not always delighted, let's say. We're not always in agreement completely with the decisions you might make. But I think, from the time when you were the chairman of the committee of the whole House until the present time of your very great elevation you have improved markedly.

Mr. Renwick: You should read the rule book one day.

Mr. Young: We expect that this improvement will continue until the end of this session, whenever that end might be. We want to offer our word of congratulations.

I also want to offer congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne, not because of the very great quality of what they had to say in their arguments—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Oh, I'm disappointed. I thought it was because of the content.

Mr. Young: —but because of the very great courage these people showed in defending this government in the first place. It is a government which perhaps needs defence but which, in the eyes of many of us, is sort of on its way out. Also we think that they deserve congratulations because of their courage in defending, or in even moving and seconding, a Speech from the Throne which is as wishy-washy and without content as this one was. Certainly it was unfortunate that this government saw fit for the first time that our charming Lieutenant Governor read the Speech from the Throne to impose upon her this kind of a speech without actual content. We're sorry for that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: We're very sorry for that. When the next session rolls around, whoever may be the government, and we think there'll be a change, then we expect the content to be improved. At least if this party forms a government, I'm sure it will.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: And we look forward to that day coming.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): How does it look?

Mr. Young: Well, very good I would say from where I stand.

I would like to make a comment, Mr. Speaker, on the content of the speeches that these two gentlemen made in moving and seconding the speech. They were disappointed that I had not congratulated them on the content, and I'm going to tell them why. I'm going to start with the seconder. I have here the instant Hansard of his speech. I'm rather intrigued by some of the statements that he makes. He says this, and I quote him directly:

We are all aware of the various serious silicosis problem affecting our miners in Elliot Lake and other areas of the province.

I may be wrong, but certainly in my hearing, and I'm not here all the time, as most members aren't, this was the first time that this member has raised this matter publicly on the floor of this House. If I'm wrong, perhaps he can correct me. He may say to me that he has raised the matter privately with the minister, and no doubt he has from time to time. But he goes on to say this:

Mr. Speaker, I regard the appointment of the commission as a very positive step in the right direction. However, it seems to me that much could have been accomplished and sooner [And I underline that word "sooner."] if all parties had worked together and laid aside personal and political differences. Officials of the United Steelworkers of America in Elliot Lake chose to ignore me and direct all their requests through NDP members.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): He was never available.

Mr. Young: He said:

Until a few weeks ago, I had no communication from the union. I received not a visit, a phone call, a letter, a brief or any type of communication of any kind.

Mr. Foulds: Not so.

Mr. Young: He said:

Three weeks ago was the first such an approach in three years that I've been a member of this House.

In respect to these comments, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a couple of observations. In the first place, the member knew very well what was happening in Elliot Lake underground and otherwise. He knew very well what was happening. If he had wanted to, he could well have approached the steelworkers union—they're an approachable group—and he could have talked over the problem with them. They would have welcomed him, I'm certain of that:

Mr. J. Lane (Algoma-Manitoulin): I approached the minister.

Mr. Martel: He spoke to whom?

Mr. Lane: I approached the minister.

Mr. Young: The hon. member says that he approached the minister. That's fine.

Mr. Foulds: How close?

Mr. Young: In other words the member approached the minister, and so officially, from the member, the minister was aware of the problem. Unfortunately, the minister did nothing about it. This is our quarrel.

Mr. Martel: For 15 years.

Mr. Young: The member for Sudbury East and other members who knew what the situation was in Elliot Lake raised this problem in this House. They raised it here first. The member for Sudbury East went to Elliot Lake on several occasions, saw what was happening, understood the problem, came back and raised it again in the House.

In other words, as far as public awareness was concerned, Mr. Speaker—because the member for Algoma-Manitoulin says he raised it privately—as far as public awareness was concerned in this House it was brought to the attention of the minister and to the public by the member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Long before.

Mr. Young: Even though that matter was brought to the minister's attention by the member, and even though at a later date it was brought to the public's attention by the member for Sudbury East, the minister still did not act; and this is where we quarrelled.

Mr. Martel: He denied it, I recall.

Mr. Young: He said it was a wage dispute.

Mr. Martel: The minister said it was a wage dispute.

Mr. Young: A wage dispute, a matter of collective bargaining, I don't know.

Mr. Lane: All members opposite were looking for was political advantage.

Mr. Martel: "It was a wage dispute," quoth the minister.

Mr. Young: All right, let me say this: The members say that if all parties had worked together the thing could have been done; but I say to him that at that time the minister had the power to appoint the commission. He had power to act. He had power to say to the company: "Clean up the situation underground or else we will penalize you." He didn't do it.

Mr. Martel: He still hasn't done it.

Mr. Young: The other thing that really intrigues me is this: "if all the parties had worked together much could have been accomplished, and sooner."

Now what does this mean, Mr. Speaker? Is the member for Algoma-Manitoulin saying that the minister would have acted sooner if the New Democrats had not brought this to public attention? Is this what he is saying? That he will not act if opposition parties bring these matters to his attention? Is this what he is saying?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: No, no.

Mr. Young: I have heard that time after time; that unless you elect a government member you don't get action.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: No, no.

Mr. Lane: He only hears out of one ear.

Mr. Young: Unless a government member brings this to public attention we don't get action. That is what is going on and is being said right here in this House.

Mr. Martel: Give it to them.

Mr. Young: And, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to recognize that—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I didn't mean that. Let's be fair; don't play politics.

Mr. Stokes: What do we do when a government member won't act?

Mr. Young: Right. This is the whole story.

Mr. Lane: The union never recognized me as the member for Algoma-Manitoulin, they only dealt with the NDP.

Mr. Young: When we realize this inaction on the part of a minister was happening while over 50 workers died from silicosis since 1955, that is a large casualty list for any industry.

Mr. Foulds: It's tantamount to murder.

Mr. Young: And the management, which we are told was concerned about the whole thing, did not act; the minister did not act, even though we had 50 men die since 1955. The member says this: "You know, sir, I too feel very real. I have flesh on my bones and blood in my veins." Yes, so did the victims of this situation in Elliot Lake. They were living up until a certain period of time when the silicosis finished them off.

Mr. Martel: They are still working in over-exposure.

Mr. Young: Right now men are still working underground in Elliot Lake in a situation which should not be tolerated. When the member says: "I will not take advantage of the silicotic miner and his family by making political hay as the NDP are doing"; I wonder just what he means again. Political hay in bringing to the attention of this House the kind of situation that exists there in Elliot Lake?

When he talks about the leader of this party and says that it has been said that he forced action; well I suppose the minister can't be forced to do anything he doesn't want to do as far as forcing is concerned, but let me say this, that while the member was talking quietly to the minister, while the member for Sudbury East was talking publicly about this matter here and outside, we still had no action.

So the leader of this party went to Elliot Lake. He investigated that situation with complete and accurate thoroughness. Then he came back to this House and in the committee downstairs he spent almost three hours documenting to the minister, with proof which could not be argued with—

Mr. Martel: And the member for Algoma-Manitoulin didn't even show up for those estimates.

Mr. Young: —what was happening in the mines and what was happening to the men in those mines.

The minister, that day, was shaken. There's no question he was shaken. He said so. I

don't think he realized up to that time how important it was that something be done for Elliot Lake. I don't think he realized the casualty list that was building up there, and is still building up. But it wasn't until after that episode, and after the public pressure that was brought to bear in the public media—the newspapers, the TV screen, the radio, the whole bit—that finally the minister did appoint a commission to look into the whole situation.

Mr. Martel: In fact, they sent Jewett to France the next day to meet with Dr. Mastromatteo—

Mr. Young: He started to work on the whole thing.

Mr. Martel: Very interesting. They flew him over to Paris. They flew Mastromatteo in from Geneva.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Yorkview is making this speech, I believe.

Mr. Martel: The member for Algoma-Manitoulin didn't even have the courtesy to come to the estimates.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to see this on the record and to hear the member say these words—

Mr. Martel: He didn't even show up at the entire estimates, which lasted two weeks.

Mr. Young: He said:

I say at this time any miner showing any percentage of silicosis wishing to have a job that will not expose him further can and will be retrained and re-employed in the Elliot Lake area. I will also continue working toward a method to subsidize his earnings from the time he leaves the job underground until he is relocated with a comparable earning.

I was delighted to hear that, but so far I don't think any announcement has been made that this actually is government policy. I give the member full marks for sincerity in the whole business, now that he is fully aware of what is going on there, but I hope he will now insist to the minister privately, and if necessary, publicly, with all the force at his command, that these words, which he has put on record, will in fact come to fruition and that these men who are still underground, and still silicotic, will have light work, if I can use that phrase which is used by the Workmen's Compensation Board, with pay comparable—I trust that means equal—to what they make as miners.

Mr. Speaker, I commend what I have said to the member for Algoma-Manitoulin. I trust he will learn from the wisdom that I have laid before him this afternoon. But I hope, more than anything else, that he is now convinced that he must do more than he has done so far for the benefit of his constituents in Elliot Lake.

Mr. Lane: Thanks for telling me.

Mr. Stokes: I'm glad my friend is addressing his remarks to the member for Algoma-Manitoulin, because there is no one else across the way to listen.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Don't toss out Thunder Bay so easily.

Mr. Foulds: The member for Fort William (Mr. Jesseman) looks pretty lonely. He is a nobody.

Mr. Martel: I think this should be sent out to the Elliot Lake people.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I want to come to the mover of the motion, the member for Prince Edward-Lennox. I would like to read two or three of his quotations. First of all, as he talked a great deal about the system of free enterprise in this province and lauded it to the skies, he said: "Our economic achievement in this province is due to our market economy." He also said: "The people of Ontario don't want more government. In any case, they want to get government off their backs."

That's an interesting observation. He also says—if I can find the reference and to be fair to him:

The fact that this province has been able to develop and grow through the free enterprise system to create a good environment for private development is significant, I think, because otherwise we would not be able to reap the rewards of those profits to purchase the soft services, in terms of a welfare programme, that we've been able to do.

Now, it is agreed that we are getting soft services because of certain things that are happening in the private sector. But let me say this to the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox: Soft services began to be purchased by governments dating from the time when governments began to get on the backs of free enterprise and began to interfere with the free enterprise system to channel certain of the benefits created to the people as a whole.

We in the New Democratic Party don't believe, as the hon. member said, and I quote him: "Contrary to the socialist philosophy that the state should own everything." The hon. member knows different than that.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): That's when his mind goes blank.

Mr. Young: He knows differently.

Mr. Lawlor: That is when he becomes frivolous.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I have studied Marx and Engles and the philosophy of the party of hon. members opposite.

Mr. Young: Perhaps the hon. gentleman was exaggerating for the sake of emphasis; I don't know. But in any case, that's what he said.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They might let me own my toothbrush if I was fortunate.

Mr. Martel: No.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Let the record show that they wouldn't even let me own my toothbrush.

Mr. Young: That's what he said: "Contrary to the socialist philosophy that the state should own everything."

Mr. Martel: We don't think he is competent to own a toothbrush.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, let me say that the state would not be interested in owning the member's toothbrush or his razor, and a lot of other things.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They wouldn't even give me one.

Mr. Young: As far as the New Democratic Party is concerned, and I speak through you, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member, because I think he needs to know some of these things. The New Democratic Party believes, as he believes, in a combination of private and public endeavour. However, he thinks that the public intervention should be minimal, whereas we think it should be much more.

Mr. Martel: The profitable part.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: All right, now here's what I have to say. We believe the state should intervene—

Mr. Martel: We don't know where the Liberals are, that's the trouble. They never

told anyone. They are off in never-never land.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): We know where we are.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: We believe, Mr. Speaker, that the state should intervene to the extent necessary to see that the productivity of the nation serves social goals; and that the wealth must not flow only into the hands of those who gain control of the means of production. It should also serve those whose labour and whose brainpower create the wealth.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Oh those are only platitudes; just platitudes.

Mr. Young: All right, let's get this clear. He sang the glories of free enterprise, but then the member began to laud this government for the places in which it had intervened and climbed onto the back of free enterprise. These were the things.

Mr. Lawlor: Don't expect consistency. That would be too much.

Mr. Young: Let me point out what I mean.

Mr. Martel: If he listens he will learn something.

Mr. Stokes: That is called blue socialism.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: Let me point out to the hon. member what I mean; let me quote his words. All right, on page 81 of the instant Hansard for March 13 we have the member for Prince Edward-Lennox saying: "The Ontario government has given approval to several power development projects for Ontario Hydro from 1977 to 1982." He names them and says they are expansions of the Pickering generating station, the new generating station at Wellesleyville and construction of two additional heavy water plants in the Bruce nuclear power project.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Heavy water may not be what he thinks it is.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, it was back in the early part of this century when a Tory government decided that Hydro was not being produced as cheaply and as efficiently as it ought to be by private enterprise.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It was not only that.

Mr. Young: And so the government moved in in order to ensure a supply to the manu-

facturing sector of this province and to the people who lived in Ontario. At that very early time the Tories climbed on to the back of private enterprise and not only climbed on to its back but—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That wasn't climbing on the back.

Mr. Young: —simply pushed it aside, and said "No longer—"

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That was creating a proper economic climate.

Mr. Young: All right. This is a field which free enterprise still pre-empts in much of the United States but as far as Canada is concerned, even in British Columbia and Quebec some years ago after each one of them fought an election on free enterprise for hydro, within the year they had socialized the hydro development in those provinces. We did that long, long ago. In other words, free enterprise couldn't provide the power we needed in Ontario and so we socialized it.

Mr. Martel: We should socialize the farmers.

Mr. Young: We brought it under public ownership.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: I'm just pointing out this fact.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Young: On the same page the member says this, "We have programmes—"

Mr. Martel: The member doesn't believe them?

Mr. Young: —"to develop watts from waste."

An hon. member: That's right.

Mr. Young: Sure.

These are forward and progressive steps. The goal of the experiment is to be carried out in the Lakeview generating station. Initially, six reclamation and recycling plants [he's talking about this whole matter] are to be built at a cost of \$17 million for the Kingston, Sudbury, London, Metropolitan Toronto, Halton and Peel areas. That, indeed, is great news and another forward advance [and I might put in the words "into socialism"] in Ontario.

An hon. member: Of course.

Mr. Young: What I am saying is that private enterprise—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Whenever we do something that the member likes he calls it socialism. That's his definition of socialism.

Mr. Young: All I'm saying to the member through you, Mr. Speaker—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Young: —is he had better not talk about private enterprise developing this province. The government ought to get off the backs of private enterprise and not lam-baste the socialists—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: What about the government getting off the backs of the people?

Mr. Lawlor: As a matter of fact government is not the enemy the member makes it.

Mr. Young: The member says let the government get off the backs of people but it is his government he's talking about.

Mr. Martel: Right.

Mr. Young: I'd like to know what he means by this.

Mr. Martel: He's talking out of both sides of his mouth.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, he is; of course he is.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: We don't want too much government.

Mr. Young: I am not sure what this Hansard is going to look like, Mr. Speaker; however, it will look like the member's did on Friday.

An hon. member: Give him a Liberal speech.

Mr. Young: What has happened in our economy is that free enterprise was concerned with profits. The companies were not concerned with the waste they created; they could do the packaging. They could discard the waste cars. They could build up all kinds of news on paper and then discard it. They were not interested in the recycling or the reclamation of these products. They were not interested in the cost to society of the waste they created.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Yes, they were.

Mr. Martel: Right on.

Mr. Young: So it is that governments—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Private enterprise has constructed recycling plants.

Mr. Young: —the governments, Mr. Speaker, have had to move in and fill the gap and we have had to socialize the recycling and the disposal of waste in this province as well as everywhere else.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Where does the member get the money to do all these things? The people who produce?

An hon. member: Where does the government get it from?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: By taxing the middle income groups; they're the people who produce.

Mr. Young: The question I have been asked, Mr. Speaker, is where do we get the money to do these things?

An hon. member: Tax the workers.

Mr. Young: The money is coming—

An hon. member: They are already taxed.

Mr. Martel: Who created it?

Mr. Young: We have the boast that this is now being undertaken. In other words, this government is going to find the money because this government has been forced to find it. The problem is this—that society pays the cost anyway.

Mr. Martel: Of free enterprise.

Mr. Young: If we have to discard these things and bury them in our dumps, we've got to pay the costs. When we have an era of perhaps deliberate and planned obsolescence as we have had, then society is going to pay the cost of that obsolescence in extra goods that we produce, extra material we use and, as I say, in the cost of disposition. We might as well face that cost as a society. We might as well as a socialist enterprise enter into this thing and frankly and fearlessly start to dispose of the waste and to use that waste with as much recovery of assets as we possibly can.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: So the member thinks the state should own the means of production.

Mr. Young: I did not say that. Mr. Speaker, I don't want the member for Prince Edward-Lennox to put words into my mouth.

Mr. G. Nixon: Mix it up.

Mr. Young: I'm giving him a lesson here. If he doesn't want to understand me, that's up to him.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Get right down to the discussion of the means of production.

Mr. Young: Then we come to the fourth matter on page 65 of his speech.

Mr. Martel: He is sounding more like a socialist every day.

Mr. Young: He is very proud of this. The member for Sudbury East said: "That is also following in the footsteps of what BC did. You are late there too." The member for Prince Edward-Lennox then went on to say—and it fits in beautifully, although perhaps in fairness to him, I should go back and pick up what he said first, which was:

The new drug programme was introduced on Sept. 1 extending further the benefit of the province's health system to allow over half a million residents to receive drugs without charge. Can you imagine that?

Mr. G. Samis (Stormont): My God, don't tell me the member is against that too.

Mr. Young: In other words, I sat in this House over the years, Mr. Speaker, as you did, and I saw from the beginning the struggle of this party to establish or to have established a health system in this province. We saw government after government headed by successive premiers refuse.

Mr. Martel: That Machiavellian scheme.

Mr. Young: Always leave it in the hands of private enterprise, this was the basis. "We cannot have socialism in health," they said.

Mr. Martel: John Robarts called it a Machiavellian scheme.

Mr. Young: And I heard this, day after day, year after year, over on those benches, "We cannot socialize the health services." Yet, finally, what happened, Mr. Speaker? The very rush of events and the demand of the people of this country—following Saskatchewan and others who brought it in—the people of Ontario demanded it, and in order to save its bacon again this government brought a health plan to Ontario.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The federal government did. It brought it to all the provinces.

Mr. Young: Well, the federal government laid down the conditions. But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this government in order to save its bacon and to take advantage of the federal grants did finally introduce socialism in the health plan.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The federal grants were actually given by Ontario from the productivity of its free enterprise.

Mr. Young: However the member slices it, the fact is that the government has brought in a public health plan in Ontario and is now extending it and will extend it. There is no way to go back.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Drugs for the old people. What is wrong with that?

Mr. Young: Saskatchewan had drugs for the old people, Mr. Speaker, back in 1945.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the member could continue his speech.

Mr. Young: That is just another illustration of how this government has been backing into socialist enterprise.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: They are being dragged kicking and squealing into the 20th century.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. member for Yorkview continue his speech.

Mr. Young: Again, we find the hon. member saying this:

Increased pension benefits to widows, dependants of deceased injured workmen and full compensation for partially injured workmen who are unable to find suitable employment.

Now, of course, there was a time when all pensions and all insurances like this were handled by private enterprise, by private insurance companies. This government fought this idea for a long time, but finally, again we had to face up to the fact that these things had to come and so the private enterprise system was breached again.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Doesn't the member agree with that?

Mr. Young: Certainly.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Doesn't he agree with the government programme?

Mr. Young: I am agreeing with this government programme. All I am doing—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That is what we want to hear.

Mr. Young: All right.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: All I am saying is that when—

Mr. Stokes: They can't have it both ways.

Mr. Young: —a member lauds the free enterprise system and damns the socialist system, he had better realize what he is saying. In other words, while he had very unkind words to say about us and our so-called socialism, everything that he bragged about in this speech of his is government intervention in the private enterprise system.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That is not government intervention.

Mr. Martel: What does he call it then?

Mr. Young: What does the member call it then?

An hon. member: Government takeover.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Let's hear the hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. Martel: These free enterprisers! It's lousy socialist government over there.

Mr. Young: Then again, Mr. Speaker, I find these words from the member for Prince Edward-Lennox:

In connection with housing, the Ontario Building Code was developed and new legislation passed in the last session which should significantly benefit the citizens of Ontario by ensuring effective building safety standards and evaluating new business techniques and materials.

When it comes to housing, Mr. Speaker, the fight is still going on in that field, in this government and across Canada. There was a time when we left housing entirely to private enterprise; but we found this, that private enterprise was only interested in high-priced housing for the well-to-do.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That's not right.

Mr. Young: That's right. The poor were being housed through the trickle-down theory: As older houses disintegrated and deteriorated into slums, then the poorer people were able to afford to move into those houses after they had been divided up into smaller apartments.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Hundreds of thousands of houses that were built were for the working man.

Mr. Young: All right.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They were built under the free enterprise marketplace system.

Mr. Young: Agreed. I am not disputing it when the member says that free enterprise did build hundreds of thousands of houses for the working man, but sooner or later we came to the place where no longer would free enterprise build those houses for the working man—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Oh no.

Mr. Young: —and so Ontario Housing, an enterprise run by this government, was set up here; just as CHMC was set up in Ottawa. And let me say this, Mr. Speaker, that while free enterprise built those houses for the working man, they would not finance them. The only way they were able to finance them was through a socialist enterprise in Ottawa, the Central Mortgage and Housing Corp.—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That's not right.

Mr. Young: —which put public funds into the housing projects.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: What about the trust companies and the banks and the insurance companies?

Mr. Young: All right, the banks and insurance companies played some part in the building of high-priced houses—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Not high priced; the working man's houses.

Mr. Young: —but very few bankers would ever allow money to go into low-cost housing. It was too great a risk. But in the long run—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The government doesn't hold all the mortgages.

Mr. Young: You know, Mr. Speaker, I don't mind them interrupting, because it shows how little they understand what has been going on in this country.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Martel: I am glad the member said that.

Mr. Young: The fact is that the builders did then and still do go to CMHC to get public financing for the houses, the apartments, even the shopping centres that they build; even today.

So again private enterprise does not supply the bulk of the funds. It is, again, government services which supply these funds.

When it comes to shoddy buildings, so often, for some reason or other, the govern-

ment has had to intervene in setting up building codes because too many builders were putting up shoddy houses. I think the member will agree with me that this has been the case, and so governments again have been forced to intervene—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Of course there has been a lot of shoddy workmanship.

Mr. Young:—and forced to set up a building code to which these men must build.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That's right; there's been a lot of shoddy workmanship.

Mr. Young: All right, sure; that's private enterprise again.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Blame it on the unions.

Mr. Young: Now we come to another matter—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Let the record show that I am not opposed to unions.

Mr. Young: The member mentioned the Ontario Energy Corp., an energy corporation set up by the government of this province, and rightly so. We don't quarrel with that, because we've been calling for this for a long time; but a better energy corporation than the one we have now in order to ensure that Ontario has enough natural gas for its consumers and industries at the end of this decade. We've come to the place where we realize we can no longer leave the production and distribution of energy in this country entirely to the private enterprisers, because they would not, in the first place—

Mr. Martel: We should nationalize the whole thing.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: There we are. He would nationalize everything.

Mr. Martel: I would nationalize the whole petroleum industry.

Mr. Young: All right. I'll come to that. But again we see government interfering with the most powerful group of private enterprisers in the world, I suppose, the oil companies. They've seen fit in this government to interfere and to get on their backs with a certain amount of planning and regulations. And that can only increase as time goes on.

Then we come to one other matter which I want to mention—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: When I mentioned government on the backs, I was talking about the backs of people. The member has con-

finied that remark to the corporations, which isn't right.

Mr. Young: Well after all, the people of Ontario don't want more government either; I presume that means individually or collectively.

Mr. Lawlor: Corporations are on the backs of people.

Mr. Young: When you get on to the backs of the corporations, then you're talking about socialism. The member doesn't object to that, I take it.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The NDP wants to regulate human behaviour to the nth degree.

An hon. member: Oh come off it.

Mr. Martel: There's only one thing the members opposite haven't passed. Know what it is?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Will the member for Yorkview continue? Perhaps if he faced this way it might be more appropriate.

Mr. Young: I'm coming pretty close to the end of this particular illustration which I'm trying to show, Mr. Speaker. He mentions this:

Now let's mention consumer protection and legislation that has been developed to assist the unwary, the consumer, the ordinary citizen who has to purchase products. The Ontario Business Practices Act is designed to remove deceptive and false business practices. And some of the Ontario business practices which were considered and are now covered—

An hon. member: Where have all the Tories gone?

Mr. Young: "The selling of a consumer product and informing him that services and parts are available when they are not."

Well with so many interruptions it was pretty hard for the hon. member to get the reason into this—

Mr. Lawlor: The Tories scotched that.

Mr. Young: What he was getting at is that we have had to interfere very markedly with the free enterprise system because the free enterprise system was rooking us right and left.

Mr. Martel: We found that out Thursday afternoon, didn't we?

Mr. Young: That's right. So to protect the consumer we've had to intervene in that particular way.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: One can blame the system, but it's the people who make the system.

Mr. Martel: It's the people at the top who make it.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: We're talking about people in every walk of life at all levels.

Mr. Samis: Who controls the system?

Mr. Young: All I wished to illustrate, Mr. Speaker, was that while the member was lauding the free enterprise system, it's clear that the free enterprise system had to be interfered with by government in order to achieve progress, and that he himself was boasting about the achievements of this government.

Mr. Lawlor: That's perfectly right.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Does the member agree with that?

Mr. Martel: That's a socialist viewpoint.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I want to come to a couple of myths that we heard in the speech last week. One was this matter which I just spoke about—progress. You know, I want to emphasize again that progress for society has come at the very point where the public has intervened in order to channel the goods which the private enterprisers produce into socially useful purposes. I remember a description of 1929, Mr. Speaker; it is a very apt description. It was this: The hive is filled and the bees are fired. Now that is happening today again. The hive is being filled, we are getting a surplus of goods and the people who produce them are being fired again.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That's not accurate though. There was a lot of business going out of this country.

Mr. Young: All right. There is enough truth in this. When the bees are fired, of course, then somebody who has control of the hive is eating the honey; but the little businessman does have trouble at that point because of a lack of purchasing power. Right? And that's exactly what the member was saying the other day, and I agree with him.

An hon. member: He was having real problems the other day.

Mr. Carruthers: The bees are in private enterprise.

Mr. Young: Now the member said this about housing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: I am going to come to the small businessman. I am going to do that in a few minutes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They have to work 18 hours a day. The member wouldn't want to nationalize them would you?

Mr. Young: Now the member says this:

These are very difficult times indeed but it's [the government] doing everything possible to facilitate people to own their own homes. Our philosophy is that it is important that the people of the province have a vested interest in the province. That's important, that they own something, which is contrary to the socialist philosophy that the state should own everything.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the great myths that is being perpetrated by this member and others—that the average guy, under this kind of a system and this kind of a government, can own his own house. You see, the fact is over the last two or three years that the prices of single family homes have doubled—they have gone up to the point.

Mr. T. A. Wardle (Beaches-Woodbine): What has caused that, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Young: I am saying the system works this way.

Mr. Wardle: But what has caused it?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: But as far as ownership is concerned his own members don't want people to own the land; the NDP want the government to own it and to rent it to the people. Ask the member for Ottawa and the islands.

Mr. Young: We have the whole matter of speculation in land and in housing which this government—and I give it some credit—has tried to stop—

Mr. Martel: Oh, not very hard though.

Mr. Young: —with some degree of success, but it has left out the commercial and other aspects, which are vital if we are going to stop this kind of speculation.

Also more and more today our people are being hived into apartments. That's the way

it is happening. That's the way the policies of this kind of government work. The people are not only not owning their own homes, but they are going into apartments, and so this myth about—

An hon. member: What does the hon. member suggest?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: This government passed condominium legislation so they could own their own homes.

Mr. Young: Okay, agreed.

Mr. Martel: Own their own apartment, not their own home.

Mr. Young: A strange thing this—how this government is going into co-operative ownership, which is taking the ownership out of the hands of the apartment owners and putting it in the hands of the people. That is good, we agree with that. But that is not free enterprise.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: This speech will come back to haunt the member, he is agreeing with private ownership. He should watch he doesn't get chastised by his party hierarchy.

Mr. Wardle: Wait until his leader reads it tomorrow.

Mr. G. Nixon: He will be drummed out.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: He will be joining us pretty soon.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention another matter which the gentleman mentioned the other day, and that is small business. I think all of us are concerned about the plight of small business today.

Over the weekend I had the privilege of meeting with a group of service station operators, small businessmen, who are trying their best to make their private enterprise system work as far as they can. But we have today—and this has been brought up time after time in this House by various members in this House, and it wasn't confined entirely to this party—we have a situation where the service station operators are today competing with each other for business.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Young: All right, but that competition only goes to the extent of pumping the gas or getting the materials out. The oil companies lay down the laws of competition and the rules of competition for these people

—how they can compete. The oil companies deliver the oil and the gas to them.

Mr. Carruthers: Risk capital.

Mr. Martel: Risk capital!

Mr. Young: Until just before this last increase took place between seven major oil companies, the wholesale price ranged all the way—

Mr. Carruthers: Why doesn't the NDP nationalize the potash industry in Saskatchewan?

Mr. Martel: We even developed it.

Mr. Carruthers: I'll tell them why.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Tell them.

Mr. Martel: Why?

Mr. Young: All right. We'll get the speech later.

Mr. Martel: I can hardly wait.

Mr. Carruthers: I'll let the member know.

Mr. Young: The wholesale price of gasoline pumped into the service station tanks ranged all the way—and this is seven companies—from 57.5 cents to 57.8 cents. That's real competition—three-tenths of one cent difference in the seven of them. In other words, they delivered the gas at that price. Up to that point there was no competition among the oil companies.

Mr. Martel: Comparing the costs of such things.

An hon. member: That's sharpening their pencils.

Mr. Young: That sure is. That's getting together.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: How about the price of milk and bread?

Mr. Martel: If that's not collusion, what do you call it?

Mr. Young: Imperial Oil's profit, just announced, was \$290 million for 1974, which was up 28 per cent over 1973—

Mr. Carruthers: What are they going to do with the money?

Mr. Haggerty: That's what the public would like to know.

Mr. Young: —and 75 per cent above 1972, and 1972 was the highest in the history of the company.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Is that in terms of dollars?

Mr. Young: Now, these people who have that kind of profit the other day came along and said to me and to all of us, "You're going to pay 2.2 cents more per gallon for heating oil and for gasoline."

Mr. Carruthers: What are they going to do with the profits?

Mr. Young: My question is, if they're that profitable why do they need to take another two cents, 2.5 cents or three cents?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The federal government takes away most of the profit.

Mr. Lawlor: Not after depletion allowances. Not after the handouts the member's government gives them.

Mr. Young: When the companies now dump that gasoline at the higher price into a service station tank they say to the service station operator, "You sell at the old price."

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Oh no, they don't. Not where I buy.

Mr. Young: They want them to, but all of them don't. Some of them are independent. They also deliver gasoline to other independents at the same price or lower. In other words, very often an independent can buy from Imperial Oil or Texaco, gasoline at a lower price than the companies wholesale to their own service station operators. If the member calls that fair competition, I don't know where it is.

Then if the stations are going to sell at a smaller margin on gas—and sometimes the companies will give the operators some assistance to lower their price—they say; "Make it up in other items—tires, batteries, service, repairs."

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The member may be an expert on gas but let's hear about bread and milk.

Mr. Young: Then they came along the other day and they say to the service station operators, "We're going to put your rent up from six per cent of gross"—I have it here, the clipping:

Under the current lease, Imperial charges lessees one cent for each gallon of gasoline sold plus six per cent of gross revenues from service and parts. He said the new formula means monthly rents will range from 11 per cent to 15 per cent, depending on the size of the station and the gross margin on gasoline and auto part

sales, plus 11 per cent to 15 per cent of labour billings.

That's interesting, because what the service station operators are now faced with is a jump from six per cent to 15 per cent of gross sales and labour billings. So they tell me that the only way they're going to make it go is to raise, first of all, the price of their tires, batteries, parts and all the rest of it. At the same time they're going to have to raise the rate of labour which they charge the customer from about \$14, which is the present current rate, to \$18 to \$20. They point out that this means not only does Imperial Oil get the 15 per cent of the present amount but it will get the 15 per cent of the increase. So if labour prices go up to \$18 they get 15 per cent of \$18 instead of 15 per cent of \$14. So you have a bigger slice.

What is happening is a simple thing. People are driving cars more. They're not buying as many new cars as they were. They're sending old ones in for repairs so the repair bays are busy these days and it's very difficult, I'm told, to get a space in a repair bay. Repairs are going up by leaps and bounds. Not only are the automobile companies raising the price of spare parts to these people, but they themselves now are being forced to raise the price of spare parts and price of labour. The oil companies are now seeing the lucrative market and moving right in to cash in on it at the expense of the service station operator.

If the price of labour goes up then, of course, the working man gets it in the neck again.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: How does the working man get it in the neck if the cost of oil goes up?

Mr. Young: He gets it because he's blamed for the high cost of labour. He's getting perhaps \$6 or \$7 an hour, and now the charge will perhaps be \$18. Then we blame labour for inflation.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: What about the little guy who can't earn that kind of money?

Mr. Young: More than this, I want just to simply outline two or three things that the service station operator is up against, Mr. Speaker, with your permission.

First of all, some of them are being forced to discount prices to meet competition of other companies. He gets a smaller profit margin, but he's told by the company that the lower price will mean bigger gallonage,

and they will also help him with a reduction of one or two cents. But when he has to sell at the discount price, then he himself has to take part of that loss.

But worse still, all along the line there are company-operated service stations, operated right to the retail level. And so the little fellow, who is a lessee of Imperial Oil, for instance, has to compete with the Imperial Oil station which is selling directly to the customer and making profits at both the wholesale and the retail levels—and very often they can then afford to cut the retail just a bit. So he's up against that.

The third thing he is now up against is self-service. Self-serve stations are proliferating right across this province, and they are all run by the companies themselves. Again, the company is competing in the self-service industry with its own lessee down the street and putting him out of business. So the self-service business today is creating considerable casualties in the lessee field.

So we have a price jungle today. We are told gas is becoming more plentiful and there is a surplus of gasoline everywhere. And with that surplus, as I again point out, Imperial and the other companies saw fit to raise the price of gasoline, and particularly the price of fuel oil for homes everywhere. In spite of the surplus, in spite of the profits they have done this.

Mr. Lawlor: What a joke.

Mr. Young: So we have a price jungle. For example, take a look at prices on Highway 400. A man who made a survey on Saturday said that on 400 and 401—in a captive market area where people had to turn in and buy gas—the price was 72.9 cents. But at a BP station just off 400 on Highway 89, the price was 65.9 cents.

All over this city and all over this province, prices are juggled and the service station operator is at the mercy of the companies that are trying to unload surplus gas. They are finding themselves—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: He charges whatever the market will bear.

Mr. Young: The lessee?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The service station operator maximizes his profits.

Mr. Young: All right, if he can.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That is the object of the exercise.

Mr. Young: But if somebody next door to him with another gas company is being subsidized to cut the gas price down, he is then in trouble and he's out of business.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: If you have a price war you are into something else again.

Mr. Young: That's right, I'm simply presenting a situation in which so many of these small businessmen find themselves today.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The member should not confine himself solely to lessees of service stations.

Mr. Young: I'm talking about this group of small businessmen—and we haven't time to go over them all.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I am concerned about more than the lessee of the service station.

Mr. Young: If you look at the figures last week, you find that small businesses are going bankrupt at a very large rate right now because of the layoffs, because of the lack of purchasing power, Mr. Speaker. These people, mom and pop stores in many cases, are finding it very very difficult to carry on.

What I'm saying is that small business is pretty well controlled today—controlled by the big industries. At the small mom and pop stores their prices are set at the wholesale level and they've got to get their margin there. The prices of the lessee in the service station are also controlled by the oil monopoly. Or take what you will—the guy who is selling farm machinery, whosoever it is, is still controlled at the wholesale level and at the wholesale level competition has virtually disappeared. We used to depend on competition. We used to depend on competition to keep prices down, but the competitive factor has all but disappeared from the face of this country and from the face of the earth.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Only when industry reaches the size of government will competition go down, so what would happen if the state owned all of the industry?

Mr. Young: When industry reaches the size of government, then of course we have to have some countervailing forces, and when industry can get together and dictate prices as they have been recently then, of course, government must step in with that countervailing force. That's the way it is.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: With anti-trust legislation, combines legislation and so on.

Mr. Young: In the oil and gas industry today we have no way of knowing how much

oil and how much gas is available under the ground. Time after time, since 1914, when the oil companies said to Britain and France, "Your navies need our oil and oil is so scarce that we think the next five years will see the end of the oil in the world," they jacked the price up to the British navy and to the French navy, and, of course, to everybody else. Then when the war was over, of course, we were swimming in the sea of oil. A few years ago, we were told in Canada that we had enough oil and gas to last us for a century or more. That was the time when oil companies in the United States wanted us to export gas and oil to the United States. We were cut off from exporting oil for a while and we were told, "We'll take your oil if you let us have your gas," in a long-term business. We didn't know how much oil and gas we had, except the companies said we had all that stuff under ground, all these reserves.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It is there but you have to get it out.

Mr. Young: They said nothing about that. Then suddenly, a year or so ago, we are told that there is a scarcity, that prices have got to go up so we can drill for more. We heard nothing about that scarcity until we needed a price increase for the oil companies. So we haven't any competition really. What is needed today, as far as the oil companies are concerned, is exactly what the member for Sudbury East said some time ago—and we have advocated this—we need to take over at least one of the major oil companies.

Mr. Martel: I'd take them all.

Mr. Young: Well, in any case, let's start with one.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: His colleague says he would take them all.

Mr. Young: This way we will know, first of all, what the margin is, what the operating costs are, and we'll know what the reserves of oil and gas are underground and whether or not more money is needed. The startling thing is that the oil companies were doing more drilling in Canada when oil was less than \$2 a barrel than they are doing right now, at \$6.50. It's a strange thing.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: He is going to take one over to find out what it is all about? That's what he is saying. One would think he knew what it was all about, the way he is talking.

Mr. Young: All right. I am saying that we must bring part of this industry under public

ownership and control so that we can then run it and we can not only know these things but then we can afford to make available to the Canadian people the products of this industry at a reasonable price—and we will know it's a reasonable price.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: They are Simple Simons over there.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Make everybody a civil servant.

Mr. Martel: What about the \$3 billion ripoff last year?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Could we have one person making—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Could we have one person making a speech and would he address the Chair and face in this direction please?

Mr. Martel: A \$3 million ripoff; it was proved last year.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, this is a very interesting afternoon as far as I am concerned. We are getting some reaction and it's rather a healthy reaction and—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Mostly from his colleagues who want to take over more than the member does.

Mr. Speaker: My request isn't being followed. Would the member please address his remarks and the other members remain quiet?

Mr. Young: All right. I am going to finish this part of my address very quickly, Mr. Speaker. I simply want to use another illustration in this whole field of the sheer lack of competitive effort in the so-called free enterprise system. We have seen how motor cars have escalated in price over the past few years, partly because of the demand for safety and pollution controls. Every time a safety device or pollution control is put on, it would knock the cost. We never did know what the cost was except we did get a printout from Ford back in 1966 when this process started; we found what the markup was in some of the things and it was phenomenal.

The blame for the escalation was often put on the safety and pollution devices. Also, the cars grew in size, until finally people began to look at the imports and the smaller

cars came in. Then, as the motor car industry went into the small car business, it escalated the price of the smaller cars until we got a Buick price, almost, on a Pinto.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Look at the price of sugar and the price of bread.

Mr. Young: Exactly, that is what I am saying to members. The price of sugar is in exactly the same category; a combine, which is now under investigation, had got together to raise the price, without mercy, on the people.

I want to point out this: When the competition really hit, when people stopped buying both sugar and motor cars, what happened? It wasn't a case of competition at that point.

It was a case, first of all in the case of motor cars, that a bonus was given if one bought a certain car; a bonus. Now the price remains the same—they don't drop that—but a bonus is given. All the companies get together and decide they are going to keep the list price the way it is. Also, maybe, by cutting off certain of the so-called options that were built in over the last few years, they can lighten that car and get it down to the place where they can at least drop the price for those things. But price maintenance must be there.

When it comes to sugar, we saw how the combines raised the price and the government in Ottawa began to investigate.

Mr. D. J. Wiseman (Lanark): What happens if they don't sell those cars? They are up now.

Mr. Young: That is my point. The competition isn't there any longer. The companies have not competed. Ordinarily, years and years ago, they would have lowered the price and sold the cars. They don't any more.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Does the member think they can sell the cars by reducing the price.

Mr. Young: They believe that by advertising and manipulation they can get the cars moved out. If they don't, they drop the men who make the cars. That's the problem.

When it came to sugar Mr. Speaker, what we got was a combine raising sugar prices to the place where they finally found that people would no longer buy. Then the price starts back in a managed way so that the sugar price is maintained and they'll find the point at which people are going to start to buy again. It will not come back to the former level at which they were making plenty

of money—or even twice that—but they're going to keep it at the managed level. Competition is gone.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Tell me something that is not going up in price.

Mr. Young: All right. What I am saying is that when we talk about the free enterprise system and competition, of course we're just whistling in the dark.

Mr. Lawlor: Everything is going up in price because of what is called maximization of profits.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The unions are competing all the time for wages.

Mr. Young: What I am saying is that as the power of the combines grow, governments must move in, as we said a few minutes ago, with countervailing force to prevent those combines from taking the people for a complete ride.

I want to quote for the members' benefit a statement made by one of the ministers of the Crown, the Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell) to the Business Press Editors Association on Feb. 20, 1975. He said:

In a recent speech my predecessor and colleague made the following statement: "I'm going to predict increased public involvement in areas that historically have been the preserve of the private sector and I'm going to state right now that this will happen because it is unavoidable. The developing realities of our society demand it. The private sector was not prepared to put up all the necessary capital and so the Syncrude project had to be partially financed by the government, even though a company had already gone in to the tar sands and is now making money there [strangely enough].

"It might be useful to reflect on the fact that Ontario broke the trail in the direction of public power in the first decade of this century and today the generation and distribution of power by the public sector is the norm rather than the exception. The leading British oil company and the leading German oil company both are mixed public-private enterprises. The entire coal industry of Britain and France is owned by the public. The German coal industry is for all practical purposes also publicly owned. The leading steel industry in Italy is publicly owned. The entire steel industry in Britain is publicly owned."

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I don't think they are bragging about that.

Mr. Young: Quoting:

"To varying degrees the same is true in France, Germany, the Netherlands and Belgium. The fact is that private industry had gone bankrupt and had refused to operate. It wasn't giving Britain the steel it needed and the other countries too."

Mr. Lawlor: Like Dominion Coal in the Maritimes.

Mr. Young: Quoting:

"In the aluminum industry," and this is interesting "there are important government-owned or mixed-ownership aluminum companies in Germany, Norway, Austria, Spain and Italy."

He went on to say this:

"I am not saying that this interlocking of business and government is good or bad. I am saying it is happening in the industrial countries of the world and seems to be happening at an increasing rate, and it frequently appears to be a pragmatic response to realities rather than a response to doctrinaire predisposition or government opportunism.

"In the United States, the financial problems of some of the big railroads resulted in the creation of Conrail, which is mixed public-private in the railbusiness [even that bastion of private enterprise] after the rail industry had gone.

"In Canada, we have opted for a national railway, a national airline and public power, to name a few. Now Syncrude is joint public-private. I repeat that I have no disposition to argue if this is a good thing or a bad thing. [He is not going to put himself on record in this way], but it exists—"

Mr. Lawlor: It is a good thing.

Mr. Young: He went on:

"It is happening in other countries on a relatively grand scale and seems to be gaining some momentum here. This we can all observe. Today I am doing nothing

more than making it explicit. There is little purpose in pretending that reality does not exist."

That, of course, is the very thing that the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox was doing—he was pretending that reality does not exist.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Oh, no.

Mr. Young: He was going aboard the socialists, so called, lauding free enterprise and ignoring the fact that the very examples that he was talking about were the examples where government does interfere with private enterprise. It has to interfere for the good of society.

Mr. Lawlor: He is the victim of his own ideology.

Mr. Young: Then again the difference between his philosophy and our philosophy would be the extent and the speed to which that interference should take place. That's all.

Mr. Turner: That is an oversimplification.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, my agreement with the hon. House leader was that when I reached this particular point in the debate this afternoon. I could adjourn the debate and continue tomorrow.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, that is, of course, following the speech of the member's leader.

Mr. Young: All right.

Mr. Young moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5:50 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, March 17, 1975

International Women's Year grant, statement by Mr. Welch	97
Public housing funds, statement by Mr. Irvine	98
Secondary school dropout rate, questions of Mrs. Birch: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis	99
Niagara Escarpment resort development, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Good	99
Dore Wrecking Co., questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Breithaupt	101
International Women's Year grant to Ontario Arts Council, questions of Mr. Welch: Mr. Lewis, Mrs. Campbell	102
Employment of women in government ministries, questions of Mr. Winkler, Mr. W. Newman, Mr. MacBeth, Mr. Meen: Mr. Lewis	103
Daycare facility at Queen's Park, questions of Mrs. Birch and Mr. Winkler: Mr. Lewis	104
Task force on legal aid, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Singer	105
Asbestos problem, questions of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Shulman, Mr. Reid, Mr. Bounsall	106
Uranium compounds in dentures, questions of Mr. Miller: Mr. Burr	107
Asbestos problem, question of Mr. Miller: Mr. Burr	107
Murray Travel Service Ltd., question of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Bullbrook	108
HOME project in Hamilton, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Deans	108
Nursing home beds, question of Mr. Miller: Mr. Good	108
Fog in Sudbury area, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Martel	109
Study of Metro Toronto, questions of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Singer, Mr. Reid	109
Seafarers' International Union, question of Mr. Clement: Mr. Shulman	109
Safety Committees Act, 1975, Mr. Haggerty, first reading	110
St. Patrick's Day, statement by Mr. Grossman	110
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. J. R. Smith, Mr. Young	111
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Young, agreed to	144
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	144



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, March 18, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 18, 1975

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

I'm sure all members will wish to welcome the distinguished members of the Canadian Commission on Parliamentary Accommodation who are seated in the Speaker's gallery this afternoon.

The commission today is under the acting chairmanship of the hon. Richard Bell, PC, QC, and amongst its number I would particularly like to welcome a former Speaker of the House of Commons, the hon. Marcel Lambert. I know the hon. members would like to welcome this group to our chamber this afternoon.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce to the members of the House that we have once again with us today a group of students from the Queensmount Senior Public School in Kitchener. They are in the east gallery. I hope they will enjoy their visit to the Legislature and that the members will welcome them.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, in the west gallery we have students from St. Paul's Junior High School in Mississauga. I'm sure the members will join with me in welcoming them and their teacher, Mrs. Lanois, here this afternoon.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the members of the House to join with me in welcoming 36 students and three adults under the charge of Mr. Morris, the principal. The students are from Ridgeview Public School at CF Base, Falconbridge.

Hon. A. K. Meen (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I would like the members of the House to join with me in welcoming 19 students and their teacher, Mr. Christopher, from grade 12 of Leaside High School in my riding of York East.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

COMMUNITY COLLEGES ARBITRATION AWARD

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the board of arbitration, chaired by hon. Mr. Justice W. Z. Estey, handed down an interim award on a contract between the Ontario Council of Regents for Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology and the Civil Service Association of Ontario representing the academic staff of the colleges. Officials of my ministry and the colleges are currently studying the implications of the award on college budgets and the level of activity that can be accommodated. The award covers a two-year contract period, commencing Sept. 1, 1973, and ending Aug. 31, 1975.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Not long from now.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Salary scales are to be increased by eight per cent effective Sept. 1, 1973; 13.5 per cent effective March 1, 1975. The compound effect of these awards represents a 26.3 per cent increase over the two-year term of the contract.

Most of this award represents retroactive salary payments. Academic staff have already received up to \$1,000 of this retroactive salary as a result of an interim award made by the board of arbitration in December. I anticipate the salary costs of the award for the current fiscal year can be met from the operating grant funds set aside for the college system for fiscal 1974-1975.

I should emphasize, however, that there will be no increase in the \$200.2 million I have already announced as the available operating support for colleges of applied arts and technology for 1975-1976. The award of the board of arbitration also calls for some reduction in workload of academic staff commencing in September, 1975. To maintain as much flexibility as possible in college offerings to the community, the award establishes principles on which workload should be negotiated rather than providing for any fixed workload formula.

ONTARIO STUDENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMME

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I have another statement regarding 1975-1976 student assistance. I would like to give the House details of student assistance programmes in 1975-1976.

As was stated in the Speech from the Throne, it is the government's intention to ensure access to our learning and training institutions. With this aim in mind, we intend to increase the funds allocated to the Ontario Student Assistance Programme, commonly referred to as OSAP, and to introduce two new programmes which will provide assistance to students not now covered by OSAP.

These programmes will provide Ontario students with a total of more than \$47 million in grants and bursaries. This amount will be more than equalled by assistance provided in the form of loans through the federal government's Canada Student Loans Plan and through a new provincial programme, the Ontario Student Loans Plan.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to outline the principal characteristics of the two new programmes we are introducing, and then provide details of some of the changes we propose to make in the Ontario Student Assistance Programme.

Dealing first with the Ontario Student Loans Plan, this programme is designed to compensate for some of the shortcomings of the federal government's loans scheme. The Canada Student Loans Plan has been, and will no doubt continue to be, of great assistance to a large number of Ontario students. However, it has failed to keep pace with changing patterns of attendance at Ontario's post-secondary institutions and now leaves many students in need of financial assistance but unable to obtain it.

The Ontario Student Loans Plan will provide a source of financial aid for many of these students. It is designed to serve a variety of people, including part-time students, students taking certain upgrading courses to qualify for entry to post secondary programmes, students who require financial assistance but have already obtained the maximum amount permissible under the federal plan, and students who are unable to receive Canada Student Loans because the length or entry requirements of their programmes do not meet federal regulations.

The new Ontario plan will enable students in these circumstances to receive loans of up to \$1,400 for a normal academic year, to a

maximum of \$4,000. We are currently working out the terms and conditions of the loans and expect they will be more or less the same as the terms and conditions of Canada Student Loans.

The second new programme we intend to introduce is the Ontario Special Bursary Programme. This programme is based on a successful experiment of bursaries being made available to part-time students, which is currently in effect at a small number of institutions.

The programme will provide non-repayable bursaries to the most needy part-time students and will permit people in very restricted financial circumstances to take post-secondary courses that may enable them to improve their financial situation.

Applicants to the programme must be receiving social assistance, be unemployed, or have a low family income. If they are eligible they will receive funds to cover the costs of their tuition and other compulsory fees, as well as any books or equipment they require. They may also receive an additional bursary of up to \$125 per term to help cover other costs, such as baby-sitting, day care or unusual transportation expenses.

I have written to the various institutions inviting them to participate in the Ontario Special Bursary Programme. I hope the programme will be available at all universities and colleges of applied arts and technology in Ontario and at Ryerson and the Ontario College of Art.

Mr. Speaker, may I take a moment to deal with the Ontario Student Assistance Programme. Hon. members no doubt appreciate that OSAP is by far the largest student assistance programme and provides financial aid to approximately two out of every five full-time students in Ontario. There has been a good deal of public discussion about OSAP and the various allowances made under the programme. Consequently, I would like to spell out in some detail the changes we intend to make.

The total budget for the programme in 1975-1976 will be \$46.55 million, an increase of approximately 16 per cent over expenditures in 1974-1975.

One of the principal concerns of students with regard to OSAP is the amount of money they are required to accept as a loan guaranteed by the government before they qualify to receive a grant from the province. New federal regulations enable us to raise the loan ceiling to \$1,800. However, I am pleased to report that we have been able

to retain the ceiling at \$25 per week, or \$800 over the course of a normal academic year.

With respect to the individual allowances for living expenses provided under OSAP, the board and lodging allowance will be increased from \$32 to \$40 per week; the allowance for miscellaneous expenses, which was increased last year from \$9.80 to \$11.50 for the current year, will remain at \$11.50; and local transportation allowances currently \$2.50 and \$5, will be increased to \$3 and \$6 per week, depending on how far the student lives from campus.

These changes bring total living allowances to a maximum of \$57.50 per week, an 18.5 per cent increase over the current year's maximum.

I should also like to remind the House that in 1975-1976 tuition fees will be frozen at their current level, as they have been since they were last increased in 1972.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The government raises them after every election.

Hon. Mr. Auld: We believe these measures—maintaining the current loan ceiling, increasing living allowances and freezing tuition fees—should enable students to enjoy a modestly improved standard of living despite the pressures of inflation.

Other changes in the programme include an increase in the amount students are expected to save from their summer earnings. This increase is based on increases in the minimum wage.

In addition, the amount parents are expected to contribute to a student's expenses in the 1975-1976 academic year will be based on actual 1974 earnings, rather than estimated 1975 earnings. This change should take some of the guesswork out of the programme for parents and students, and will simplify the ministry's verification process.

In conclusion, I would like to draw the hon. member's attention to one further aspect of OSAP in 1975-1976. I referred earlier to the fact that students receiving financial assistance from the province are given non-repayable grants, whereas the federal government provides aid in the form of guaranteed loans. Consequently, increased OSAP allowances have much greater cost implication for the Ontario government than for the government of Canada.

For this reason, and because of the continuing need for restraint in all areas of post-secondary spending, the various increases we have made in OSAP for next

year are, in some cases, not as generous as will be allowed under the federal government's Canada Student Loans Plan.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Auld: However, to ensure that the higher levels of support provided by the federal government are not denied to students who want them, OSAP applicants will have the option of receiving assistance from the Canada Student Loans Plan only, and of having their applications assessed according to its more generous criteria. Students who select this option will, of course, only be able to receive assistance in the form of a loan.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, the plans I have outlined should continue to improve access to our post-secondary institutions for people throughout Ontario. I believe they represent another significant step forward in the development of student assistance programmes in the province and sustain our leadership in this field over all other jurisdictions in Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

REDISTRIBUTION BILL

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, before you begin the oral question period, can you confirm to the House that you received the report of the commission on redistribution last Thursday and conveyed it to the Minister of Culture and Recreation (Mr. Welch), who is just coming into his seat now, on that same day? And if that is so, would you not think, sir, that it is your responsibility, as our spokesman, to inquire why the government is sitting on this report since last week, when in fact it is a report that is of deep and great concern not only to the people of the province but to every member of the Legislature? What right have they got to sit on it?

Mr. Speaker: Well, of course, I can't predict what action the hon. minister will take but just to settle—order, please—just to confirm the discussion and to clarify the discussion we had in the House last night, I have this which I might present to the House right now.

In reply to the question raised yesterday respecting the final report of the redistribution commission, I direct the attention of the members to the last paragraph of the order authorizing the commission, which was passed on Dec. 5, 1973, which paragraph may be

found on page 209 of the journal of 1973 and reads as follows:

That where no objection has been filed with the Clerk in the manner provided, or the report has been returned to the Speaker, either with or without amendment, the commission shall prepare a draft Representation Act in the form of a bill repealing the Representation Act and embodying its report, and the draft bill shall be presented to the Speaker forthwith and the Speaker shall transmit it to the appropriate minister.

That clarifies that one question. So, as indicated yesterday, I received that bill last Thursday, the day, I am informed, it was received from the printers. The bill was immediately transmitted by me to the hon. Mr. Welch in accordance with the advice I received that he would be the minister to introduce the bill in the House and we'll have to await further action by that minister.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period is now beginning. The Leader of the Opposition.

REDISTRIBUTION BILL

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the appropriate minister would explain to the House why he has retained the bill since last week, when it is, of course, one that should be presented to the House without delay.

Hon. R. Welch (Minister of Culture and Recreation): Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to table the reports at the appropriate time in the order of proceedings today.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: What is the reason for the delay, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I just further clarify my statement? The hon. minister did not receive it from me in time, I am sure, to have done it last week.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Assuming that the minister got it on Thursday, are we to expect that the government is going to adjust the report in some way before it is presented? It is good for him. It is good exercise. It goes with his department.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I got the report Friday afternoon. I am tabling the report this afternoon.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He gave it to the minister on Thursday.

Hon. Mr. Welch: After all, the report will be in exactly the form in which it has been received.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is fine. They have all been busy for the last four days doing whatever it is they do.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): A goodie for today.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

TEACHER-SCHOOL BOARD BARGAINING LEGISLATION

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have already asked one and I have another. I would like to put it to the Minister of Education. When he predicted, as reported in the Globe and Mail on Feb. 28, that he would introduce legislation dealing with teacher-board negotiations during the first week of the session, why is it that we still have not had this legislation when it is naturally of crucial importance in the situation the province faces at the present time?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, if my friend likes to read the Globe and Mail every day, and that's a good place for him to get information, he would have noted—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —in the Globe and Mail of last Saturday that I indicated I hoped to introduce the bill some time about the week of April 7 or thereafter. He must have missed the Globe and Mail on Saturday.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Since we are concerned with the status of teacher-board relationships at the present time, would the minister not think that an attempt to introduce the bill earlier would perhaps have some ameliorative effect, if there is such a word, on the situation that we face? Why not introduce it now? Is he still considering his position?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I want to tell my friend that I suppose I have spent more hours

thinking about teacher-school board negotiations than he could ever dream about.

Mr. Roy: It's the minister's job.

Mr. Breithaupt: Well, he should. It is his job.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We will be ready to bring in a bill that will be a progressive piece of legislation, when we have had a chance to fulfil the promises that I gave to the trustees and the teachers of this province—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): It is a year and a half late.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): He is awfully slow.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —that I would consult with them before I presented a bill to this House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister is not changing his mind?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am indicating that we are looking for a piece of legislation that will be effective, that will do the job and that will bring order to this particular situation.

Mr. Cassidy: The situation gets worse and worse.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I might just say that if there is one person who has brought disorder to this whole process in this province it is the leader of the official opposition.

Some hon. members: Shame.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Slap the desks like seals.

Mr. Lewis: The minister gives him more credit than he deserves.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the member have a supplementary question?

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. In the minister's reply, he indicated the bill would do "the job." Is he willing to explain to this House what exactly the job is that he has in mind?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, the job, of course, is to provide ground rules for harmonious bargaining between the teachers and their boards.

Mr. Roy: Supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary. The member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Roy: I have a supplementary to the minister's answer to my leader, Mr. Speaker. Does he not feel as Minister of Education that his delay for a number of years in bringing in adequate legislation has, in fact, caused differences and strikes, as for instance in the Ottawa area, and that he has helped to deteriorate the situation between teachers and school boards?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I absolutely do not accept that. In fact, I might say that my friend is following a close second behind his leader in causing disorder.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to put another question to the minister, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: How does the minister feel about us? We can subvert with the best of them.

An hon. member: The member for Scarborough West is third.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Lewis: I don't want the minister to think we are amateurs.

SECONDARY SCHOOL DROPOUT RATE

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Since the minister was absent in the House yesterday when questions were put to his policy secretary regarding the dropout report from Toronto, can he give any further information, based on his interjections yesterday when he did enter the House, that would indicate that the dropout situation across the province is less severe than the Toronto report would indicate, since his own figures would show that in 1970, 71 per cent of the students in grade 9 managed to achieve grade 12 entrance, and by 1973 only 63 per cent of those students achieved grade 12?

Now those are the latest figures from the minister's own statistics. The relative change in the dropout situation for grade 13 is that 38 per cent achieved grade 13 and 1971 and only 31 achieved it in 1973.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order please. I believe the hon. leader has asked his question.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The question, really Mr. Speaker, as I'm sure you would know, is: Is the minister not concerned about the quality of education which is resulting in this substantial problem of dropouts in the public system?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be able to give authoritative figures today. I'm having the report to which the hon. member referred studied very carefully in my ministry; I'm not prepared to comment any more on it at this point in time. I'd like to have the figures so that we can compare the Toronto dropout rate with the other suburban areas in Metropolitan Toronto and other areas of the province. I haven't got those figures at the present time.

But I want to tell my friend that when we saw those figures in 1973 we appointed, as I indicated to him yesterday, a task force, in November, 1973, headed by one of our ministry people, with very broad terms of reference to collect, collate and to complete research on the problem of dropouts in this province.

They're doing this in depth with 38 boards across the province. This in-depth study, which is being assisted by the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, involves detailed interviews with people who have dropped out. This is presently going on and the report will be ready toward the end of this year. I think when we get that report we'll have some very authoritative information and research upon which to base what we should do, should not do or how we should view this situation.

In the meantime, I'll try to get some comparative figures for the member and some more detailed studies of the Toronto report, which I don't want to comment on until we've had a chance to study it in more depth.

Mr. Speaker: Further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Since the minister has indicated that a review is being undertaken, could we not get, without delay, simply the statistical size of the problem to see whether students in the rest of the province are reacting the way those in the city of Toronto are?

Since it indicates a crisis in at least a perception of the quality of education in Toronto and in the province, rather than wait for the in-depth review, would the minister not undertake to provide at least the statistical approach that simply shows how many are dropping out at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, first of all I don't accept that it shows a crisis.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Twenty-five per cent of the kids are dropping out and that's a crisis.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think to my friend every little thing that comes along is a crisis in education. It's a problem, there may be certain manifestations of it and we have to look at them.

Mr. Lewis: It is a serious problem.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Now to have the kind of information that would be relevant to look at, we're going to need the kind of information that our task force brings together. The problem today is that it's like comparing apples with oranges. If one takes the Toronto report and compares it with some figures from Scarborough or from Brant or from someplace else, they've all done them in a different way and they read differently. They're not comparing the same things and we don't get a really accurate picture.

I think that's unfair. I think the Toronto report points out quite clearly—in the report itself although it doesn't give the statistical information—that the Toronto situation, in the area of the Toronto board, it is much higher than in the suburban areas. It says that itself, although I'm not sure the suburban areas have done the same kind of detailed research this report represents.

Mr. Speaker: Any further supplementaries?

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I'm a little concerned about the use of statistics. Surely this is a human problem and not a statistical problem.

What steps is the ministry taking to ensure that those students who have dropped out have the ability and the wherewithal to drop back into school when they want to and that the bureaucratic barriers aren't put up against them that are presently being put up against them?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, certainly as far as the ministry is concerned—and I can't speak for everybody in the educational system who may come in contact with people who try to drop back in or come back into schools—but as far as I'm concerned every barrier that makes it difficult for a person to come back into school should be removed.

We're doing, as far as I'm concerned and on my instructions, everything possible to remove those barriers to make it easy and possible for a person who has left school to come back into the system.

Mr. Foulds: Specifically, has the minister a directive out to the directors of education and the principals to that effect?

Mr. J. H. Jessiman (Fort William): Does the member want a leave of absence?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that we have sent memorandums to inform people on this. As my friend knows we have set some new ground rules insofar as treating mature students is concerned and giving credits for courses they had before they dropped out. All these things are being handled.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions, the Leader of the Opposition?

The hon. member for Scarborough West.

OPERATIONS AT REEVES MINE

Mr. Lewis: Could I ask the Minister of Health, briefly, has he had as yet the dust count levels which were available at Reeves mine before it closed down?

Hon. F. S. Miller (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I have the latest reports on the Reeves mine, yes. I just got them today at about 1:55 p.m. Our own report, the latest report of the Ministry of Health, is at least two years old; however, there have been independent tests done that admittedly were very high.

Mr. Lewis: That leads to two sorts of curious questions. One is, why would occupational health not have tested an area of clear environmental danger for a period of two years to get asbestos fibre dust counts? And secondly, will we as legislators ever have access to the independent counts that were taken?

Hon. Mr. Miller: I can answer the latter question and say that no, I am not at liberty to give the independent counts. I am concerned that there was that length of time without a ministry check on independent counts.

However, recognizing as I do now just how many places we have been asked to be in that period of time, I have some sympathy for my staff's inability to be in all the places they should be. They had been at that mine personally within the last two weeks—

Mr. Lewis: Yes, after the event.

Hon. Mr. Miller: In between the events, one might say—looking over the feasibility and means of maintaining the mine in opera-

tion. It was the mine's opinion, I believe, that they couldn't meet our requirements in any way, shape or form because of the very great overrun that they were experiencing.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is it not true that some of the counts at the Reeves mine site were as high as 28? And was the minister aware of the submission that was made to the Ham commission by the Steelworkers' union?

Hon. Mr. Miller: I am not aware of the specific recommendation; I am aware that the values are high. I certainly don't think the hon. member is overstating them.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. Lewis: That is quite incredible. If the asbestos fibre counts were as high as my colleague suggests—and knowing a little about the source, I think he may well be right—what is going to be done to monitor the health of the 150 employees who were there over a considerable period of time? That may be one of the highest exposures to asbestos fibre concentration on the continent in the last several years. How do we look at the health of those workers in the future?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I did answer that part the other day. If the hon. member will notice my answer to a supplementary, I think, from the member for Cochrane South, I gave some details of the health follow-ups that are going on and have been going on. We intend to carry those on in the future. We are trying to keep track of people in these areas.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. Ferrier: Is the minister aware that the miners themselves have said there has been some carelessness in the time periods when they have had the x-rays and the chest examinations? If the minister is aware of this, will he take a second look at the possibility of having additional medicals carried out on these men in the very near future by his chest x-ray department up there?

Hon. Mr. Miller: I would be pleased to do any of those things to follow up on the health of the men, which is my primary concern. I don't think it is one of the worst places, but I am certainly concerned about that particular mine.

Mr. Laughren: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: One more supplementary.

Mr. Laughren: Would the minister be prepared to recommend that those men who worked at the mine be retained on full salary by the company until all medical testing has been completed?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, that is not within my terms of reference.

Mr. Laughren: I asked if the minister would recommend it.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Scarborough West have further questions?

EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN IN GOVERNMENT MINISTRIES

Mr. Lewis: I have a question which leads from yesterday's exchange with the Minister of Government Services. Who is the affirmative action appointee in his ministry?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might speak on this since the overall question came to me.

Mr. Lewis: No, I did not put the question to the Chairman of Management Board. I thank him very much for his helpful and saving intervention, but I have a reason for asking this minister.

Who is the affirmative action appointee in the Ministry of Government Services?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to advise the leader of the New Democrats that the woman in charge of this programme in my ministry is Mrs. Ann Taylor, a senior employee of the ministry who works in the personnel department. I don't know her official title in that department, but I know she works very closely with senior management in recruitment of staff for the ministry.

Mr. Lewis: Was the minister aware of the petition in his ministry protesting the manner of the appointment without opening it up to alternative placement, to other people?

Hon. Mr. Snow: No, I'm not aware of that, Mr. Speaker. I haven't heard anything about it. Nothing has come to my attention. This appointment was made, I believe, in early January and a letter went out from my deputy minister to all employees out-

lining the programme and advising of Mrs. Taylor's appointment.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Mr. Lewis: Yes. What does the Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet want to say?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to enlighten the hon. member in regard to it and I didn't think he wanted to listen. That's what bothered me.

I wanted to indicate to him and to the House precisely what took place prior to the appointments being made and the directives that were issued.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Shouldn't this be a ministerial statement?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, it's no statement at all. I wanted to read the directive so that the members would understand.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What question is the minister responding to?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Scarborough West asked a question of the House leader.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I would like to indicate that the directives went from the chairman of the Civil Service Commission to the deputy ministers, and I have them if the members would wish me to put them on the record.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): We won't ask that question again.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think it's quite necessary in regard to what happened yesterday. Despite the chatter which is coming from over there on the Liberal benches, I'll put this on the record. It was to the deputy ministers from Mr. S. W. Clarkson and is headed: "Affirmative Action Guidelines for Women Crown Employees."

Please find attached a copy of the Guidelines on Affirmative Action for Women Crown Employees for your information and action within your ministry.

These guidelines were prepared by the executive co-ordinator, women's programmes division, Ministry of Labour. They have been reviewed and recommended by the Civil Service Commission and approved by Management Board of Cabinet.

It is requested that action be taken within your ministry as soon as possible to initiate the action plan which has been suggested in order to give substance to the affirmative action outlined.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's very helpful.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That was on Sept. 16, 1974. Oh, of course, from the protesting that was made yesterday one would think nothing had been done.

Then, on Nov. 28, a further directive from Mr. Clarkson to all deputy ministers was made:

To all deputy ministers: Further to my memorandum of Sept. 16, 1974, requesting action in each ministry to initiate the suggested action plan prepared by the executive co-ordinator, women's programmes division, Ministry of Labour—

Mr. Roy: I like that word "action."

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I'll continue:

—recommended by the Civil Service Commission and approved by Management Board of Cabinet, it was not envisaged either by the Civil Service Commission or by the Management Board of Cabinet that ministries would be requesting new complement positions to provide leadership in their ministry to implement the programme and to effect liaison with the women Crown employees' office. It was, rather, expected that each ministry would assign the duties of a women's adviser to an individual who would be responsible to the deputy minister for co-ordinating the ministry programme, with sufficient resources to ensure that the programme would be carried out.

In view of the above it is suggested that ministries should reassess their plans for implementation of the programme, and, if they consider a full-time women's adviser is required, be prepared to reassign present complement within the ministry to make this possible.

Then, of course, there was a statement in the House following that. There is all sorts of material to indicate what is going on in different ministries, plus a substantive section of the Speech from the Throne. Let it not be said—

Mr. Lewis: That's the funniest part.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister protests too much.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Let it not be said—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, indeed.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Let it not be said that we're not doing anything for women in this year, 1975. It is a very positive programme.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: All these directives were from a Mr. Clarkson, was it?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: From the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. Lewis: Yes. Can I ask the minister why he didn't feel it necessary to inform the members of the cabinet of an appointment so important within their own operating ministries?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: We were asking for a report back before we got into the implementation phases and that will happen. That will happen in the course of the next few days and then the member for Scarborough West will have his eyes opened.

An hon. member: He did.

Mr. Lewis: Fine.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions? The member for Scarborough West?

Mr. Lewis: No, I'll have my chance later.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

DISMISSAL OF WOMAN POLICE OFFICER

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the acting Solicitor General. In view of the dismissal of probationary constable Jacqueline Hall from Stratford police force, which was commented upon in the news media today, could the minister give us his views as to whether or not it is appropriate that police forces such as Stratford have women constables; and whether or not the termination of her probationary period just on the eve of the end of the 18-month period was reasonable and logical; and the extent to which the minister is looking into the circumstances surrounding her dismissal?

Hon. J. T. Clement (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Mr. Speaker, as to the question of whether women police constables provide a valuable service or not, in my mind I think that, yes, they do, under certain cir-

cumstances. I think this was recognized by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police recently and also the Ontario Provincial Police who are recruiting.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Waldo Monteith says—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Clement: With reference to the young lady referred to in the Woodstock area, if she feels—

Mr. Singer: Stratford.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Or Stratford area. If she feels that she has been unfairly dealt with then she has, of course, grievance procedure available to her. I'm advised that as of 2 o'clock today she has not seen fit to initiate any grievance procedure.

Mr. Singer: She is only a probationary constable.

Hon. Mr. Clement: She still has grievance procedure available to her under the Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

REMOVAL OF ASBESTOS FIBRES FROM TAP WATER

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of the Environment: When will the minister send me an answer, as he undertook to do on Oct. 24—

An hon. member: What year?

Mr. Burr:—during the discussion of his estimates, to my question, namely, whether or not the distillation of tap water removed asbestos fibres from the drinking water?

Hon. W. Newman (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I thought I had answered that question several times. Distillation does remove some, but not all of it. We have had a report in on that just recently and I'll send the member a copy.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin.

HYDRO RIGHT OF WAY

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Energy. About a year ago there was some

discussion on the Bradley Junction-Georgetown corridor, and I suggested that there should be a public hearing before a final decision was made and that they should keep off the agricultural lands if practical and possibly take the route over and down the Essa corridor. In recent weeks, I find that I—

Mr. Foulds: Question.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Question.

Mr. Ferrier: Question.

Mr. Cassidy: Is this a split in the Conservative caucus?

Mr. Speaker: Could we have the question, please?

Mr. Root: Yes. In recent weeks I have been getting a lot of support from local people, councils, and even the agricultural critic of the Liberal Party for this proposal—

Mr. Martel: Is that the question?

Mr. Root:—and I'd like to ask the minister, what has he been doing? What does he propose to do about holding a public hearing before the last decision has been made?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Breithaupt: The answer is nothing.

Mr. Cassidy: Answer. Answer

Mr. Roy: The minister mustn't let it go to his head.

Hon. D. R. Timbrell (Minister of Energy): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member, I'm very aware of his concern about this project.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): The minister should be, the member sits right behind him.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Within a very few days of my assuming this portfolio he was in touch with me both by phone and by letter. Since then I've spent a great deal of time studying all of the available material on the project. As well, as he may know, I went up a week ago Friday and spent most of the day there travelling all the lines and concessions to see for myself the sites that were proposed to be crossed with the hydro corridor. Also, a week ago Sunday I flew up in a helicopter to fly over all of the alternative routes.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Did the minister land on the Root farm?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: In addition, Mr. Speaker, I have been in touch with a Mr. William Mann, who is chairman of the local group in that area, I believe. I get the names of the townships mixed up; I think he's in Erin township. Next Tuesday morning Mr. Mann is bringing in a group of people from that area representing the Federation of Agriculture and, I believe, the local councils.

I will make my final decision as to what to do on this after I've spoken with them.

Mr. Laughren: Is the member for Wellington-Dufferin the oldest Tory over there?

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary: the member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Has the minister given any consideration to subjecting this particular line to an independent study on a priority basis?

An hon. member: Oh, no way.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows—and we've discussed this several times—my concern—and I'm checking this out, as I mentioned to him late last week, but I've been ill since then—my concern is that with the Bruce generating station coming on stream in a few years' time I don't want to have that station sitting there, locked in as it were, with no way of getting the power out.

I'm trying to determine whether, in fact, any of the power could be taken out of Bruce without this line and, if so, how much and for how long we could put it off. These are all factors which are entering into my decision. As I say, I don't want to make a final decision until I have heard the local people.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister consider referring the matter to the royal commission announced by his policy secretary last week which will obviously be established for just this purpose?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: No, Mr. Speaker. The board—or commission, if you want to call it that—is for those projects planned between late 1982 or early 1983 and 1993. This project, this particular line, is to bring power out of a plant which will be on stream before that time. As I say, I chatted with the member's colleague last week and the question became one of how long could that line be held up without losing money for the people of Ontario if that station sat there

ready to deliver power but unable to do so because of the lack of the line.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron.

CANADA METAL CO. PLANT

Mr. J. Riddell (Huron): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of the Environment: Will the minister report to this House about the level of arsenic emission that has been approved for the new controls on the stack at the Canada Metal plant? Specifically, how many hundreds of pounds of arsenic will that stack spew out over the course of one year?

Hon. W. Newman: Is the member talking about Canada Metal?

Mr. Riddell: That's right.

Hon. W. Newman: I'll get an answer for him on that tomorrow. I'll have my office follow through on it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

CHURCHES' REQUEST FOR INTERNATIONAL FOREIGN AID

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): A question of the Premier: What is the position and response of the government to the five major churches of the province soliciting its aid and support with respect to international foreign aid programmes arising in this constituency?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, as I recall, I believe it was Bishop Ragg who made a presentation to cabinet when we were in London with—

Mr. Lawlor: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —respect to some assistance from the government in terms of food or monetary assistance in their programme. The concern that we expressed very briefly at that time was the role of the province in what is traditionally an area where the federal government has responsibility and to a certain extent has exercised it. I think the feeling of the gentlemen who were there in support of the brief was that here was a situation where the province might also assist.

I have arranged to meet with that committee and I assume there will be representatives from all churches. I can't tell the hon. members, Mr. Speaker, just what date has

been set but I remember signing a letter—I think five or six days ago—which, hopefully, will get to Bishop Ragg indicating that this meeting would be arranged. When we have had that meeting, Mr. Speaker, and explored it more fully I will be in a better position to report to the hon. member.

Mr. Lawlor: A supplementary, please, Mr. Speaker: Is the government well-disposed with respect to extending monetary assistance in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think all of us in this House are very sympathetic to the total situation and the need for certain nations of the world to have assistance. I think the determination that has to be made is whether we should be encouraging the federal government, on behalf of all of the people of Canada, to undertake a more extensive programme in this regard or whether individual provinces should become involved. If the member is asking me about my personal disposition, I would say—and I would like to think all of us feel this way—that this country can do more for those less fortunate. Whether it should be done by individual provinces rather than the federal government or in addition thereto is something, of course, about which the meeting is going to take place.

Mr. Breithaupt: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: One final supplementary.

Mr. Breithaupt: Since the members have received copies of certain letters sent to the Premier from people in their own particular constituencies, can the Premier advise us how many persons, approximately, have written in supporting this situation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I can't, Mr. Speaker, at this moment but I would be delighted to get that figure for the member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kent.

ONTARIO HYDRO POLICY ON AGRICULTURAL SUPERVISORS

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Energy. What is the policy of Ontario Hydro in regard to the agriculture supervisors across the Province of Ontario? I am told that last year there were 13 and now there are six. Is it the policy of Ontario Hydro to do away with these agriculture supervisors? This is a great concern.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the agricultural supervisors will still be available to assist any farmer who is planning a new building on his property. There was the mention of the figures 13 and six, and I'll be glad to look into that and find out if that is a question of vacancies, or just what the problem is. But certainly I would hope that they have no intention of reducing that.

Mr. Riddell: Along the same line of thought, why is Ontario Hydro being permitted to do away with the marketing division sales section? This is a group whose job has been to provide heat loss calculations for buildings and to specify insulation requirements. What's going on in connection with the phasing-out programme of Ontario Hydro?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I haven't had a chance to acknowledge a reply to the hon. member's letter to me of about two weeks ago, I guess it is now, but I have been looking into that. In point of fact, the heat loss calculations, as I understand it, are still being performed for individuals at a fee of \$25. Now, I understand that the actual cost to Ontario Hydro is something in the order of about \$40 or \$45. I spoke with the chairman and president of Ontario Hydro on Friday morning, or early Friday afternoon, and mentioned to them that the member had been in touch with me and that I was concerned about this and I wanted to ask them for a complete report on the subject.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur.

ALLEGED SHORTAGE OF HOME PROGRAMME PAYMENT TO THUNDER BAY

Mr. Foulds: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Housing: Can the Minister of Housing explain why the cheque for the Ontario Home Rehabilitation Programme, which was delivered personally to the mayor of the city of Thunder Bay by the hon. member for Fort William, was short \$158,000 last Friday?

An hon. member: Shame.

Hon. D. R. Irvine (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of the shortage, but I'll certainly look into it.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary: Is the minister not aware that they received only 25 per cent of the amount that they had been led to expect, and can the minister tell the

House when the city of Thunder Bay can expect the remaining 75 per cent of the programme?

Mr. Deans: Where is the rest of the money? That is what we want to know.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, the original allocation is only 25 per cent, unless the municipality asks for up to 50 per cent. We don't give out the total allocation at once.

Mr. Lewis: The minister surely didn't think the member for Fort William could afford it himself.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of the Environment has the answer to a question.

Mr. Lewis: Order, Mr. Speaker.

EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN IN GOVERNMENT MINISTRIES

Hon. W. Newman: In answering a question of the leader of the NDP yesterday, I would like to correct what I believe to be somewhat of a misleading statement by the leader of the NDP in this House yesterday and reported in this morning's press in reference to the activities of women advisers.

I admit I was unable to explain yesterday the activities of our woman adviser, because she reports directly to our deputy minister, Everett Biggs, in the area of administration of the ministry.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is a point of order; that is not a question.

Hon. W. Newman: It was a question asked yesterday, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I remember the hon. minister was asked a question yesterday which he wasn't able to answer.

Mr. Lewis: A point of order: He didn't take the question as notice, he just couldn't answer it.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): The leader of the NDP doesn't want an answer.

Hon. W. Newman: I said I would get the member an answer.

Mr. Lewis: Well, give it on a point of privilege later on.

Mr. Speaker: I think in view of the unfinished answer to the question yesterday, we should allow it.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): If the member wants to ask questions in the House, he should expect to get an answer.

Mr. Lewis: The member is unbelievable. He is unbelievable. How many feet does he have?

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. W. Newman: On Oct. 31, 1974, Mrs. Blackadar was appointed by the deputy as the women's adviser to act in liaison with the women's Crown employees office in the Ministry of Labour. She was formerly executive assistant to the deputy. As an executive officer one, the salary range is \$13,800 to \$16,200. Our women's adviser has addressed meetings of senior and middle management people explaining the policy of affirmative action for equal opportunity for women Crown employees and seeking their recommendations for objectives for recruitment, training and development of women and the criteria for identifying potential. As well, she has done some career counselling with individual women of the ministry.

Grace Blackadar has initiated career development workshops to be implemented by our personnel branch this April. She is presently assisting with the preparation of a special issue of an in-house publication directed toward the women in my ministry. She will also be showing some films to male and female staff on woman's changing role in society. Our women's adviser feels that consciousness-raising is very necessary in the early stages of the programme.

Mr. Lewis: Hear, hear. There are some who need it more than others.

Hon. W. Newman: Having read today's press, Grace Blackadar, who is my co-ordinator, has asked me to express to the member her strong resentment at being insinuatingly referred to as a tokenism. She accepted her assignment in good faith because she is sincerely interested in the best use of human resource and in any effort she can make to bring this about.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Point of privilege.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of privilege, Grace asked me to express to the minister in the House her resentment that he didn't even know who she was.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York-Forest Hill.

RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR UNIVERSITY ADMISSION

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good time of the year to ask the Minister of Colleges and Universities whether he intends to use the tremendous clout which he has, by virtue of the fact that he hands out tremendous sums of money to colleges and universities, to influence the boards of admission, particularly of professional faculties of this province, to give a greater degree of weight or preference to the applications of children of long-term residents of the Province of Ontario than they have done in the past, where they have favoured the applications of children who establish temporary residence in Ontario simply for the purpose of being admitted.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, we have discussed this question several times in the House. I think I have indicated that it is apparent the public itself is interested in the admission practices at the universities, particularly in the professional courses.

Presently something less than four per cent of the accepted applicants are non-Canadian citizens or landed immigrants. In the graduate field particularly, there are far more Canadians taking graduate studies in the United States, for instance, than there are US citizens here. It would appear that the universities are taking the line that the hon. member has suggested, but I very much doubt that we will see the day when they are 100 per cent Canadian citizens. I don't think any of us would like to see that.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: One supplementary.

Mr. Shulman: What is the percentage of landed immigrants in the first-year medical class at the University of Toronto?

Mr. Ferrier: The minister should carry his statistics around with him.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. minister have the answer? If not, we could go on.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I have so many answers here, Mr. Speaker, that it takes a little while to find them.

Mr. Breithaupt: We only wish he would put them.

Mr. Cassidy: He is waiting for questions.

Mr. Deans: Why doesn't he send us a copy and we will know which questions to ask?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I have now forgotten the question.

Mr. Shulman: How many landed immigrants in first-year medicine at U of T?

Hon. Mr. Auld: At U of T there were 1,743 applications and there were 240 acceptances. Of these, 2.5 per cent students have foreign visas and the rest are Canadian citizens or landed immigrants.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South.

Mr. Givens: I have a supplementary question. Why does the minister resist the request for boards of admission to give preference to the applicants of long-time Ontario residence? Why does he resist this so much? He has resisted this time and time again. What is so unpatriotic about having the children of taxpayers of Ontario favoured in their applications at the universities of the Province of Ontario? I am not talking about Canadian citizens.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, first of all, as I am sure the hon. member is aware, the government of Canada puts up about 50 per cent of the grants. The Council of Ministers of Education of Canada, the provincial ministers, has met on several occasions and discussed provincial boundaries and borders and so on. They have all agreed that it is more desirable that there be complete student interchangeability, if I can put it that way, between Ontario and Manitoba or Quebec or PEI or Newfoundland. As a matter of fact, interestingly enough there is a very high percentage of Ontario students who go to St. John's, Nfld. I don't think that we want to put up any restrictions that will affect our prospective students in terms of where they wish to go.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. Shulman: On a point of order, if I may, Mr. Speaker. I asked the minister a question. I asked him specifically what percentage were landed immigrants, and he replied that 97 per cent were citizens or landed immigrants. What kind of misleading information is that?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Excuse me. For medicine at the U of T in 1974, out of a total of 255 acceptances, there were 189 Canadian citizens,

or 74 per cent; 60 individuals, or 23.5 per cent, were landed immigrants—

Mr. Shulman: That's too many.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He is not prepared to tell us.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —and six students with foreign student visas, or 2.5 per cent.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South.

PRICE OF MILK

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food with regard to the proposed increase in the price of milk.

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): The York South farmer!

Mr. MacDonald: Would the minister give the House some assurance that the proposed additional two cents that is going to be put on by the dairies, in addition to the implementation of the milk formula for the benefit of the farmers, will be subjected to some review so that we can discover whether or not it is justified.

Secondly, in view of the price of milk, is the government on its own, or in conjunction with the federal government, going to consider the implementation of a permanent consumer subsidy—I emphasize “permanent consumer subsidy”—so that this vital product will not be removed from the reach of many low-income families?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Answering the last question first, Mr. Speaker, there is no action being contemplated to put on any permanent subsidy, or any other kind of subsidy that I know of, on fluid milk products, either by the federal government or by the provincial government. We've just gone through the process of the federal government having removed the five-cent consumer subsidy.

Mr. MacDonald: That was a temporary one, not a permanent one—for election purposes.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: With regard to the first question, I was not aware of the increase in price until I saw it in today's paper. We will be taking a look at it through the appropriate channels of the ministry.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary, the minister has avoided

or evaded my question; I don't know which. Will the government implement some sort of review of the proposed additional two cents which the dairies are going to put on by unilateral action, subject and responsible to nobody?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, we have a Food Prices Review Board at Ottawa. If my hon. friend suggests that we should—

Mr. Laughren: Oh, stop it.

Mr. MacDonald: Go on.

Mr. Cassidy: He cops out again.

Mr. Laughren: He is the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the minister going to do something about prices in the Province of Ontario?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We're wasting time.

Mr. Cassidy: Those guys deserve to go.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My hon. friend suggests we should do the same thing here, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I didn't say that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question period is just about over. There are several members who want to place original questions. I will recognize the hon. member for Ottawa East.

OTTAWA TEACHERS' DISPUTE

Mr. Roy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Minister of Education.

In view of the fact that the Ottawa public school board teachers' strike is now in its third week, and the reports are that there's no way the classes are going to re-open prior to April, and since both parties apparently aren't even talking to each other, is the minister taking any steps to see that they sit down and discuss this? Does he have anyone down there? In fact, why doesn't he go down there himself and see if he can get them to start talking to each other?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, we are in constant touch with both sides. We have made offers to provide mediation when and if

both sides are ready. A few days ago, as I recall, the teachers had indicated they were ready to have a mediator, but the board's position at that time was that they would accept a mediator if the teachers would go back to work, which wasn't acceptable to the teachers. At the present time they are both biding their time, I guess you might say, insofar as negotiations are concerned.

Mr. Roy: Why doesn't the minister go down there and get them to talk to each other?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, both sides know that I and my ministry are available to assist them in any way possible.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East.

HEALTH SURVEY OF ELLIOT LAKE MINERS

Mr. Martel: A question of the Minister of Health: When will he be tabling the report on the Elliot Lake workers that was undertaken by his ministry, involving sputum tests and dust tests, I believe?

Hon. Mr. Miller: I haven't got a date on that yet, Mr. Speaker. I don't know when the report will be available for me. I'll find out.

Mr. Lewis: It is not a bad report actually. It is a fairly good report. I will tell the House about it.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson from the select committee appointed to prepare the lists of members to compose the standing committees of the House, presented the committee's report which was read as follows:

Your committee recommends that the lists of standing committees ordered by the House be composed of the following members:

1. **PROCEDURAL AFFAIRS:** Messrs. Bales, Bounsall, Burr, Mrs. Campbell, Messrs. Carton, Dymond, Edighoffer, Henderson, Johnston, Kerr, McNie, Morrow, Reilly, Reuter, Smith (Hamilton Mountain), Smith (Simcoe East), Spence—17.

2. **ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE:** Messrs. Bullbrook, Carruthers, Davison, Downer, Drea, Ewen, Givens, Havrot, Lawlor, Leluk, Nixon

(Dovercourt), Nuttall, Renwick, Singer, Taylor (Carleton East), Turner, Walker, Wardle, Yaremko—19.

3. **SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT:** Messrs. Apps, Belanger, Braithwaite, Deacon, Duktza, Eaton, Foulds, Hamilton, Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton), Jessiman, Lane, Martel, Morningstar, Parrott, Roy, Mrs. Scrivener, Messrs Smith (Nipissing), Timbrell, Villeneuve—19.

4. **RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT:** Messrs. Allan, Beckett, Evans, Gaunt, Gilbertson, Good, Haggerty, Laughren, MacDonald, Maeck, McIlveen, McNeil, Rollins, Root, Sargent, Stokes, Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox), Wiseman, Yakubuski—19.

5. **MISCELLANEOUS ESTIMATES:** Mrs. Campbell, Messrs. Carruthers, Cassidy, Drea, Evans, Hamilton, Nixon (Dovercourt), Nuttall, Paterson, Reuter, Riddell, Root, Samis, Mrs. Scrivener, Messrs. Stokes, Villeneuve, Wardle, Yaremko—18.

6. **PUBLIC ACCOUNTS:** Messrs. Allen, Bales, Ewen, Ferrier, Germa, Havrot, Lane, Reid, Ruston, Smith (Nipissing), Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox), Wiseman, Yakubuski—13.

7. **REGULATIONS:** Messrs. Belanger, Deans, Havrot, Johnston, Maeck, Morningstar, Morrow, Newman (Windsor-Walkerville), Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox), Turner, Worton, Young—12.

The quorum of committees one to five and of the private bills committee to be seven in each case. The quorum of committees six and seven to be five in each case.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Before you move the adoption of the report there are two comments I want to make with regard to it.

I think it doesn't really make much sense for us to strike a select committee every year in order to set up the composition of standing committees. It would be much easier if we were to establish by rule of the House the numbers that each party would have in terms of the makeup of the committees and then the committees would simply send to the Clerk's office a list of the members' names they would want to sit on that committee.

It is quite obvious to me that the archaic procedure of meeting in the morning simply to read the names into the record and then to have the matter approved or not approved, according to the whims and fancies of two or three people, is time-consuming and wasteful. Unless the select committee is going to be given some additional powers to consider other matters pertaining to the way in which

the standing committees might operate during the course of the year, the things we have done over the last number of years don't make much sense.

I want to point out to you that today, for example, we—my colleague and I—attempted to raise the matter of the possibility of making a recommendation to the House on the issue of substitution during the consideration of legislation. We pointed out that it was in the best interest of the members of the Legislature that they be permitted to sit on a committee with all rights during the time when that committee was considering legislation in which or for which they had a particular interest. This was refused by the chairman on the basis that he believed the committee didn't have the power to make recommendations to the Legislature with regard to matters of standing committees. It doesn't make sense that substitution be not permitted; it makes even less sense that a select committee be struck if that select committee's only job is a stereotyped job to review the names submitted by the various political parties.

I point out to you, for example, Mr. Speaker, the committee this morning did something which may or may not have been within its scope but which we on the committee decided was worthwhile. That was to add one member to the complement of the public accounts committee. That seemed to make sense to us and yet that wasn't within the terms of reference as they were set out. It wasn't specifically excluded but it certainly was not included specifically either.

I point out that neither was the matter of whether or not substitution could be permitted for consideration of other than the estimates specifically excluded. It wasn't included but it wasn't specifically excluded either. It was as much the right of the committee to determine that matter as it was the right of the committee to decide (a) to add one member to the public accounts committee or (b) to establish the quorum for the committees since neither of those two things was specifically set out in the motion that the House approved on Friday last.

I put this to you. If we're going to go through the motions of setting up an all-party committee to discuss the appropriate ways that standing committees might operate, let's at least give it the right to speak about all of the things raised by the members during the debate that takes place on the motion made by the House leader to establish the select committee. Let's at least allow the

select committee, once established, the opportunity to deal with all of the matters raised during the debate and at least to recommend to the House appropriate measures to be taken, rather than simply saying they're not matters to be dealt with by that select committee.

The truth of the matter is if they can't be dealt with by the select committee, there is really no appropriate procedure within the procedures of the House to deal with these matters. It's almost left to the whim of each individual standing committee to determine such things as whether the hearings it conducts will be conducted with or without any record being kept; whether or not the affairs of the select committee will be conducted by 12 or 13 members; or, for that matter, whether the membership should be changed in accordance with some other formula to be established.

I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if you're going to follow this procedure in any new parliament we should reconsider the ways in which the committee is set up and the terms of reference given to the committee; and that the committee be afforded the opportunity to deal sensibly with all of the difficulties which may have arisen over the course of the previous year.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kitchener.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, I agree substantially with the comments that have been made by the House leader of the New Democratic Party. Certainly, if the committee which, in turn, strikes membership of committees is going to have any particular effect or usefulness as it does its annual task, there must be a number of other items which are within the province of that committee to discuss and recommend.

It is interesting, of course, to note that we have had, I think, the happy result of increasing the membership, at least for this coming session, of the public accounts committee by an additional member. The comments raised by the member for Rainy River (Mr. Reid), who has served as chairman, are certainly without question reasonable ones since to be chairman of that committee, when there is a small opposition membership, means really to remove oneself from the day-to-day operation of asking questions or bringing up various points as the work of that committee is attended to. Having served as chairman of the public accounts committee for five years I think I am somewhat aware of the particular difficulties that can come up when committee member-

ship has the chairman removed from the members otherwise available to the opposition. This, of course, has not been the case historically in all the other committees, as the chairman is chosen from the government membership which is, of course, substantially larger in the first place. I do commend the result of the deliberations at least to the point of including an additional member with respect to the public accounts committee.

I am interested, of course, in this whole matter of substitution. This has been raised for the last several years, and for reasons really unknown to me, the government has refused to allow this suggested change. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it is indeed time that all of the rules of the Legislature are reviewed, not only to refer to this particular item but to others. Within a month's time it will be five years since the standing orders of the assembly were approved. They were approved on April 22, 1970.

Certainly there have been many changes and, I think, many benefits have resulted over the past year or so in the operation of the House and in the development and change of some of these rules. I think the results of the Camp commission report, particularly as perhaps they have affected both the member for Wentworth and myself in the creation of the positions of House leaders for the opposition parties, have I trust been helpful and useful to the operation of the Legislature.

There are though, particularly, other areas of concern which not only he and I share as being interested in the rules of the development of the House, but I'm sure which you share as well, Mr. Speaker. We have seen this whole matter of substitution referred to from time to time. Certainly it is time now to review this particular point and to allow for better and more reasonable operation of committees where the substitution of one member for the other can take place, so that the voting results—and, indeed, the membership and co-ordination of the committee work—will come to a better and happier form.

I would certainly hope that this matter can be actively pursued. I would suggest that this report now being considered should have added to it certain views from this House with respect to how we see the operation of the committees, at least in future if not now, and also our views with respect to the whole and entire matter of substitution.

Mr. R. C. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, the committee structure of this House is usually prepared to deal with those

matters relayed and referred to it. The terms of reference in regard to substitution were perfectly clear and therefore I ruled the member for Lambton's (Mr. Henderson) motion out of order in the committee and it was upheld. But I do feel that matters of substitution were raised in the original motion placed before the House; it was discussed and the House did not see fit to place before our committee in terms of reference the opportunity for us to discuss this thoroughly and to report back.

I am very sympathetic to the idea of substitution in those committees myself; I have said so in the past. I am convinced it is one thing that would be an improvement. However, I do believe the House should by motion refer that to our standing committee on procedural affairs. I think that's the proper committee; it has been in the past and substitution is one matter this House should seriously consider referring to that committee. I do not consider the striking committee as such was the proper committee. However, the House may see fit to consider it so at some point in time.

Mr. Speaker, the report of the committee is a recommendation to the House. The members of the striking committee did see fit to add one additional member to the public accounts committee, and in my moving of the adoption of the report I do hope that the House will join with me in recommending and accepting that motion in the report.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the report be adopted?

Mr. Bullbrook: No, I want to direct a question, if it might be permitted, during the course of some remarks and, if it is possible, have some response.

The problem with relying on the procedural affairs committee is a two-fold one. First of all, it very seldom sits. Secondly, it's dependent upon government action that the procedural affairs committee sits, Mr. Speaker.

It is all well and good and very placid to say that this matter of substitution should be best dealt with in that committee. I'm inclined to agree as a matter of principle that the hon. member is correct. Could he possibly assure us that he could bring in an amendment? Why not an amendment now, for example, adding to the striking committee's report that the question of substitution, as digested by that committee, be referred to the procedural affairs committee?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why not?

Mr. Bullbrook: Because it's a very vital thing. Why not? Why does he shake his head?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Because I was not allowed to do it by the terms of reference.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well if he wasn't allowed to do it by the terms of reference, then he can make a motion now. I'll make one if he wants. There's nothing at all that prohibits us from activating that procedural affairs committee.

It's obvious to many of us here in the House that at least members of the opposition are vitally concerned, Mr. Speaker, with the question of substitution. I for one sit on the private bills committee and the procedural affairs committee and yet I am not on the resources committee. My present and happy responsibility is as energy critic. As legislation comes before the resources committee it will be my obligation, hopefully, to go to that committee, lend some weight of debate to it, and I find myself completely stultified in active participation and supporting of my own position. That's what happens. Certainly it happens.

Mr. Martel: It does happen.

Mr. Bullbrook: Certainly it happens. Why do we keep shaking our heads and saying it doesn't happen? The fact of the matter is we know it happens. We sit there and see it happen.

Mr. Cassidy: Those guys are so simple-minded.

Mr. Bullbrook: We see a critic for the opposition debating with a minister and finding himself in the position of a political eunuch. He can't do anything about what he's talking about.

Mr. Martel: Move a motion.

Mr. Bullbrook: That's all we want to do. I agree, as a matter of procedure, that it should go before the procedural affairs committee; but to get the thing on the floor so that at least we will have some vote I am going to move an amendment.

Mr. Bullbrook moves that a member of each committee established by the motion may be substituted for by a member of his party upon notice given to the chairman or vice-chairman of the appropriate committee prior to the commencement of the day's proceedings of such committee.

Mr. Speaker: It is my understanding that this was dealt with by the House last Friday when the matter of substitutions—

Mr. Deans: There was no motion.

Mr. Speaker: Yes there was; and it cannot be reintroduced in this way.

Mr. Deans: The House leader held a discussion, but there was no motion.

An hon. member: There was no motion.

Mr. Singer: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the House leader gave the undertaking that the matter of replacement would be reviewed. Now we have had no direction from the House leader. We've got this motion. This will be the last chance we get before the committees are on their way to being set up. That's what the House leader said, that the matter of replacement or substitution would be reviewed.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, but the matter of substitutions was dealt with at that time. I think it's been a very useful discussion, however. I think possibly the House leader will have something further to say on that later, but in the meantime I must rule this motion out of order.

Mr. Bullbrook: I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I'm sorry if I gave that impression—

Mr. Bullbrook: I am sorry, I didn't understand. On a point of order, or for clarification, begging your indulgence, did you say that my motion was not in order?

Mr. Speaker: Yes. I believe it to be not in order because the matter of substitution was dealt with by the House.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): It wasn't dealt with.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The member wasn't here.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Yes it was. There were certain substitutions agreed to—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The House leader said he would review it.

Mr. Speaker: —and that closed that matter. The House leader indicated—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: —he was going to review the situation. I don't know whether he has yet or not.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On a point of order, before the hon. member speaks, I would like to submit to you, sir, that it was not dealt with when the motion arose previously, but I would think that the most reasonable way out of what may become an impasse would be for the House leader to indicate that the government is prepared to recommend that the matter go before the procedural affairs committee for discussion—

Mr. Bullbrook: Right.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —with, hopefully, a recommendation that is going to come back without any partisan division—

Mr. Bullbrook: Right.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —but for the good of the committee system of the House. How about that? Let's do that.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I will stay with the proposal that I made to the House yesterday. I must admit that I have not had an opportunity to bring it back, but I will give it consideration, possibly before the committees start their function, or at the earliest possible opportunity I'll come back with a proposal and see if it is acceptable to the House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Speaking to the motion, might I just say, Mr. Speaker, that I would recommend to the House leader that a matter such as this should be discussed by representatives of all parties in the procedural affairs committee, rather than being totally the decision of the House leader and anyone he might choose to discuss it with.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): We'll deal with it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: This is a matter that does not divide the parties, surely, but is in fact a matter having to do with the efficiency of the whole committee system. I don't believe there is a party decision here.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I'll consider that too.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I am tabling today for the information of the members of the House the final report of the Ontario Electoral Boundaries Commission.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT, 1975

Hon. Mr. Stewart, on behalf of Hon. Mr. Rhodes, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 1974.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, if I may, by way of explanation, I've been asked to say that the recent amendments to the Highway Traffic Act contained in Bill 177, 1975, enacted changes to the school bus stopping law which were to become effective on April 1, 1975. At the request of the Minister of Education, representatives of several school boards and representatives of school bus operators, I have been asked to introduce today on behalf of the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Rhodes), this bill which will have the effect of postponing the implementation of those specific amendments until Sept. 1, 1975.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (continued)

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Does the member have enough supporters?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): I have as sturdy and as indomitable band of 20 as he'll ever find. They are quite capable of running him in.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say as I begin that one of the things which gives me great pleasure, and I think gives the House great pleasure, is that I can participate in this Throne Speech debate in the presence of a co-colleague of all of us who has not been well but has happily returned to the House today, the member for Hamilton East (Mr. Gisborn). He has endured many such speeches, Mr. Speaker, with equanimity. I can't imagine after all the years that he has been in this chamber, how he can still abide it, but he does, God bless him, and that's a testament to his extraordinary resilience.

I'm going to freewheel through this Throne Speech at some little length. I'm not going to spend much time on pleasantries Mr. Speaker, in advance. The Throne Speech itself was an incomparably simple-minded and irrelevant document, and I don't really think it deserves much more than that. I thought it was almost touching that the former provincial Treasurer should say that it was of a philosophic nature with thematic content—no Aristotle he. The Speech from the Throne has about it the literary and philosophic quality of the editorial pages of the *Globe and Mail*, if it even ascends to that height. I suppose it could be given to a grade 10 class for parsing—that's a possibility—or to a grade 12 class to show how you can turn the incomparable beauty of the English language into turgid drivel. But I suspect that just to consign it to obscurity would be the best place for it.

The Throne Speech therefore in this instance can be merely a peg to my remarks. I am going to start with the Premier of Ontario (Mr. Davis) and I am going to end with him. That seems to me to be appropriate. He is after all the man who has masterminded Ontario's present position, or he may be seen by some as the *bête noire*. He is a man who has experienced the flush of adoration in 1971 and the pallor of indignity in 1975. He is a man who probably feels much at this moment.

Mr. Speaker, I have been called in latter weeks by a great many people who are forever writing articles about the Premier. There has been one journalist in the gallery for the last week or so, waiting to catch every breathless moment of the Premier's words when he's here for an article for a major magazine, the Canadian, I think. I was interviewed not long ago by someone from the refurbished, resuscitated *Saturday Night* about the Premier. I was interviewed not very long ago by someone writing of the Premier for *Toronto Life*. I must say it has a sort of florid political obituary flavour about it. I am amazed at all the queries.

When I have been asked to talk about the Premier—I hope the Minister of Culture and Recreation (Mr. Welch) will convey my remarks—I am inclined to talk about the Premier in some personal ways. I see the public man. I don't see the private man all that much. I like the Premier very much. I consider him—I always have—a very generous and decent person. I have a sense of him that I have always felt in a very specific kind of way and which I really haven't discussed very often publicly. My sense of the Premier

is embodied in one very special role, and I suppose in a sense it leads into a number of things I want to say.

I have been one of those few in this Legislature who have been fortunate enough to enter the inner sanctum, to walk right into the Premier's office. I want to assure his cabinet colleague it doesn't happen very often, and it will never happen again after this afternoon, that I know. But I have actually walked into the Premier's office. He has a little cluster of chairs off to the left of his desk. The Minister of Culture and Recreation has been there once or twice, so he knows there is a little cluster of chairs there. When they fall from glory or they are re-appointed, I am sure they visit him in that little office.

You sit in the cluster of chairs in a very informal way, with the Premier smoking happily a very large cigar. I do the same, but mine is an Old Port and his is Cuban. It is all a matter of ideology.

We chat in a friendly way and then something invariably happens—I am absolutely sure it's orchestrated—that encapsules the Premier for me. A kind of chime rings through the room. You know what I mean. I have always thought it sounds like Tinkerbelle in Peter Pan. It's a most extraordinary little chime.

The Premier's eye turns and looks over to the console apparatus behind his desk where a number of hot lines are arranged, with little lights and buttons. It is kind of like the panel of a DC-8 just there behind the Premier's desk. The Premier excuses himself with a nod of his head, he gets up and walks over to that console, and he clicks the little button that turns off the particular light.

He picks up the receiver, taking the cigar out of his mouth. He puts the receiver to his ear, because it is always a terribly important call—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: —and the most benign smile crosses his face. I have never seen a sense of such intense and acute satisfaction as when that receiver comes off, the light goes on, the phone call comes through. I suspect it's the closest thing to political eroticism this chamber has ever witnessed. And I sense about it all: That is power. That's power. That to the Premier is the exercise of power.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): He is talking to his wife.

Mr. Lewis: Alas, I've never been there at that moment. It's always Fleck or—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Or some flack.

Mr. Lewis: Or a flack or Stewart or Kelly or Macaulay—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Or Clare.

Mr. Lewis: Or Westcott. I can't think in my entire experience—

Mr. J. Duksza (Parkdale): Ross Shouldice.

Mr. Lewis: Or Ross Shouldice. In my entire experience I don't think it's ever been a cabinet minister. But then, maybe they don't have access to the lines.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): He grimaces when a cabinet minister calls.

Mr. Lewis: I have always seen the Premier as a man who absolutely loves the trappings of power. I don't deny him that right.

Mr. Bounsall: So short-lived.

Mr. Lewis: He enjoys it immensely. It is for him very much the nature of the political process. But what has happened in Ontario is that what goes with that exercise of power—however incidentally it is revealed about men in positions of influence—whatever has happened to that power, the leadership that must accompany it has gone. And if the Tories in Ontario can be characterized in any phrase, in terms of the present problems which beset them and overwhelm them, it's the failure of leadership.

Mr. Bounsall: They should pull themselves together.

Mr. Lewis: I don't mean that in a very personal way about the Premier at all. I'm talking about the collective leadership of a government. I'm talking about the capacity of a party to govern. I'm talking about the ability to identify issues, to isolate them, to work out alternatives, to provide solutions, to do it lucidly, to do it promptly, to do it without evasion and forthrightly. That's the nature of political leadership. It requires some sensitivity, it requires being direct and open, and it never happens any more in Ontario. The failure is absolutely total. The failure of leadership is what leads so directly to Ontario's political disaffection.

It's most amazing that it should have happened so quickly. It's most amazing that it should have happened on so many issues simultaneously. In the place of leadership in

this province now, there's a kind of arthritic defensive government. That's what we're left with. They are turning ever inward on themselves, drawing comfort from each other, and rejected by the world. It's not incestuous, but they are forever drawing comfort from each other.

They are paranoid about the media; that's another classic comment on this government. They are angry when they should be gentle, and reticent when they should be outraged. They are creative about trivia, and helpless when it comes to matters of substance.

It's the classic last days of the old regime; absolutely classic. They move and retreat, move and retreat, move and retreat.

I told my colleagues at the Ontario NDP council meeting that the moving and retreating was like a political metronome ticking away the life of the government. You can watch it happening, Mr. Speaker. You can see it in policy after policy. Everybody in the province is aware of it, except perhaps the Tories themselves. But it's true, isn't it? They are forever the last to know.

There's no accessibility left about the government or the Premier. There is a certain inevitability about the collapse which is coming. As a matter of fact, it's almost Shakespearian. The Premier could be Hamlet, if he lost a little weight.

The inevitability of the Tories' defeat that is coming is documented in the broad failure of leadership in one area after another.

And what I want to do this afternoon—it's going to take a little time, but I'm going to do it as specifically as I can—is to indicate in a representative number of ministerial areas where the government has failed and how, and what the failure of leadership means. I am not going to do it just in critical terms; I am going to try to provide the House with a sense of what the New Democrats would do as an alternative because that is what we understand by way of leadership in this province; that is what we understand the craving of the electorate to be—for candour and some kind of leadership for Ontario.

I am going to deal with some ministries very briefly and with others to document a case. Let me assure the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacBeth) I will be coming to him, I would think, by Thursday afternoon. I am going to deal first, although he isn't here, with the Minister of Housing (Mr. Irvine). I want to say about the Minister of Housing—and I hope it will be conveyed to him, Mr. Speaker—that he is drowning in his announcements and his rhetoric; the entire bureaucracy

of that ministry is reduced to churning out endless press releases. I have never seen anything like it in my experience in this House. The whole ministry is one giant paperweight; that is the way they spend their time in the Ministry of Housing. One can't, in fact, cover the reality of the Ministry of Housing.

Let me try to put it in figures as simply as I can. In the Province of Ontario the government had 110,000 starts in 1973; it had 85,000 starts in 1974; it will be lucky to make 75,000 starts in 1975. A worse record of the provision of shelter is not known in this country. It is fair to say that this government has provided a great many housing units in the past although never anywhere near the need in absolute figures but the cumulative decline is really quite extraordinary.

The Minister of Housing is forever reminding us that he would like us to view it on a fiscal year basis. Do members know how many houses we are going to have in Ontario on a fiscal year basis, 1974-1975, by March 31? It will be 77,110.

Mr. T. A. Wardle (Beaches-Woodbine):
Up 2,000.

Mr. Lewis: What a fall that is from the 100,000 which were predicted whether on an annual year basis or on a fiscal year basis. We never used the money that was available in housing in this province. That was the crime. We let \$11 million sit in the Treasury in 1969 and 1970; \$6 million in 1970-1971; \$13 million in 1971-1972; \$54 million in 1972-1973; \$49 million in 1973-1974. We left \$133 million unused over those five years in the Province of Ontario. And the crisis which we face today is, in fact, inherited from all the years when the government preferred to make public pronouncements rather than to build housing. The Conservatives were toying with the dreams and expectations of Ontario and toyed with them in the most cavalier fashion.

We understand the game that is now being played. The government first started to attack the municipalities; now it has turned its guns on the federal government. Every diversion in the world is attempted except the real one, Mr. Speaker, which is to provide housing by the Province of Ontario for the people of Ontario. I cannot imagine a more hopeless record than this. Let me just take you through it.

June, 1974 over June, 1973, housing starts were down 45 per cent. July, 1974 over July, 1973, housing starts down 19 per cent.

August, 42 per cent; September, 41 per cent; October, 45 per cent; November, 41 per cent; December, 57 per cent; January, 1975, 30 per cent; February, 1975, 53 per cent. Can one imagine a more calamitous decline in the provision of shelter in any province in the country? And when one looks at what it means in terms of cost, if I can find it that way, the average cost in Metropolitan Toronto for the first half of March, 1975, was \$60,499 per real estate transaction.

Now look at what the Conservatives have done to housing in Ontario. They have priced everybody out of the market. Do members remember the Land Speculation Tax Act that was brought in here last year? Do they remember the kudos that was claimed for it about lowering housing prices? Do they know that this is the first time in years—in fact, probably in the history of this province—that the average price per home in any given month has exceeded the \$60,000 figure? Gone are all the promises of mid-1974, when it was said that the Land Speculation Tax Act would result in a serious drop in house prices in Metropolitan Toronto and other urban centres.

If we continue as we are in terms of cost of housing, Mr. Speaker, and in terms of number of units then we will be at a level of production in the vicinity of 65,000 by the end of this year. We will be lower than any year since 1966 and, if the government members want to understand why all of the under-30s are deserting them—if they want to try to understand why there is so much anxiety in the body politic about the housing situation, then it's because of the unavailability of shelter; it's because of the cost and it's because of the extraordinary reduction in numbers. It goes further than that.

One of the things we don't talk about often in this House, Mr. Speaker, is the question of rents and the impossible situation which is faced by people who have to rent. We forget that 50 per cent of Ontario, or very nearly 50 per cent, now rents accommodation. We forget that the vacancy rates are down below one per cent in many major urban centres. None of them seem to care over there. I want to come to that later too—about the human consequences of social neglect, because that's the nature of this government; that's the way it works.

Mr. Speaker, if you take a look at the CMHC figures which have finally begun to add rents into their calculations since they filled out their documentation as a public body, the following pattern emerges:

Between June 1974 and January 1975, one-bedroom apartments went up 14 per cent in the Toronto area; two-bedroom apartments went up 25 per cent; three-bedroom apartments went up 18 per cent. In a one-year period, December 1973 to December 1974 or January 1975, the jump for family accommodation, for two-bedroom apartments, was 36 per cent and for three-bedroom apartments 32 per cent. We put a little advertisement in the—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): You would have to be a cabinet minister to afford it.

Mr. Lewis: Sure you would have to be a cabinet minister, Mr. Speaker. You can't believe how these rents are clobbering people who are either on fixed incomes, low incomes or middle incomes. We put a little advertisement into the Toronto Sun a week or 10 days ago, and it read as follows:

"Attention: Has your rent gone up? How much? We'd like to know. Please call NDP research—" and the number is there. I'm not going to give the government members the number. We don't want them phoning us and I know they'd never find it by themselves.

The kinds of patterns of rental increases that we're identifying through the phone calls—coming in, I may say, a good many a day—are really amazing. Let me give you some examples, Mr. Speaker:

Greenwin runs an apartment building at 155 Balliol: A two-bedroom apartment rent went up from \$245 to \$318, a \$73 increase or 30 per cent. Meridian, at 55 Oakmount: A one-bedroom unit went from \$172 to \$225, a \$53 increase or 31 per cent. At 225 Markham Rd.—not far from where I live, I know the area well—Fathom Holdings: Two-bedrooms up 26 per cent. Another Meridian apartment at 106 Goodwood Park in East York: From \$163 to \$223, for 37 per cent. At 12 Auburndale Court in Rexdale, Sonol Investments: A two-bedroom, up from \$200 to \$270, 35 per cent.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Cadillac, 77 Quebec Ave. in High Park: A one-bedroom, up 20 per cent.

As I walked in here this afternoon I was given figures that had just come in on the phone today. I don't know whether I could find them. They all vary. Yes, here they are. I jotted down a couple that are particularly appropriate. At 120 George Henry Blvd., Cadillac Fairview: Three-bedroom, up from \$239 to \$314, 31 per cent. At 370 Riddell

Ave., a Tannenbaum apartment: Two-bedroom, from \$234 to \$315, 35 per cent.

Will the government tell me how it is conceivable that people at the end of a lease—if lease they have and for never more than a year, let it be said, in most of these places—can cope with increases of \$50, \$60, \$70 or \$80 a month, increases which reflect 20, 25, 30 or 35 per cent? We did this last year as a party because we were interested. Last year we put it in the Toronto Daily Star. The Star wouldn't let us run the ad this year. The Star discriminates against homosexuals who want to place ads and political parties which want to place ads; another ideological confusion, I would think. In any event, we are not allowed to place an ad of this kind in the Toronto Star. The Toronto Sun said "yes."

Last year the increases in rent were roughly in the 15 to 25 per cent range. This year the increases in rent are in the 25 to 35 per cent range. The Minister of Culture and Recreation is holding the fort singlehanded against the infidel, sitting here watching the storming of the gates placidly, knowing full well that for the moment he's in control; for the moment, and barely.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Picking his teeth.

Mr. Lewis: He is not picking his teeth. What a nonsensical thing to say; it's hardly cultural.

Mr. Foulds: It is recreational.

Mr. Lewis: Does he bite his nails too? He doesn't have nearly the aggression I have, my friend.

Hon. R. Welch (Minister of Culture and Recreation): I don't put ads in the papers.

Mr. Lewis: No, I'm sure he doesn't, and then only in the personal column. I want to say that although he can receive it in a fairly phlegmatic and relaxed way, what it does to individual people, of course, is beyond contest.

We also did something else, just in order to cover all bases, we inquired with the Metro Landlord and Tenant Advisory Bureau. They are up to 20,000 calls a year now. I don't know how the devil they handle it, in terms of the load they have, with the people they have there.

Very few people phone the Metro Landlord and Tenant Advisory Bureau in order to question them about rent increases, because they know there is absolutely nothing that

can be done about it; absolutely nothing that can be done about it. But, in fact, the rent increases that they are noting just idly by the phone—let me give you the percentage increases, Mr. Speaker—are as follows, just for the last few calls they took, I think in the last couple of weeks: 23 per cent, 23 per cent, 43 per cent, 24 per cent, 56 per cent, 24 per cent, 48 per cent, 33 per cent, 24 per cent, 43 per cent, 23 per cent, 50 per cent, 27 per cent, 26 per cent, 39 per cent, 31 per cent, 41 per cent, 50 per cent, 26 per cent, 79 per cent.

Thank God, Mr. Speaker, there is one province in this country, the Province of British Columbia, which has a piece of rent control legislation which forbids any landlord, under the present shortage of rental accommodation, to extract more than 10½ per cent from the tenant. That is what we should have in the Province of Ontario, make no mistake about it. As long as we have this kind of shortage they don't hold their tenants to ransom; which is what we are doing in Ontario with the complicity of the government.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Five, six, seven, eight, nine, 10, all 11 of them over there.

Mr. P. J. Yakubski (Renfrew South): Tell the other side of the story. They have no rental accommodation in BC since the rent control programme.

Mr. Lewis: In the absence of—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please, the hon. member for Scarborough West has the floor.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): There's only one cabinet minister present.

Mr. Lewis: The absence of cabinet ministers is made up for by the presence of the member for Renfrew South, as we all know. Right, right.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I think his presence is some kind of a plot; dastardly at that.

Mr. Yakubski: The member for Scarborough West should not tell us that. There is no rental accommodation going up in BC. It is the outrageous result of Barrett's socialist policies. No rental units are being built.

Mr. Lewis: Just a second. My friend can make his speech in the Throne debate when he wants to, and he can grunt animatedly too.

I want to say that the failure of leadership of this government in the housing field, as all people feel and all surveys demonstrate, is one of the real millstones around the neck of this God-forsaken government, because there is nothing left to it. They have done nothing on condominiums to prevent conversions. They have done nothing about the conversion to adult-only buildings. They have done nothing about rent control, and their provision of accommodation in the private sector is hopeless. And it will never change until over there they abandon that old free-enterprise fetishism of theirs and recognize that the only way there will be houses in this province is when the government acquires land from developers, and many people in Ontario are beginning to understand that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me turn to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. W. Newman). Again, as in all of the critical areas of this government, there is a failure of leadership. And I want to tell you that the Ministry of the Environment is the laughing stock of environmentalists in this province—probably right across the country. It is also true that the minister is pleasant enough, but his policies are open to ridicule everywhere. And one need only document it very very simply.

To this day there is no environmental impact legislation in the Province of Ontario, and so everything happens, from the construction of Stelco at Nanticoke to 7,500 residential units on the Niagara Escarpment, without the slightest environmental impact assessment worthy of the name; not one, not one.

One would have thought that after all these years there could be some spontaneous response about environmental pressures—none at all. They've got an Environmental Hearing Board established under that ministry which continues to be a laughing stock. The behaviour of the Environmental Hearing Board in the downtown lead hearings in the city of Toronto was frankly a scandal.

My colleagues, the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) and the member for Parkdale met earlier with a committee representing a large number of citizens that had come to the Legislature to present a brief in terms of the lead pollution in downtown Toronto as a result of Canada Metal, Toronto Refiners and Smelters, et al. They wanted the hearing board farce to stop.

This government has set up an Environmental Hearing Board, but has given it no

powers worthy of the name. It allows itself to be run roughshod over by a number of lawyers who abuse public hearings for the purpose of making a stated case on behalf of corporations. And the Environmental Hearing Board takes it all passively.

The programme for recycling and reclamation in this province is laughable. And we are still obsessed with waste management. Isn't it incredible that to this point in time, no matter how often the Leader of the Opposition asks, no matter how often I ask, we still don't know whether the Hope township landfill site is to proceed or not? That's called the failure of political leadership.

Last night at 8 o'clock I met with a group of constituents from the riding of my colleague from Wentworth (Mr. Deans), the Binbrook anti-dump committee, yet another group of citizens facing the prospect of a landfill site over 500 acres in size to take the waste disposal from the Hamilton-Wentworth region. This is yet another group of citizens driven to frantic protestation because the government will not proceed with its reclamation and recycling plans. That's called the failure of political leadership.

I stood outside yesterday afternoon with the Minister of the Environment as he wandered through the Pollution Probe caravan. And he was sitting in the caravan counting his flip-tops, just peeling them off and throwing them in the air—"She loves me; she loves me not"—with his little flip-tops from the cans.

You know, I'll tell you something, Mr. Speaker. When I listen to that minister I feel if bluster were bottles there wouldn't be a can left in the Province of Ontario.

He sat in the caravan yesterday talking to the reporters, talking to the members of Pollution Probe, promising nothing and making no efforts at providing any responses to the solid waste task force and the recommendations by that task force. It's called the classic failure of political leadership.

When he refuses to say what is happening to the Hope township dump, it's called not levelling with the public of Ontario. There is simply no recognition in the government any longer of what policy alternatives mean—not complex, not incomprehensible, just real and direct. There is no recognition of that at all. No recognition of straight talk; no recognition of leadership.

When one leaves the Minister of the Environment, one can move comfortably to the Minister of Health (Mr. Miller), that very lovable minister, the man most likely to be hugged in public. Does it happen to them

at cabinet sessions? Do ministers feel badly about it? Do they feel detached when people turn to the Minister of Health with an affection they never showed for others? He has bitten off a great deal, that man. He's trying very hard at it. He gives public admonitions where admonitions are required. He shafts the acupuncturists when he's not happy with what they're doing. He'll now allow the Minister of Culture and Recreation to straighten his ears, courtesy of OHIP. That too has been reinstated in the last several days.

Everything that is fairly modest, the Minister of Health is able to do. But in the three most critical areas of health social policy, he is, as all his predecessors, completely defunct. Do you realize, Mr. Speaker, that we have entered the year 1975 and there is no programme for the serious construction of community health centres right across Ontario to reduce the cost of hospital beds in Ontario and to shift the emphasis to preventive medicine? Do you realize that we have come through 32 years of Tory rule, and in March, 1975, we still don't have a preventive medical alternative to the most rigid, inflexible and inefficient delivery system man and woman can devise?

Do you realize, Mr. Speaker, that we have come right through to March, 1975, and despite all the talk of the last years, we still have not arranged an alternative method of payment for the medical profession? They are still on fee for service. They are still getting their net \$45,000 plus per year—and every year going up. We still haven't worked out salary arrangements, capitation arrangements, fee for service plus salary—all of the things that we have talked about—to prevent health from being destroyed in terms of the charge on the public purse. None of that has occurred. All of the major problems then remain acute failures of political leadership.

Beyond that, there is another matter now which has become central to the life of Ontario. I want to deal with it briefly. It's the matter of occupational health. It's a matter of protecting the workers of Ontario in their work environments. Here the failure, the abdication, is truly shocking.

I don't ever quite know how to deal with all of this. I don't understand what has happened to the Minister of Health on the issue of occupational health. I must say that to you, Mr. Speaker. I don't understand how he can respond in a whole range of other areas but on the issue of occupational health is reduced to personal paralysis. The fact of the matter is that there is something wrong with

that occupational health branch, and I want it conveyed to him as strongly as possible. There is something wrong with that branch. We sit here with equanimity and we listen to it being tossed off.

The occupational health branch was in Reeves township at the Johns-Manville asbestos mine two years ago, to do asbestos fibre level testing. Do you ever bet? I would be prepared to stake a seat on it, that the levels of asbestos fibre emission two years ago were well above the permissible levels in Ontario. How does it happen when men work in an environment so fraught with danger that it's never followed up? What? Overwork? Claptrap! They just don't care.

We saw it, as a matter of fact, by those incredible memos which were exchanged around the mining industry in Elliot Lake. I don't understand it. I say to the Minister of Health that he simply has to move in and clean house because we are dealing very much with the life and death of workers. I couldn't believe what I picked up today but I am sure it's true. I am sure nothing happened in that intervening two years, just as very little is happening now.

What about lead? I am going to have a lot more to say about lead. We in this party are going to have much more to say about lead in the weeks ahead. It's going to be an issue measurably of the asbestos, silicosis, mercury kind in this province because of what is emerging about lead. But the occupational health people have done the same thing. They get report after report. The emissions in the plant are at a danger level. The dangers to the community are documented. No one does anything about it. They cluck-cluck when another child enters Toronto's Sick Children's Hospital with a blood-lead level greater than 60, 70 or 80 or whatever the level is supposed to be. I guess 80 is the permissible threshold limit value in Ontario.

Mr. L. Maeck (Parry Sound): The leader of the NDP is talking about the minister behind his back.

Mr. Lewis: It is the apologists for the status quo who are emerging in the occupation health branch, and I feel direct enough with the Minister of Health that I have no qualms about saying that.

As I say, the Minister of Health offers admonitions. I got a very interesting letter from the Minister of Health just yesterday. I am not even going to go into the details of it. I had brought to his attention a request to the occupational health branch about a

potential or possible safety hazard in northern Ontario, a request that had come to them in June, 1974, and they had done nothing about it until they were reminded in January, 1975.

I wrote to the Minister of Health, and I said, "Can you explain this to me? Can you tell me about it?" He wrote me back and said he was no happier about the lapse of time than I was and he had made his feelings known, or words to that effect. I think I have paraphrased him accurately.

How do you explain a two-year absence of occupational health testing in one of the most dangerous work situations in the Province of Ontario, Mr. Speaker?

I was up at the Oliver Mowat school when the community gathered to hear the various presentations about the possible dangers of asbestos from the Johns-Manville plant. I heard the presentation from Dr. Cowle at that school. I am going to say something now that I feel very reluctant to say, but I am going to say it anyway. I haven't heard as facile and gratuitous a presentation in a long time. It worried me, not because of its lack of content but because of what it said about the attitude of the occupational health group.

Mr. Bounsall: Clean out the entire branch!

Mr. Lewis: More than that, all of the old saws about blue asbestos being the serious hazard compared to everything else were trotted out by people no less than those medical practitioners in the Ministry of Health, when they all know that the major studies by Selikoff and Nicholson had been done in areas where blue asbestos fibres weren't even present and that all of the resulting deaths, the mesothelioma, the lung cancer and the asbestosis that is chronicled is as evident when you are using white asbestos fibres as blue asbestos fibres. To drag that blue herring across the scene is to do a disservice to all things in occupational health.

That branch worries me. It worries me that they know they are exceeding the threshold limit value right now in a number of working locations in the Johns-Manville plant in Scarborough, and no one seems to be concerned about it. It worries me that people know that the present level of two fibres per cubic centimetre is an inadequate level and no one does anything about it.

There is even a major international symposium next week in New York at which papers will be given to demonstrate occupational hazards and carcinogenesis, and it will be attested to again that the levels we

accept are dangerous levels. How does it go on? How does it happen?

Dr. Cowle recently sat down with Dr. Charles Bryan, head of respiratory research at the Sick Children's Hospital. Dr. Bryan had approached the Minister of Health about the possibility of doing some work with Johns-Manville people after he read about what had happened in the papers. He was referred to Dr. Cowle. He has had, I gather, a very excellent discussion with Dr. Cowle.

I have in front of me an excellent letter from Dr. Bryan, dated March 3, indicating the kinds of things which should be done and what he would like to do. I presume maybe the occupational health people are doing it or will be doing it. I think he feels satisfied on some grounds. What the physicians in the field want to do, anxious and interested as they are, are pulmonary lung function tests for the workers, sputum cytology, a lot of x-rays; and do them not just for the workers but for the children of the families.

Do members know that Dr. Selikoff's most recent work dealt with the wives and children of the asbestos workers in Paterson, New Jersey, who were exposed to levels not all that much in excess of the levels in Scarborough? Do members know that they have found a 40 per cent x-ray abnormality in the wives and children? What's happening with the children and the wives here in Ontario?

How is it not possible to develop a programme in conjunction with the Hospital for Sick Children, with the Toronto General or with Mount Sinai where they have the special respiratory research unit? How is it not possible to do it in conjunction with Montreal and McGill where they now have a grant from the Department of National Health and Welfare, to monitor the situation and to explore it? Why is it that Ontario can never enter into it?

Mr. Martel: They wait until it's too late.

Mr. Lewis: Why isn't it possible for the Minister of Health to establish an occupational health institute in this province, comprising government, unions, industry, the medical profession? The kind of body that would help the minister set standards, provide enforcement, provide regulation and move in like an iron fist if it was varied from by a fraction at any given moment? That's the kind of thing we would like to do. That's called political leadership. That's called not operating in a vacuum. That's called showing some initiative in the face of an incredible occupational health hazard. But there's no such leadership. There's just gobbledegook or, as one of my associates

in the caucus told me, there's bafflebag which is another neat phrase to describe the sounds emitted from the government front bench when dealing with matters of occupational health.

I want to raise something else with the House. Where is the co-ordination in all of this? To this day nobody knows what anybody else is doing. The Workmen's Compensation Board doesn't know what occupational health is doing. Occupational health doesn't know what Labour is doing. Labour doesn't know what Natural Resources is doing. We watch the whole pattern unfold in a clinically fatal way and nobody knows what anybody else is doing. They can't be so unresponsive and callous that they watch people get ill and die without responding. It means that people don't know. Where is the co-ordination? We would like to establish the co-ordination.

I have an even more central question to ask about the occupational health branch and that has to do with the Elliot Lake survey which, coincidentally enough, my colleague from Sudbury East raised in question period. I had no idea he intended to. What's happened to that survey? What the devil's going on in the province. As I recall it, the request came to the minister in October or November, 1973. The survey and the tests were done in February and March, 1974. It's now March-April, 1975. What's happening to the document? How long does it take to look at x-rays? How long does it take to analyse the lung function tests? What is it with the occupational health people?

I want to tell you something, Mr. Speaker, that also worries me very much. Do you know that from the day of that survey to the present, the one man who knows more about the Elliot Lake x-ray situation than any other person in this province, Dr. Charles Stewart of the Workmen's Compensation Board, head of the chest division, probably the most notable man in his field at the board—probably in the province generally in chest matters—from that day to this, Dr. Stewart has never been consulted, not once? How is that explained? How does that happen?

Here's a man who was a doctor in Elliot Lake. Here's a man who read the x-rays for years. Here's a man who, in 1974, went back and re-read the x-rays and much of the data. How did it happen that the occupational health branch set itself up and apart from such knowledge and expertise?

And how does it therefore happen that the findings of the occupational health branch differ so fundamentally from Dr. Stewart's findings? How did that happen?

A medical difference of opinion? Scientific evidence? How will we know? The key figure was never consulted with. How does it all occur? What does it say about the occupational health branch?

Let me tell you something about it. The occupational health branch survey of the miners in Elliot Lake shows, I am told authoritatively, that there are 23 cases of silicosis presently in Elliot Lake—23 cases; it is quite unbelievable. Dr. Stewart, in writing the International Labour Office on Workmen's Compensation Board letterhead—and anyway, this information is now public; I don't think it is wrong to read it—he said:

There are at present more than 40 men working in Elliot Lake who have confirmed radiological silicosis. Most of these men are working on surface and non-dust exposure jobs, but there are a few still working underground. The majority have mild to moderate disability only, some have no disability, and a small percentage have major disability.

How does a doctor who is intimately familiar with it, who has gone back to check, find 40 cases of radiological disability and radiological silicosis, and the ministry's study turns up 23 cases? I want to know something about the occupational health branch. I want to know more than that. That study in the occupational health branch turns up 47 people who have probably early effects of silica dust inhalation. Dr. Stewart turns up 100 additional men in dust exposures who are at risk. He says:

This means that, in my opinion, all demonstrate some of the stigmata of silica dust effects or pre-silicosis. In other words, those changes in the chest x-rays which we know in others have often progressed to frank radiological silicosis.

Let me read more of the letter, Mr. Speaker:

Included in this 100 are those whose x-rays show very early changes, often subtle, and occurring in men who started work prior to 1961. Some of these men have positive tuberculin tests—not all—and therefore this adds slightly to the risk factor. There are approximately 30 men in this borderline group. The majority of approximately 64 show more distinct x-ray changes than those seen in the prior group, and which clearly suggest incipient silicosis or pre-silicosis. Once again, all of these men, with the exception of two or three, started work before 1961.

Finally, there are a half dozen cases of pulmonary sarcoidosis, which should be included in this risk group.

That was half a dozen cases, but the survey conducted by occupational health shows no cases of sarcoidosis. How did that happen?

Let me read you Dr. Stewart's conclusions, because I think they are important. He says:

It follows from this breakdown that a great many of the 100 men concerned—and this is over and above those who have real silicosis—are not presently in urgent need of removal from dust, and in fact the majority have no significant pulmonary impairment.

To show you how direct a person he is, he doesn't exaggerate things, this man. He continues:

Many of these men can continue working underground, but since almost all of them started work before 1961, and because a recent environmental study revealed the majority of dust counts to be above the threshold limits value, then almost certainly a majority will develop frank silicosis if they continue underground. This must be the assumption, since almost all the men who develop frank silicosis so far started work before 1961.

This group of 100 men by no means includes all men who started work before 1961 and who have continued in dust exposure uninterrupted to date. It may well be prudent to consider all such men at risk, even though no x-ray changes are evident. All have accumulated a significant radiation load in addition to free silica over these years, and a limit should be placed on their continued exposure.

It would seem reasonable for the future to impose a 20-year limit on all men exposed to dust and radiation. For those now working and who started before 1965, ideally a 15-year limit should be set and certainly 20 years should be the absolute maximum for those who started before 1961.

Stewart and others are people who have immersed themselves and their whole lives in dealing with this issue and those johnnies-come-lately from occupational health wander in and do a survey—which we've waited more than a year to receive—whose figures correspond not at all with the findings of those who've been on the spot for years. Maybe it says something about x-ray readings; maybe it says something about occupational health; I suppose what it mostly says is the time that is permitted to lag between interest and policy. It's called the failure of political leadership and, again, in this instance, it plays with the lives of workers.

Let me leave that with the Minister of Health and ask him simply to pursue it as he will, although I want to add one last footnote to it. I've become a perambulator of international conferences. I enjoy international conferences on occupational and environmental health matters. The Minister of Health not very long ago raised a question about Dr. Morgan's survey at the University of Toronto in its link between asbestos and laryngeal cancer. Dr. Cowle made a similar offhand remark at the Oliver Mowat meeting. I want to say something to the minister—the quality of the work that Dr. Morgan did compares very favourably with the quality of the work in the health study at Elliot Lake and I can't imagine what possesses the occupational health branch that the most knowledgeable people in the province are not called in to participate.

What is it about the ministry? What is this defensiveness? What are those apologies? Why can they not start to fight a hazard on behalf of workers? Why must they forever excuse and prevaricate? I don't understand it and the workers who are sick don't understand it either.

It's a natural move for me to shift from Health to Natural Resources while I'm on Elliot Lake, and I'm not going to spend time because I'd become absolutely irrational when dealing with it. It's a perfectly dreadful ministry in every sense. I don't care whether it's Algonquin Park or the recognition of northern needs, the Ministry of Natural Resources just demonstrates a failure of political leadership that's abject and total.

I just want to bring to the attention of the Legislature one small point: The dust counts at Rio Algom in Elliot Lake, whether or not anybody in the Legislature on the government's side cares, are still running above the recommended threshold limit. I have time and it's worth putting it on the record. The mines people themselves, the mining companies, say that silica dust of the kind found in Elliot Lake should not be in concentrations of greater than 200 particles per cubic centimetre. The Ministry of Health says no greater than 176 particles per cubic centimetre. To go over four, five, 10, 15 particles is pretty serious in the long run, so it has been chronicled, to health. In Rio Algom—and I hope to have figures on Denison by the end of this week—the level is 273 particles per cubic centimetre in 67 out of 77 locations tested in January.

Let me read what the Minister of Health said on Tuesday, Dec. 10, 1974, when he

tabled his original dust report. He said, and I quote from page 6233 of Hansard:

It is clear from this report that prompt action is necessary to correct this condition. The report also contains a list of the measures recommended for controlling the quartz hazard, and also for improving the methods now used to monitor that condition.

As the House will be aware, the presentation of these recommendations fulfils the present responsibility held by the Minister of Health in this matter, but I am assured by my cabinet colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources, that aggressive and constructive steps will be taken immediately by his ministry to follow through with corrective action involving those directly affected in the Elliot Lake area.

Did he mean to mislead the House, I want to ask the Minister of Health? It wasn't deliberate, was it? It was an inadvertent misleading of the House.

A little later and on the same day, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) said in answer to a question from the House leader of the Liberal Party, who asked about the tabling of the survey, "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I might say that we have some very positive plans and steps that we will be taking." I say, we say, balderdash.

That was Dec. 10. It's more than three months later and the minister hasn't corrected a thing at Elliot Lake. I don't know whether it's the Minister of Natural Resources who is at fault or whether it's the Minister of Health who has now conspired with him to be at fault but they can't toy with people that way with flip little comments in the Legislature in response to legitimate questions put to them by the opposition. Nothing has been done. Some would say it was a direct misleading of the House. I think it was worse than that but I can't say it so what's the point?

A final footnote about the Ministry of Natural Resources. Seldom has a ministry been so neatly blackmailed by a corporation as in the case of Johns-Manville and the Reeves township mine. I want to call that in because my colleague from Cochrane South (Mr. Ferrier), in whose riding the mine is located, represents many of the workers; and my colleague from Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren) has many of the workers in his riding. They've met with the workers and they've talked with the workers.

Mr. Speaker, the closing down of the Johns-Manville mine in Reeves township was a vindictive, corporate act. It was meant to penalize the workers because Johns-Manville had been criticized publicly. There were nine years of asbestos ore body left. It would have been possible with modern technology to bring that mine and mill into a model for the North American continent as my colleague for Nickel Belt suggested the other day. It

could have been run by way of a Crown corporation. As it now stands Johns-Manville is not paying the men for the days they lost in the interim period before formal termination was registered. The company has thumbed its nose at the government. The government made no announcement at all. It made no public statement. Johns-Manville is laughing at the government.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): It shouldn't be allowed to operate.

Mr. Lewis: It should not be in this blessed province, as a matter of fact, to behave that way.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Throw them out.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): Throw them out.

Mr. Lewis: Members cannot imagine the way in which the company has dealt with the workers up in Reeves township.

Mr. Havrot: Don't be so sanctimonious.

Mr. Martel: Maybe the member can tell us about his statement regarding the Indians.

Mr. Havrot: The Indians? Would the member like a few?

Mr. Martel: Yes, tell us about them.

Mr. Havrot: What does the member know about it?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Mr. Lewis: Does the member have some statements he wants to make?

Mr. Martel: What was the price?

Mr. Lewis: I presume the member for Timiskaming is as enlightened as the hon. James Richardson. Is that fair? Am I on base? I would have stopped that.

Mr. Havrot: I don't even know what he is talking about.

Mr. Lewis: I must say Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health or to the few—

Mr. Martel: They're about to leave us.

Mr. Lewis: I am driving them out. They are now down to nine. It is a bravura performance on my part; I think when I get down below five I'm stopping for reasons of egocentricity if nothing else. I insist on having more than five Tories here. There must be enough of them to be able to call a vote

should they feel the government collapsing around them.

I don't know how the minister allows these corporations to get away with it. He has treated Johns-Manville with kid gloves from the outset. He has done nothing very important to clean up internally that plant in Scarborough and he allowed them to play fast and free with the economic livelihood of 200 workers up in Reeves township. It is a scandal what Johns-Manville has done to him.

This is a real freebooting, entrepreneurial outfit, make no mistake about it. What it has done in the United States is a chapter in itself. I have a delicious couple of paragraphs, Mr. Speaker, which I want to put on the record, from the vice-president of Johns-Manville, Dr. Paul Kotin, who is based in Denver, Col., and who asked me to say these things so I might as well read directly from his letter.

After this man came to Canada and held a press conference and said that Johns-Manville could conform to the minister's regulations; after he told scientific colleagues and then me personally in Chicago that Johns-Manville could bring the Reeves mine and mill well down below the recommended level and that he had "a blank cheque" to do it with, the corporation closed it down.

Mr. Havrot: Why?

Mr. Lewis: They closed it down as a petulant corporate act. That's why. They wouldn't spend the additional money.

An hon. member: That's the corporate ethic.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, it's called the corporate ethic. Then Kotin has the effrontery to write me a letter, two paragraphs of which read as follows:

Finally, I hope that you and other members of Parliament, to say nothing of other constituencies concerned with health, safety and environmental quality, will take the opportunity to commend Johns-Manville in taking the serious step of shutting operations on the basis of its commitment to employees and environmental health.

I need not tell you that in this particular situation and in the current economic milieu, this move is an expression of corporate regard at the very highest level and where commercial considerations are clearly of a second-order concern.

Mr. Ferrier: What a twisted mind that man has.

Mr. Lewis: In terms of my ethnic inheritance, Mr. Speaker, that's a piece of corporate chutzpah which won't be equalled in this House.

Let me come to the next area, and that's the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart). Everywhere one turns in this government the repetitive theme of failure of leadership is documented in ministry after ministry. All the things a public expects from a government cannot be followed through. The Minister of Agriculture and Food has just announced, through the Throne Speech, that there will be a farm income programme. When was the Throne Speech? It's right here in front of me—March 11, 1975.

On Feb. 16, 1975, the member for York South, speaking to the nominating convention of the new riding of Brant-Norfolk, began his press release this way:

Last year the New Democratic Party was the lone political voice calling for an income assurance plan as a major means of stabilizing the agricultural industry.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): That is not so.

Mr. Lewis: He said: "The provincial Liberals were silent on the issue—"

Mr. Gaunt: That is not so.

Mr. Lewis: "So was the Agriculture Minister, Mr. Stewart. What a difference a year makes."

Mr. Gaunt: That is not so.

Mr. Lewis: What a difference a year makes. As a matter of fact—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If it's a press release from the member for York South—

Mr. Lewis: If it is a press release from him, then it is accurate. It is absolutely accurate.

An hon. member: Right on.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact, it's overwhelmingly accurate, as you can see—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: So says the member.

Mr. Lewis: So say us all—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Not quite us all.

Mr. Lewis: —we who know Liberals and sniff Tories.

The "Challenge of Abundance" was what year, 1969?

Mr. MacDonald: It was 1969-1970.

Mr. Lewis: That was when the deputy minister chairing that committee, Biggs, I believe, came out with the proposition of an income security programme—which from then and to this day, and before, this party and the member for York South in particular, had promoted—to try to rationalize the agricultural sector. At a death-bed moment, at the 11th hour, on collision course, this government brings in an income security programme for the farmers. Well, so it says. We've seen nothing of it. It's just a promise in the Throne Speech.

But more important, Mr. Speaker, there is still absolutely no programme in Ontario to preserve agricultural land. And again, as one looks over the litany of government neglect in the Province of Ontario, agricultural land emerges as a pretty significant issue. It's no longer just a backwater subject. It is absolutely central.

Agricultural land is lost every day through the continued appropriation of land for government projects by the Minister of Housing, by the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Rhodes), by the Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell) and by the Minister of the Environment. An example is the landfill site at Binbrook in Wentworth that I met with the people on yesterday and talked about today. Even that landfill site is going to take three productive agricultural farms. Wherever you see agriculture in production in this province, the government moves to appropriate it.

Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party has said that we don't care whether it requires zoning. We don't care whether it requires development controls. If necessary, there will have to be consideration of compensation for expectations unfulfilled. It might not happen, but that is at least a legitimate consideration.

We don't care whether it's an agricultural bank that is established by the government. We don't care whether it's the kind of freeze which again emerged from British Columbia, although we don't have to go to that extreme in this province. We would not allow a single further acre of class 1 or class 2 agricultural land to go out of production in Ontario in the mindless and destructive fashion which this government permits.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, when the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) was faced with the matter of agricultural land at the Oshawa

cabinet meeting, what he said? It was reported in the Financial Times and elsewhere. Let me read you the news item:

Darcy McKeough, provincial Treasurer, has told rural municipal officials, who bear the loss of farmland to urban expansion, they will have to solve their problems without legislation.

Can you imagine that from the Treasurer of Ontario, Mr. Speaker? They will have to solve their problems without legislation.

Do you know what the Treasurer was saying? He was serving notice on the Ministry of Agriculture and Food that agricultural land will continue to go out of production in the future at the rate which characterizes the present. The Treasurer was making it clear that the government will not intervene on behalf of the farmer or on behalf of those consumers who quite normally, on a day-to-day basis, purchase food. He was saying that as a matter of government policy agricultural land has had it in Ontario.

We repudiate that. In terms of the failure of political leadership, could one possibly have a more vivid example? I think not, and I think the credibility gap therefore grows.

Mr. Speaker, I want then to move to another area where the credibility gap grows. I'm being selective. I want you to know that the most painful part of preparing this Throne Speech was excluding areas of importance which show the failure of leadership. I've been terribly, remorselessly selective in extracting those items which are central. There are all kinds of items which are just as important which I cannot deal with. Happily, my colleagues will elaborate on them through the course of the Throne Speech itself.

The matter of education comes to mind. I'm prompted to raise it generally. I intended to, especially in light of some of the comments that were made in this Legislature yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition.

I don't know where one starts on the matter of education, Mr. Speaker. I listened to the Leader of the Opposition yesterday and I felt that the central point he was making was valid, although I must say, on the reading rather carefully of the research document from the board of education in Toronto which I read last night, I wasn't as persuaded of what it purported to say or what he said it suggested. However, that is irrelevant.

Throughout Ontario, there is a desperate and growing concern about education in this province, make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker. My colleague the member for Port

Arthur will elaborate somewhat on this theme when he speaks in the Throne debate. I want to speak to two issues where leadership has been terribly wanting.

The first is the whole question of teacher-board negotiations. It is almost beyond belief that the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) could have the temerity to say today that he was about to bring in a bill on collective bargaining. That teacher demonstration was Dec. 18, 1973. We haven't had legislation of a substantial kind in the year and three months—January, February, March—which has followed that. What is wrong with the people over there?

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): They think slowly.

Mr. Lewis: What is wrong with that government? What is it with them? Why do they allow situations to deteriorate? Why do they never intervene when it is in the public interest to intervene? How is it possible that they sit mute, silent, ineffective and indifferent to all of the crises that harass Ontario month after month?

That's why they have lost the confidence of the province. That's why every poll and survey show them a disintegrating rump. That's why the numbers here this afternoon exceed the numbers who will be re-elected in the next provincial election.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Where are those Tory members? What are they doing? Are they playing euchre?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact, I see no one here who will be re-elected, which is an interesting commentary. Some will lose their deposits, like the member for Timiskaming. Others, Mr. Speaker—oh, the guru of grunts enters again.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Look, it was 171 votes—and don't understate it again. Every vote counts when one wins by that margin, my friend. Don't tell me. I expect on redistribution to get that up to 172 or 173. Don't make light of it.

Mr. Havrot: Don't count on it.

Mr. Lewis: I don't. It could be nip and tuck.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: The member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) may be right. Those phre-

netic little gremlins in the Tory caucus, those impish gnomes, are probably huddled around a speaker somewhere listening to this debate and working on press releases to be issued in the next hour and 20 minutes to rebut this.

Hon. D. R. Irvine (Minister of Housing): I've got mine ready.

Mr. Lewis: Has the minister got his ready? I hope he does have it ready. He can just open any filing cabinet. I am surprised that he can find his way to his desk for the press releases that surround it.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Wall-paper for the house.

Mr. Lewis: I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the absence of direction in teacher-board negotiations is one of the most critical deficiencies of the government. It has been demonstrated time and again over the last several months.

I don't know whether the legislation would have forestalled Windsor, would have forestalled Thunder Bay, would have forestalled Ottawa; but I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, we in this caucus think that the government is responsible directly and personally for the three strikes in those areas. They may never have happened.

Before this debate ends, I am going to try to suggest why they need never have happened. But one of the guilty areas was the absence of legislation, because neither side has any sense of what to expect.

As a matter of fact, in Ottawa both sides are sitting breathless wondering what the announcement on ceilings is going to be, since obviously that will affect the pace of negotiations in Ottawa. But nothing comes from the government except the occasional muted rumour.

Now there's a second question in education which has to be dealt with which flows more from the debate. You know I must say to my colleague, the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor), my colleague the member for York South, my colleague the member for Riverdale, and the member for Port Arthur and others in the caucus, those of us who have responsibility for dealing with education or university estimates over the last several years in this House; those of us who have been in the House for eight to 12 years, let's put it that way—God it's a long time—those of us who have been here are not surprised at what is happening in the province right now, because it was predicted, Mr. Speaker. I say that to you. It was predicted in every estimate debate that

I participated in and that I can remember sitting and listening to from 1964 to 1972.

Let me talk for a moment about the cracks in the educational system that are emerging and let me stay away from the ceilings, because that's all we talk about and I want to talk about something else. I want to come at it another way.

All the passion and the feeling now expressed about education derives directly from the failures of the last 15 years. I think that one of the most disheartening experiences which many of us felt in this House while we were here through the sixties and seventies is the inability to talk about anything in education other than numbers, dollars and buildings. That is all we could talk about.

Mr. Laughren: "More scholar for the dollar."

Mr. Lewis: Yes, and the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. White) coined that Philistine little crack of his: "More scholar for the dollar." And that's the only way the government thought: Dollars, numbers, buildings; nothing else.

We could never get them to understand that there was something called the quality of education; that there was something called the transactions which take place in a classroom between kids and teachers; that there was something called, which the Speaker understands a little about, the learning process. We could never engage them on that. Whether it was the Premier (Mr. Davis) to the present Minister of Education, all they wanted to talk about were the bricks and the numbers and the dollars.

Now this research paper, Mr. Speaker, this has a number of interesting things about it. One of the things which is indisputable about the paper, and certainly attests to the argument the leader of the Liberal Party was making yesterday, was that fully 35 per cent of the students in Toronto who did drop out are in the category of what the paper calls "classic dropout" or "cultural isolate." They're in the pattern of kids who have been deprived, who come from difficult economic circumstances, whose own levels of literacy and competence at home are not very high, who have very difficult cultural pressures.

These kids, the classic dropouts, are I suppose a repetitive pattern in Toronto and in Ontario which will never change. They're victims of a perverse system. They're the real tragedy in this study; that in all the years of education in this province, we've never been able to adapt the structure and the content to give some support to these kids.

The comment at the end about these children, which of course is obvious but is worth repeating says that: "Early identification is a necessity, and any meaningful intervention would have had to occur before secondary school." It wasn't a product of secondary school at all.

Most of the rest of the kids who dropped out in this study, dropped out for what Gordon Cressy, the chairman of the Toronto board, and others view as positive reasons. They were work-motivated, they were home-maker-motivated; they were, in many instances, glad to drop out and said so. They understood, curiously enough, the value of education. They wanted to return to education later on.

That's why my colleague the member for Port Arthur raised the question about the barriers that exist to reaccessibility to education later on. Most of these kids had a temporary but defined plan of what they wanted to do with their life. They wanted to drop out now. We're not talking about pre-pubescent, I want to make that clear. In this report the average age of the dropout is 17, so we're dealing with kids who can come to those conclusions, I suppose.

But the questions that are raised by all of that, the questions that are raised both by the classic dropouts, for whom it is a tragedy, and those who are well motivated and dropped out, for whom it is difficult to make generalized statements, the question that is posed is what kind of system is it that is so inadaptible, so inelastic, that all of this is now happening?

And, Mr. Speaker, that comes back to what is being felt in the educational system. The pressure on the elementary teachers of this province is indescribable. They cannot cope with the class size in Ontario, Mr. Speaker; we tell you that straight. It is destroying elementary education in this province. They simply can't cope. There are too many kids with too many problems for a teacher to handle 25, 30, 35 of them.

There's another argument that my colleague from Port Arthur has made more emphatically than any member of this House, and that's the absurd disparity in the amount of money we spend on kids in elementary school and the amount of money we spend on kids in secondary school. The disparity is now \$515 per pupil. How do you expect kids to maintain themselves in secondary school when they don't have a sufficient economic and educational investment in primary school and when the classes are so large? And what do you do about a system

which doesn't understand that the emphasis on the earliest grades, whether it's preschool or kindergarten or grade 1, 2 and 3, that is what education is all about in Ontario. But there is no such emphasis given.

And then what happens to high school? High school becomes a holding operation, that's what happens—with all of the hostility of the teacher and the student bristling; with all of the frustration and despair that the teachers feel and the students feel, clear to anybody who visits it.

If, in fact, Mr. Speaker, the teacher alienation was simply a matter of wage disputes, it would have cooled out long ago. Don't kid yourself, Mr. Speaker, collective bargaining is no sustainer of militancy, not for ever—and the Tories just don't understand it. The reasons for the agitated teacher movement in Ontario are because of the way in which the school system is abusing them and their students.

That is what has happened in Ontario, that is what has occurred in the last decade while everybody sat silently by and watched the buildings and the numbers and the dollars, and cared not one whit for what went on inside. And as things fall apart the solutions become desperate, don't they? A lot of us in the NDP, and I suspect a lot of people everywhere, feel very disheartened about it.

The Minister of Education talks about the three Rs. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, the three Rs he is talking about are not the three Rs you hear talked about in many places. My wife was at a meeting at the St. Lawrence Centre not very long ago, just a few nights ago, covering it as a journalist for a specific job, when the discussion of the three Rs took place. The parents who wanted the three Rs that night saw the three Rs not as a supplement, not as intelligent learning in a liberal environment, in a progressive environment; they saw the three Rs as a return to the old disciplined, reactionary system, often in conjunction with the strap.

It is called the backlash in education, and it should never have happened. It need not have happened—the preoccupation that parents are feeling is because they are so frantic, because they don't understand the disillusion of the kids and they don't understand the frustration of the teachers; and the government's system doesn't involve them. So they return to personal experience; and personal experience was discipline, personal experience

was defined; personal experience was at times unbearable—but it worked, so-called.

Well, it is a hell of a reaction; but it is happening, and it is happening because the government has been so totally delinquent in responding to educational change.

Ironically, I was listening to the Leader of the Opposition yesterday and I share his feelings about core curriculum. Ironically, what the research study shows is that those kids for whom the core curriculum might make most sense are dropping out of school because of their antagonism to authority and inadequate student-centred learning. How much they would want a core curriculum is really questionable; whether it would make any difference to them. That is another disheartening response to what is emerging.

The most significant part of this whole study, Mr. Speaker, I put to you, lies in two simple percentage statistics. For the kids who dropped out, only 39 per cent of the parents actively opposed their dropping out. For the kids of equal learning calibre who stayed in, 90 per cent of the parents supported their remaining in school. It all comes down to the question of parental support as it supplements the learning environment.

I think the NDP would say to the minister—and I am cautious about this; I defer to many of my colleagues; I defer especially to the member for Port Arthur, but I think we are at one on this—if the NDP wanted to change this perverse educational system there are a number of things we would do and do very quickly:

We would shift the emphasis of the system to the earliest primary grades. We would shift in to such early primary grades that all of the identification of things that might go wrong would be picked up instantly.

We would give so much more support to teacher training that it would be experienced as a qualitative shift in the minds of the teachers.

We would recognize that only smaller classes at elementary school can solve the problems in the educational system. There is no other way.

We would recognize that what the province needs is a vast network of alternative school situations. We've got parents and kids; they want compulsion; they want core subjects; they want discipline; they want the strap. They should have their school. It's not my cup of tea. They want it; they should have their school.

We have a group of parents and kids who want especially high academic concentrated

schools. They should have their school. There is a school where they embrace academic and other problems. I think at Eastdale in Toronto. That should be available. There is a school where parents and children want the performing arts, as is true in Jesse Ketchum in downtown Toronto. That kind of school should be available.

Mr. Speaker, you set up in the province alternative schooling, for parents and for children, combining with teachers and students and working it out, of a kind that satisfies people so that there is an adaptability, so that there's flexibility and so that all of the things that are now going wrong don't go wrong forever with so many damaging results.

You decentralize to the community, not just to the board; that's where we part company. We go even further; we go beyond the boards. One of the most important things about schools is to allow the parents to enter the schools at the community level. I mean the smallest cluster at schools in any given community, in conjunction with kids and teachers in those communities, should design the kind of educational framework that they want. Bring back into the school system, or at least introduce to the school system from which parents are now largely rejected—for a whole complex of reasons that aren't appropriate to this debate—and to recognize that this is what's happening within the system, is really tragic at this point in time.

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't help but laugh, or smile ironically, that yesterday afternoon, sitting up in the gallery, was Ivan Illich. I don't agree with everything that Ivan Illich says, but what a pleasure it would be were an occasional word or two to penetrate the dogged interstices of the Ministry of Education. What a pleasure it would be to have a few of the alternatives which are provided by Illich and others here. It doesn't happen.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: "Dogged interstices?"

Mr. Lewis: Yes; doggedly closed. It doesn't happen in this province.

Mr. Martel: What does?

Mr. Lewis: If you're looking for a failure of leadership, if you're looking for the place where the government is breaking down, then education is emerging as an issue in this province, Mr. Speaker, and it's emerging as an issue in a way which we feel very comfortable about. It's no longer just ceilings and it's no longer just buildings. It's now a matter of substance and content.

I look over at the government's educated elite and I know that not all has been perfection in the past, and it may perhaps account for the absurdity of the present, but many of us feel that unless it is altered the pattern will be irreversible.

Mr. Speaker, the loss of faith in the school system as an area of political leadership now extends, if I can take my remarks just a couple of points further, to the question of energy.

I don't want to discuss Syncrude and I don't want to discuss prices at the pump; I want to say something about Ontario Hydro, which we have raised a number of times in this Legislature, and what is happening in the province, because it is really, in its own way, quite frightening.

I don't know how it all happened and I don't know how it gets out of control, except when one has no political leadership, when no one over there on the government's side is watching, thinking or curious, then these things occur. If there ever was an abdication in Ontario, it's in the energy field.

Ontario Hydro is allowed to go its own way. The Energy Board becomes the final arbiter. In fact the province should be making the decisions, but the government is not making the decisions at all. Leadership, Mr. Speaker, is nowhere to be found. After 1983, we'll have a public inquiry; from 1974 to 1982 we'll have no inquiry at all.

Let me put quickly on the record what the figures are and what the growth rates are. I think some members of the House, I hope some members of my own caucus, will find it interesting.

Just listen to what has happened. In 1973, Mr. Speaker, George Gathercole, then chairman of Hydro, indicated that the cost from 1974 to 1982 would be \$10 billion; that was in 1973. In January, 1974, that estimate had jumped to \$15 billion. In April, 1974, the estimate had jumped to \$16 billion; and in March, 1975, it now stands at \$23 billion. That's a move from September, 1973, to March, 1975—what is that, a year and a half?—of \$13 billion.

Mr. Stokes: It sounds like Syncrude.

Mr. Lewis: Those people over there who sit so sanguine and comfortable in their pews have to understand they are heading toward the bankruptcy of the Province of Ontario. I want to read from a memo which was prepared for me by our research group—I don't pretend to have mastered these things myself—just to show what should be happening

and what would be happening with a New Democratic approach.

All of Hydro's proposals of \$23 billion are based on a growth assumption slightly in excess of seven per cent. They call for an addition of 14,000 megawatts to the system by 1982 for a total system size of 32,443 megawatts.

The Ontario Energy Board asked Ontario Hydro to reduce its reserve requirements from 28 per cent to 23 per cent. Ontario Hydro has said no.

That in itself is insufferable. That in itself should give the government the right to move in on Ontario Hydro and do something about it.

Simply reducing the growth assumption to seven per cent and adopting the Ontario Energy Board's reserve recommendations, [that is from 28 to 23 per cent] would reduce the system expansion by 1,676 megawatts or 12 per cent.

If Hydro planned on an assumed growth rate of 6.4 per cent instead of seven or more, [and 6.4 has been the actual average growth] and held its reserves to the level of the board, the system expansion would be reduced by 3,195 megawatts or 22.7 per cent.

If Hydro and the government abandoned their passive posture and adopted a conservation programme over the next eight years to reduce the growth rate, the savings become quite dramatic: A programme to reduce growth by 0.2 percentage points a year to five per cent by 1982 would reduce the required expansion by 4,704 megawatts or 33.4 per cent.

If, in fact, they brought it down to a four per cent growth rate, where we think it should be, which would still allow for an increase in individual consumption each year the saving would be 6,041 megawatts or 42.9 per cent. Do you know what that means in millions of dollars, Mr. Speaker.

In the first instance, just reducing the growth rate to seven per cent, it means \$2.7 billion saved. In the second, by bringing it down to 6.4 per cent, it means \$5.2 billion saved. In the third, reducing it to five per cent with the normal reserve capacity suggested by the Ontario Energy Board, it means a saving of \$7.6 billion; and if they brought it down to four per cent, it would be \$9.8 billion, a saving of \$10 billion on borrowings for the Province of Ontario underwriting the notes of Hydro in the next seven to eight years.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that if we simply held the growth rate to the present level and didn't allow Hydro its present expansion we would save \$500 million a year in interest charges by 1982.

I want to say about the government, Mr. Speaker; that if it joins and approves Hydro's growth ethic they are all nuts. They are all collectively demented and something has to happen to bring Ontario Hydro to heel. The province can't accept from that corporation a jump in cost from \$10 billion in 1973 to \$23 billion in 1975; that legitimizes a review of Ontario Hydro. The province cannot tolerate it, the economy will not be able to cope with it, and our borrowing capacity will be clobbered because of it.

But it is more important than that. I say to all those people on the government side who occasionally have some influence with their cabinet colleagues: The rates are going to go up. Every time Hydro goes before the Ontario Energy Board for another rate increase—this time for capital requirements as well as operating requirements—who do they think is going to be singled out in the public mind as the villain? The government of Ontario. And those rate reviews, I may say, are going to occur very neatly, just in advance of the next provincial election. They are occurring in the next very few weeks and months.

For its own sake, the Province of Ontario, the government, should not be so foolhardy as to let Hydro run amuk, which is precisely what is happening. Again, unless the leadership is exercised, obviously nothing will happen.

I have only two more areas I want to deal with, Mr. Speaker, and then I shall bring my remarks to a close and read the amendment—have I an amendment?—to the amendment of the Speech from the Throne, which has been prepared for me in inspired fashion.

I want to move down the row to the absent, but I am sure energetic, Minister of Transportation and Communications. He's an amiable fellow, a Calamity John of the first order. It seems a pity that this man should have had to bear so much in his short tenure. He is the man who has to make retreat look dignified. He retreats in weekly instalments from one policy position after another. He is the only man who is required to dis-embowel himself publicly with elegance month after month. The government should do something to rescue this man. He is not going to be back, if what the government is heaping upon him continues.

Mr. Laughren: And voluntarily.

Mr. Lewis: He tries very hard. He talks about seatbelts and then gives us an advertising programme, and he does it without choking. His adam's apple barely bobbed. He's a most extraordinary politician in handling the ingratitude heaped upon him by his cabinet colleagues.

He talks about lowering the speed limit and then retreats. He is the man who had to deal with Krauss-Maffei in his little stage-coach to Munich—and where is it now, where is it now? When will we hear? When are the 130 days over—or whatever it was—during which time it was all being reappraised?

He's the man who reversed Spadina; we'll have a first-rate party statement on that shortly too, Mr. Speaker. He's the man who has now allowed the increase in fares to the TTC—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) can hardly wait for that.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): The minister's out planting the trees at the CNE right now.

Mr. Lewis: He may be out planting trees. This is the man who went to Ottawa—the Minister of Transportation and Communications—on Dec. 11, 1974, and said that the government was subsidizing transit deficits; and then said, and I quote:

The only proviso in this new subsidy was that fare structures be frozen at 1973 levels. We recognized that fare increases will only drive away riders, that transit operations no longer can be funded from the fare box alone, and we recognized that local tax burdens should not be increased.

That's Dec. 11, 1974. On March 11, 1975, the entire policy is down the drain.

You know what that is? That's called duplicity; that's called political duplicity; that's called no candour; that's called evasion; that's called playing false with the public; that's called the absence of political leadership.

All the things that haunt this government around the landscape of Ontario are fashioned here in the Legislature and outside. They don't know what leadership is anymore? They don't know what forthright means anymore. The speeches vary from day to day as their moods vary from the hour. Clutching at the political instincts which elude them, the government careens from error to error.

I'll tell all of them that it catches up, because what is particularly true of all of this is the whole TTC fare increase. That's just beyond the pale. Hell; cities are for people. What is it about them that they possess such a death wish?

Don't they think that the public of Ontario understands the hypocrisy in asserting a position and then retreating from it? At least the Liberals have no position from which to retreat; or to be more kind such an infinite variety of positions that retreat can be construed as forward progress, backward progress or linear movement. It matters not; it matters not.

Mr. Gaunt: We are just totally responsive.

Mr. Givens: He envies us our flexibility.

Mr. Lewis: I envy the Liberals their flexibility. It is the first time anarchy has been called flexibility.

Mr. Gaunt: Totally responsive.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think one calls that dog dancing.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): How did the NDP arrive at their policies?

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact, I will satisfy the member's interest and deal with that in a moment. I won't be at a loss. The only thing that has varied more than the Spadina policy is the 45-ft height bylaw.

I want to tell the Liberal Party in the presence of all of the Tories who are here, that I really found Andy Szende's article in the Star—and recalling from memory—quite pleasing in terms of the Liberal's capacity to be flexible—their essential indecision.

I notice that the member for Downsview said he was quite opposed to the 45-ft bylaw, he would have nothing to do with it. I notice that the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) said that she thought it was a first rate move and that the city of Toronto had no alternative. Neither of them are a match for the member for York-Forest Hill. Neither of them. It takes the former mayor of Toronto to say what he said.

Mr. Laughren: A 60-ft bylaw.

Mr. Lewis: He said—I've got to make sure I'm getting it right.

Mr. Givens: I'll correct the member.

Mr. Lewis: I'm sure he will. The member for York-Forest Hill said either that the 45-ft

height bylaw was bad, but he would approve it anyway; or he said that it was good, but he would disapprove it anyway. I can't remember which it was. I'm not sure he can either. I'm not sure whether he said it in the morning or the afternoon.

Mr. Givens: I said the council should have the right to vote on it.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, he was opposed to it, but he would give the OMB the right to uphold it. Sorry, okay.

Mr. Givens: Local autonomy.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, local autonomy.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Street by street.

Mr. Lewis: I suppose that none of them—

Mr. Givens: Where does the member stand?

Mr. Lewis: Right on top of it.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: I don't like the OMB decision at all. We said right away, without any equivocation, that the OMB decision was wrong, that there should be a 45-ft height limit. But then we don't understand the way politics works as the member for Carleton East (Mr. P. Taylor) understands it. Power is the name of the game, baby. They all know that, eh? That is the succulent difference between Tories and Liberals. The Tories say, "Power is the name of the game," and they stop. Liberals say, "Power is the name of the game, baby."

I was saying to the council meeting of the NDP, it shows how ideologically chic they are, how trendy they are, this travesty over here. Oh, boy. I must say that the polls will change. I have to tell them that. I have insights. I have clairvoyance—

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Which way?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: I needed a minor diversion. I thank the Liberal members for providing it. They are an excellent bunch of fellows. May they languish in opposition forever.

I want to come back to this missing figure over here, the Minister of Transportation and Communications. What should have been done by the government to repair a little of the credibility, almost none of which it has left, was to have provided an operating subsidy of up to 75 per cent on the deficits, which simply would have meant \$17 million more for the TTC than would be paid by

government anyway, maintaining the fares at their present level, not penalizing those who use the TTC, who are normally low-income earners—that's the pattern of rider usage—not encouraging councils of necessity to raise property taxes, but to take it from the public revenue by a graduated income tax, a fair tax, and apply it appropriately.

And \$17 million doesn't sound like a hell of a lot when matched against the \$1 billion-plus that the government was prepared to lavish on a monument called Krauss-Maffei. But they forgot all of that. They forgot all of the factors of public transit when they came to their decision.

Now that I have been provoked and taunted into it, I want to say something about the Ministry of Labour.

Mr. Givens: Who provoked the member?

Mr. Lewis: The member for Ottawa East provoked me.

If one is looking for failures of political leadership, if one is looking in the government for the places where that lies most evidently, the conjunction of the Minister of Labour, the Chairman of Management Board and the Minister of Education is really where it lies.

I want to say to the Chairman of Management Board, since we have agreed upon some aspects of it before, and I am going to put it to him as strongly as I can: The public sector strikes which are occurring need not occur and should not occur and can be avoided. Whether he is allowing them to occur deliberately or whether he is simply incapable of dealing with them is something I have never entirely understood.

The public inconvenience, the public harassment and the public anxiety have to be responded to by collective leadership. But the Premier doesn't orchestrate or co-ordinate it. The Chairman of Management Board sits quietly by and engages in absurd 11th-hour gymnastics to prevent the civil service from going out, the Minister of Labour watches one public sector strike after another, and the Minister of Education audits them from day to day. They have got no policy at all. It remains for the opposition parties to put the policy to them. If ever there was a classic example of where leadership is simply nowhere to be found in government, it's the question of public sector disputes. It's ironic, it's paradoxical that the NDP, the Liberals and everybody else has to show the government the way out of its own dilemma. We are willing to do it, but the public understands as well. The public

very quickly understands that it doesn't have to put up with so much of what all of us would prefer to avoid.

The Liberals have come at it a hundred different ways, from compulsory arbitration, with which we disagree, right through to final-offer selection, which we think can be used, I suppose, but is a very limited way of looking at it.

We've now offered the Conservatives, as a government, three explicit directions which, as I stand here, I say to the Chairman of the Management Board would mean that strikes in the public sector would be so rare the public would have to scratch their heads to remember them. We've told the government first that it should develop a skilled group of conciliators and mediators within the Ministry of Labour whose sole responsibility it is to engage in public sector mediation. They will be people who are sensitive and who understand that there are no profits in the public sector to fight over and that what is required is recognition of the give and take of the parties, that we don't need the adversary confrontation system of General Motors and the UAW.

Secondly, we've said the government should enact a piece of legislation somewhere which gives legal force to good faith bargaining, which gives to the Minister of Labour acting on the advice of impartial advisers—or gives to conciliators or arbitrators acting on good advice—the right to take an offending party before the Ontario Labour Relations Board, the right for that board to find the party guilty of bad faith bargaining and to order the party back to the bargaining table.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It doesn't have to exist.

Mr. Lewis: But it should have to exist.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Bad faith bargaining does not have to exist.

Mr. Ledis: But if there is no way of enforcing good faith bargaining then it exists.

Mr. Deans: Nothing has to—

Mr. Lewis: The minister knows there was bad faith bargaining on the part of the Toronto Transit Commission before the strike took place. He's a fair enough man to recognize that. What does the government do when two million people are inconvenienced by bad faith bargaining for which there is no legislative response in the Province of Ontario? What the hell does it do? The Province of Ontario abdicates. It keeps completely acquiescent.

Mr. Stokes: It didn't even recognize it.

Mr. Lewis: It watched an entire metropolitan area grind to a halt for no reason whatsoever. Why? For Karl Mallette? For Paul Godfrey?

Third, because apparently the government is unwilling to support good faith because apparently it is unwilling to develop the group of skilled mediators, we've taken it a step further. I have admitted, and I do again, that we have plagiarized some of it from people like Ed Finn, who writes in "Canadian Labour," and from many of those who preceded him. The idea is not new. I discussed it carefully with people whom I know intimately and who know something about labour relations. The idea we put forward was an essential services settlement board.

What a pleasure it would be in the Province of Ontario, and why can't the members opposite adopt it? Why can't we have an essential services settlement board? I'll set it out and then anybody in the world can tell me where it's inconsistent.

It would be chaired by an absolutely first-rate person whose credentials are beyond dispute. It would have to be somebody of the Goldenberg calibre. All right? And then one appoints to such a board a number of men and women of the quality of Owen Shime, Harry Arthurs, Sylvia Ostry, you name them. They are people who know something about collective bargaining in the public sector; who have intervened; who have been arbitrators; who are known to be fair and impartial with impeccable reputations.

Then we give to that essential services settlement board all kinds of financial support to allow them to do pay research in the public sector field. The appointments are long term, let's say for life, so there can be no political interference at all. In addition to that, they report only through the Legislature, rather than through a cabinet minister. So that, too, is scrupulously separated.

This board, Mr. Speaker, does pay research on pay; comparable data on wages, on pensions, on fringe benefits, on working conditions in the public sector, in the private sector, collecting the data and making it available to both parties to assist them in the negotiation of a voluntary settlement.

Has the Chairman of the Management Board or any of the Tories seen the federation "Update", as it's called, of the OSSTF in its recent issue which deals with the Ottawa teachers' strike. On the back page of the "Update" it says, "What is a teacher worth?" and they draw comparisons with everything from a Loblaw's cashier-clerk to a registered

nurse's assistant to a bus driver because no one does know what a teacher is worth in contemporary terms. Shouldn't the public know? Shouldn't the public have a way of measuring the fairness and reasonableness of the offers and the demands? Doesn't the public, which is ultimately going to be inconvenienced, have a right to have a benchmark against which equity can be established? Shouldn't all of us know what is fair in the minds of an independent body in the Ottawa teachers' dispute? Shouldn't all of us have known whether 21½ per cent or 23 per cent or 24 per cent or maybe 19 per cent was fair in the CSAO case? Shouldn't all of us have some sense of whether the Windsor settlement for teachers is fair and adequate or excessive or otherwise?

(Why is it not possible to establish a body of such public integrity and such high research quality that we could measure it, and then the negotiations continue with all kinds of voluntary assistance from the settlement board? But suppose—and even here I don't think there is any departure—we saw that negotiations were breaking down, suppose we saw that negotiations were destined to collapse? What does the government do then? Then I think it says to the settlement board, in advance of the breakdown or negotiations: "You provide a kind of model settlement, or a kind of model suggestion for certain proposals; not all of them, just the key proposals." It is not binding on the parties; no compulsory element about it at all. Just provide it in a model way for the parties and then the public has a sense of what is fair.

If the parties break down and the workers go on strike, they go on strike, that is their democratic right. Who in the world would take it away? But it does give a tremendous moral authority to the public in giving pressure for settlement. So we know it is fair; we have an independent body; it obviously can't be binding.

We are socialists in this party. We don't believe in compulsory arbitration, but we do believe that the public should be better inconvenienced than the government is now prepared to undertake and we do believe that the public sector strikes need not happen. How do we remove strikes? Not by legislating against them; not by imposing compulsory arbitration. We remove strikes by making them unnecessary, that's how we do it, and that is something that has never occurred to the government benches, and so we will have one public sector fracas after another, more and more public anxiety.

It isn't going to redound to the government's credit. They can't manipulate it any more. They can't orchestrate it any more, but they could change it. We think it can be changed in that fashion, and we think that is the quality of leadership, and we think that that is what the province wants to hear from its politicians and its parties, some alternatives, some solutions. They won't always be right; they won't always work, but they are real in response to the problem.

If I was to deal with all the other cabinet ministers I would be here a very long time—and I have spoken a very long time already—but I wish that the Treasurer and the Premier had been here, because I must say that together they form a kind of chink, they form the Achilles heel. They are the greatest single chink in the armour. The Treasurer in particular, or the Treasury, has created such problems for Ontario, such failure of leadership, that to enumerate them is to illuminate them. I wrote them down:

Regional government; no plan for Ontario; no question of how to distribute growth to northern Ontario or eastern Ontario by way of incentives or disincentives—we will have more to say about that shortly; no response to any of the inflationary pressures; complete indifference to the problems of the auto pact and what it means in simple terms for the economy of this province and the creation of jobs. No recognition, in other words, of all the things that matter in Ontario where leadership is concerned. Whenever the Treasury Board takes an initiative it creates troubles which continue to harass it forever.

The case is surely made. The things that this province wants, we believe, are the basic ingredient of political leadership, the basic ingredient of talking straight to the public, not waffling, not evading, not creating circumlocutions in every answer but speaking straight even when it hurts. That's the nature of the political process unless the government is falling so quickly from power that it can no longer grasp any of that. Those are the things the province wants.

We think the province would like something else in the months that lead to an election. We think the province would appreciate political parties emphasizing that which is human in Ontario. They seem to forget, as a government, the human consequences of every government act. There is absolutely no response, Mr. Speaker, on the part of this government to the things which most violate people. They deal in generalities. They deal in abstractions. They play at politics in a fashion which satisfies their cravings, their

own lusts for politics, but doesn't respond to human needs at all.

The Minister without Portfolio talks—the Leader of the Opposition talked about it yesterday—this silly infantile stuff to Norm Webster. I would be embarrassed to talk to a journalist that way. “Well, the Throne Speech is thematic,” he said. There is a new announcement each day, from the Minister of Culture and Recreation one day, the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. Auld) the next day, the Premier the next day, and then somebody else. It's pathetic. It's so adolescent. It's so silly. It sees the game of politics as a fine manipulative device that has no flesh, has no blood, has no soul and has nothing. That's why the government is never aware of all the political violations of people which it creates. Mr. Speaker, you never hear the government aware of what it's doing to Workmen's Compensation Board recipients around the territory. They never do—never. I haven't heard the government respond to that group of men from the Injured Workmen's Consultants who parade around the legislature foyer from time to time, amputated, with braces. God knows the position they're in. They never respond to that. It doesn't have to happen.

My colleague from High Park (Mr. Shulman) and my colleague from Windsor West say to the Minister of Labour the other day: “Isn't it possible that people who have worked X years in an asbestos plant and who have lung cancer should automatically be seen as having a related compensable disease?” Do members know why they say that? Because families like the Days and the Syphers and the others are agonized. Some of them have no money. Some of them are living on \$260 a month. Why should they be subject to the final, the ultimate humiliation of crawling before a board in government to demand what insensitive politicians will not provide? Why is it impossible for government people to respond in human terms to human realities? Why is it impossible for government people on a question of social allowances to allow women who maintain single-parent families who want to go out and earn money through a job, to become independent of the allowance? Why do they penalize them? Why do they brutalize them?

I have two cases from my own riding in the last few weeks where women on mother's allowance wanted to go out to work. The daycare arrangements they had to make cost more ultimately than they could afford, because when they made the daycare arrangements they were left with so little money that they were better off on a mother's allow-

ance. So they returned to state dependency. That's no way to behave. That's not a civilized government. What's wrong with the government?

The government expropriates land out in Pickering for an airport. It never measured the human consequences for the people it is expropriating. It doesn't respond to it in public meetings. It doesn't respond to it in personal ways. It talks only about acreage. It talks only about noise corridors or cones. I don't understand all of it.

We talk about day care in this Legislature. We talk about women's rights and what the government does to them. But the problems of finding daycare places in Ontario are legion. We still have only 43,000 places for a need of around 300,000. Nobody thinks of going out and chronicling the consequences. We know in this caucus from inside the precious Ministry of Community and Social Services that they're cutting \$10 million from their budget.

Mr. Martel: And \$2.5 million is in day care.

Mr. Lewis: And \$2.5 million of that is in day care. What the ministry is doing in 1975-1976 is using the money left over from the programme announced in June, 1974. They will have spent \$3.5 million by March 31, 1975. That leaves about \$11.5 million, I guess, of the \$15 million to be spent and they're not adding anything more to 1975-1976. They are actually cutting back on day care.

Mr. Martel: Watch it, though; it's an election year. Remember 1971; it was \$10 million.

Mr. Lewis: Why penalize people who are already most vulnerable? What special and exquisite pleasure does it give to government to deal always in abstracts and large sums? If it can throw away \$100 million on Syn-crude, \$150 million on properties in North Pickering, and approve the expenditure of \$204 million on the part of the federal government for the airport, it does so with pleasure. If it can whistle away in 24 hours \$450 million of public money which we need for human priorities, it will do it every time. But respond to things human?—no, that's no longer true of this government.

So there is no political leadership. There is no candour. There is no human response any more to the things that are most telling and most pressing in this province.

Does the government know what it has lost completely? It has lost both its preservationism and the one-time sense of optimism

which the Tory party had about changing the human condition. We have it; others have it. We don't see these things as unsolvable. We see them as matters that can be changed and altered. But we are damned if we can get the government to come along with us.

It has never even been able to admit a mistake. I think that the greatest single error in the Premier's last four years, certainly the last two years—if I may be permitted one gratuitous personal comment—is his inability to stand before the people of Ontario and say, "Mea culpa. We've made errors. I've made errors. We are going to try to change it around." But there is none of that in the government of Ontario any more. There is just posturing and rhetoric.

The psychological corner in Ontario I think has been turned. We think collectively that it's probably beyond the point of retrieval for this government. It's going. For the Liberals? Who knows? I daren't predict. For the NDP? Who knows? I daren't predict.

I know what we want to do, Mr. Speaker. What we want to do is to set out the alternatives on issue after issue over the next several months. What we want to do is provide solutions in an uncomplicated way—I think as we've been doing, and if I may say, as the official opposition has not been doing, as a matter, I guess, of strategy.

What we want to do, Mr. Speaker, is not deal in silly complexities, not deal in areas which cost so much money they can't be handled or which are incomprehensible to those who hear them. We simply feel that when the province asks for political leadership in a collective sense it should be provided. That's what this party will attempt.

We will be on occasion wrong, I have no doubt—maybe many times wrong. But it will be done in good faith and it will always be straight. We will not equivocate, not as we go toward the election, no more than we have ever done before.

In the process, I say to the Chairman of the Management Board, we shall participate in the defeat of this government as sure as I am standing here, and every one in the government benches—the few who are in this House now—know deep in their viscera that the end is nigh, that it's all over for the Tories—

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): No.

Mr. Lewis: —even if the member for Eglinton is back to provide his felicitous annual prayer breakfasts.

But beyond that I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is all over and now the flux in the electorate, the extraordinary fluidity, is beginning to look at other options and other issues and maybe even at other people.

Mr. Givens: They're looking this way.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: What the member is saying is, he won't win. Is that what he is saying?

Mr. Lewis: No, as a matter of fact, I am not sure who will win. I want to tell the minister something, now that he has put it to me, that as I've moved around I am not sure who will win, but I can tell him who will lose, and that's the government.

To that end, as an amendment to the amendment to the inglorious Speech to the Throne—

Mr. Stokes: Elections aren't really won; they're lost.

Mr. Lewis: —the most hapless document of its kind—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member for Thunder Bay should know; he should know.

Mr. Lewis: —I move, seconded by Mr. Deans, this resplendent amendment. It positively trips down the tongue, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis moves that the amendment to the motion be amended by adding thereto the following:

That this House regrets the failure of the government to provide political leadership; in particular, that this House regrets the failure of the ministries of Health, Labour, Natural Resources and Environment to establish and enforce adequate standards for occupational safety and health; that this House regrets the failure of the Chairman of the Management Board and the Ministries of Labour and Education to develop labour laws and collective bargaining procedures in the public and private sectors to prevent the continuing breakdown of negotiations and subsequent strikes; the failure of the Ministry of Housing to pursue policies which would combat the drastic decline in house building now occurring, to provide housing for low and low-middle income groups within their income capacities, to control rents in rental accommodation and to prevent the conversion of rental accommodation to condominiums; the failure of the Ministry of Energy to control the expansionary policies of Ontario Hydro; and, further, the failure of the Premier to provide the leadership

required to combat the social and economic hardships which are affecting the citizens of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: I'll recognize the hon. member for Yorkview. Is he supposed to continue or move the adjournment, as the case may be?

Mr. Lewis: The member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the member for Yorkview doesn't feel he can complete in the remaining time and I think I can. So if the House wishes to accede to that particular accommodation—

Mr. Roy: You bet!

Mr. Gaunt: —I will be pleased to go on.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed that the member for Yorkview will be given his opportunity later then?

Agreed.

The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to participate once again in this debate. My first words, of course, should be words of commendation for you, sir, even though you did happen to cut me off in the question period today. I know it's a rather difficult job. It so happened that, with respect, sir, I think your watch skipped a couple of beats. I thought there were still two minutes remaining in the question period, but in any case I know you have a difficult job and I appreciate that. I'll get my question on in due course, I am sure.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): We're going to buy him a stopwatch.

Mr. Gaunt: May I say that I was quite taken with the windup comments of my friend from Scarborough East—

Mr. Lewis: West.

Mr. Gaunt: West, I am sorry.

Mr. Foulds: The member for Scarborough East (Mrs. Birch) is incapable of making comments today.

Mr. Gaunt: Yes, I certainly agree with him entirely when he says that the result of the next election is somewhat in question, in that he is not too sure who is going to win. I know who is going to win, I think. I think it's going to be us in the Liberal Party. But I would agree with him entirely, without any qualms or doubts, on one thing: The Tories are going to get defeated. I think all of us on this side agree with that.

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): We'll be here for a long while.

Mr. Gaunt: You know, the government has progressed steadily along the way. At one point they were afflicted with senility, but they've really progressed away beyond that.

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): He shouldn't count his chickens before they hatch.

Mr. Gaunt: I think what we're seeing in progress here today is the final death rattle of this government.

Mr. Roy: Right. And it hurts us, because some of the Tories aren't bad.

Mr. Gaunt: I'm sure that the people of the province will effect that change, given the next opportunity.

Mr. Turner: That's pretty weak.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Let's get down to facts.

Mr. Gaunt: When I come to the matter of the Throne Speech, with which I am supposed to deal during these few minutes, it's rather difficult because I really can't find anything in the Throne Speech with any substance, other than the fact—

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): That speech was well read.

Mr. Gaunt: —that the idea of my friend and colleague from Downsview has been accepted by the government in the ombudsman bill. That's really the only item of substance in the entire speech with the exception of the matter related to the farmers, wherein they're going to be guaranteed some sort of income programme. That is going to be interesting, but we'll wait with baited breath to see what that will be. Other than those two items, the speech is totally devoid of any substance.

You know, we're used to hearing Throne Speeches with quite a bit of froth and very little substance, but this year there wasn't even very much froth, so it's very difficult to talk on the Throne Speech and the programme set out by the government. So I'm not going to deal with that, I'm going to deal with a couple of other items which interest me and which I want to draw to the attention of the appropriate ministries.

I had discussed with and written to the ministry about a problem that I feel needs some attention on the part of government. The member for Yorkview touched on it in a peripheral way yesterday, and may I say

to him that I certainly agree with a lot of his comments with respect to the problems having to do with the relationship between the major oil companies and the retail service station operators in this province.

I have service station operators who come to me from time to time with their problems, and I know that if there is a system that can be described as a serfdom system in the Province of Ontario, that has to be it. The service station operators don't own their own facility. All they are in the system is serfs. They jump when the major oil company says "Jump," and they have to pay when the oil company says pay. They really have no freedom at all in the operation of their particular facility.

I know of one case where a service station operator was operating in the facility of a major oil company, and all of a sudden one of the reps came in and said to him, "Look, you're doing very well here. We want 50 per cent of your gross mechanical take"—the take in reference to repairs, oil changes, tires, labour and so on.

He had a good business. He was a good mechanic and obviously the oil company wanted to cut in on it. So they said: "We want 50 per cent of your take in those areas." And he simply said to them: "I am sorry. There is no way you are going to get it from me." He was out within three weeks. They just simply said to him: "If you are not prepared to go along with that, then I am sorry, we will have to get a new person in that service station."

As it turned out, he is a good mechanic and he had no difficulty in getting another job. But, to be perfectly frank, I think that's a terrible way for any company to operate within the Province of Ontario. I would hope that this government—and this matter isn't new, as it has been raised here a number of times—will do something about this sort of system.

Mr. Stokes: That's the free enterprise system.

Mr. Gaunt: Surely to goodness, it's possible in this province to have some sort of bill of rights—I think it has been referred to as that on numerous occasions—for these service station operators so that they are not subjected to this kind of strong-arm tactic on the part of the major oil companies. Surely we can do something about that because instead of getting better, Mr. Speaker, it is getting worse.

However, I really didn't intend to get on to that one today. I did want to pursue a matter which is of concern to me in relation to the pricing of heating oil across

the province. I think perhaps the best procedure in this regard would be for me to read parts of a letter I wrote to Hon. Arthur A. Wishart, QC, when he was Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. The letter is dated Sept. 13, 1971, and I think it sets out the problem as I see it. I said:

Dear Arthur:

As a follow-up to our telephone conversation a few days ago, I am writing to you to lodge a formal complaint with respect to the way in which all of the major oil companies, with the exception of two, have raised their prices, particularly on heating oil by simply altering their zone boundaries.

By way of explanation on that point, the major oil companies have various zones that they draw on their own and within the zone there is a certain price for heating oil. In the next zone, it may or may not be different and so they have this policy that actually works to their benefit, I find, throughout the province.

In my view, this rezoning procedure undertaken by all of the major oil companies, except Texaco and Fina, is a method used to increase prices, hence profits. Instead of announcing an overall price increase, thereby running the risk of incurring government and public wrath, as they did last year, they have accomplished the same thing by rezoning and keeping quiet.

Then I sent Mr. Wishart a map, showing the areas where the zoning took place.

It so happened that the part of the province from which I come is in zone 5 for these purposes. This is one of the lower-income areas in the province and yet people in zone 5 are paying the highest price for heating oil in the province, with the exception of northern Ontario where the price varies from town to town.

The prices indicated on the margin of the map are the prices charged by Esso, but all of the other major company prices coincide, as do the zoning areas with the exception of the two companies I mentioned above. This seems to be more than coincidental and perhaps the federal anti-combines people should be looking into this aspect as well.

However, at the moment, I am disturbed about the fact that one of the lowest income areas in the province is paying the highest price for heating oil and, converse-

ly, the highest-income area is paying the lowest price.

In my view prices should be equalized across the province so that everyone pays the same price. This is the way it is for beer, and I feel it should be the same way for heating oil as well.

The company argument is, of course, based on the fact that the further an area is from the refinery the more expensive becomes the product because of distance, transportation and so on. However, I see no reason why this cannot be overcome. It's been done with beer; it is done in the transportation of milk and I would hope the Ontario government would see fit to insist on it being done with respect to heating oil.

Whether or not you have the constitutional authority to insist on this is something I leave to your judgement and to the judgement of your cabinet colleagues. However, I would appreciate it if you could undertake a study with respect to this matter and hopefully take action along the lines I've outlined above.

That matter has gone on for four years. At least it will be four years this September and really nothing has happened as far as I can determine.

Mr. Stokes: It's got worse.

Mr. Gaunt: It's got worse, if anything, that's true. I asked the Treasurer about this matter when he was in the Ministry of Energy and he said that while he found the proposition interesting and had had preliminary discussions with some of the oil companies, he felt it was going to be very difficult for this to be done. Indeed, the oil companies rejected the suggestion out of hand and while it may have some merit, in his view he really wasn't prepared to do anything about it.

I really don't think that's good enough and I think the Minister of Energy should have another look at this matter. I'm sure he'll welcome the fact that I'm not pounding away about Ontario Hydro today; I've switched my topics. Perhaps as a sign of relief on that score, Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate it if he could give some indication as to what he's prepared to do concerning this matter. It's of vital interest to the people whom I represent in this province because they are paying the highest prices for heating oil, aside from northern Ontario, of any place in the province. I know, as far as I am concerned, they feel the excuses and the reasons

given by the companies are not valid with respect to their pricing system.

I've only got four minutes left, Mr. Speaker, and I have another topic with which I want to deal and this concerns registered retirement savings plans. There are a lot of companies involved in this. They sell a lot of registered retirement savings plans in this province for one reason or the other. Sometimes they are bought by people who want to have some assurance that they're going to get a guaranteed income when they retire. Others do it for tax reasons and so on. Regardless of the reasons, I think it's important that the superintendent of insurance in the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations take a long look at what is going on right now with respect to the selling of retirement savings plans in this province.

I'll give one example. I had a constituent who bought a retirement savings plan from a company and I won't name the company here—

Mr. Stokes: Go ahead.

Mr. Gaunt: It was in 1973. He paid \$2,000 and whether the person representing the company wasn't familiar with the plan or whether my constituent didn't ask the proper questions I'm not sure. But this is what happened. He decided after he had purchased it that he had made a mistake. It was sold to him on the basis that it was going to be advantageous for him because he had sold his farm and he was going to incur some income tax. It was sold to him on the basis that if he paid into a retirement savings plan so much money that would give him some tax relief.

He bought it on that supposition and then he found out that he really didn't have as much taxable income as he anticipated and so he wanted to withdraw. He asked the company what it would do by way of cancelling it out and paying him back his money and the company said, "All right, we will do that, but it is going to cost you a lot of money." "And so, under a letter dated Feb. 18, 1975, his \$2,000 suddenly disappeared and became \$942.53. That was the payout under the plan which he had bought a number of months before.

What had happened was that the life insurance company involved had actually put

the funds, the \$2,000, into mutual funds and, of course, the mutual funds market has really taken a rap this last number of months. So his money, in the amount of \$1,057.47, went down the drain and he wasn't able to do anything about it.

Mr. Roy: That's a good point; that's terrible.

Mr. Gaunt: In my view, the superintendent of insurance should make absolutely certain—and apply it to all sales of these retirement savings plans—that the moneys be put into guaranteed investments, so that if the person wants to cancel out at any point in time at least he is assured of getting his money back plus minimum interest. I think that is only reasonable, I think it is only fair, and I think in view of the multiplicity of companies involved in this now—it is a very popular thing and has become so in the last several years—that this is vitally important for the protection of the public.

Many people don't ask the proper questions with respect to these plans because they don't understand them. They depend on the advice of the person who is selling the plan. They expect the expertise to be there and when it isn't there they get hurt. So I would strongly urge, Mr. Speaker that this be done. I have had some communication with the superintendent of insurance office over this matter and they have indicated to me that they are studying it and I would certainly urge the minister of that ministry to support the action I have suggested.

Mr. Young moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the House I would like to say that there is some agreement that we would sit on Thursday evening next and the following Monday and Tuesday in order to accommodate those who wish to participate in this debate. If there is any change we can announce it in the House, but at the moment that's our agreement.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock, p.m.

ERRATUM

No.	Page	Col.	Line	Should read:
2	46	2	22	out fear nor favour.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 18, 1975

Community colleges arbitration award, statement by Mr. Auld	149
Ontario student assistance programme, statement by Mr. Auld	150
Redistribution bill, questions of Mr. Welch: Mr. R. F. Nixon	152
Teacher-school board bargaining legislation, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Foulds, Mr. Roy	152
Secondary school dropout rate, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Foulds	153
Operations at Reeves mine, questions of Mr. Miller: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Laughren, Mr. Ferrier	155
Employment of women in government ministries, questions of Mr. Snow and Mr. Winkler: Mr. Lewis	156
Dismissal of woman police officer, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Singer	157
Removal of asbestos fibres from tap water, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Burr	158
Hydro right of way, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Root, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. R. F. Nixon	158
Canada Metal Co. plant, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Riddell	159
Churches' request for international foreign aid, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lawlor, Mr. Breithaupt	159
Ontario Hydro policy on agricultural supervisors, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Spence, Mr. Riddell	160
Alleged shortage of home programme payment to Thunder Bay, question of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Foulds	160
Employment of women in government ministries, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Lewis	161
Residence requirements for university admission, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Givens, Mr. Shulman	162
Price of milk, questions of Mr. Stewart: Mr. MacDonald	163
Ottawa teachers' dispute, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Roy	163
Health survey of Elliot Lake miners, question of Mr. Miller: Mr. Martel	164
Report re standing committees, Mr. R. C. Hodgson	164
Report, electoral boundaries commission, Mr. Welch	168
Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 1975, Mr. Rhodes, first reading	168
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Gaunt	168
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Young, agreed to	195
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	195



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, March 20, 1975

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 1975

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House that in the west gallery there are members of the fifth Agincourt Scout Troop from Bradenburg Public School, along with Mrs. Smart. I am sure the members would like to welcome them to the Legislature today.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

EDUCATION GRANTS

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform members of the House that in three weeks time we will be mailing to all school boards in the province copies of the 1975 general legislative grants and apportionment regulations.

Once again, these regulations will indicate that the government will continue to bear 60 per cent of the total cost of elementary and secondary education in the province.

In 1975, a school board of average wealth will receive provincial grant support at the rate of 62 per cent of recognized ordinary expenditures. This is unchanged from the 1974 regulation.

The new regulations contain several important refinements, and I would like to draw attention to one of these today because it has significance for a number of school boards throughout the province.

It is now almost six months since we announced the education grant and expenditure ceilings for 1975. Prior to that announcement, we had analysed in great detail all the information available at the time regarding the probable impact of inflation on school boards in the coming year. Great care was taken to set the 1975 ceilings at levels that would allow school boards to cope with increased costs over which they would have little or no control.

This analysis led to the decision, last October, that the 1975 ceilings would be 13 per cent over the 1974 ceilings. An additional amount of \$80 was added to encourage im-

provements in basic instructional programmes at the elementary school level.

It was our best judgement, six months ago, that the 13 per cent increase would be adequate to cope with inflation. Today, however, school boards find themselves faced with new realities brought about by continuing inflation. Increased costs of such items as heating fuel, light, maintenance, paper and classroom supplies have continued to squeeze school board budgets even more than anticipated.

Because of these trends, some boards are faced with budget decisions which could have a detrimental effect on classroom programmes and pupils. We have said repeatedly that we do not want this to happen and we intend to stand by that commitment.

Thus, because of continued inflation, Mr. Speaker, the 1975 educational grant and expenditure ceilings will be increased by an additional \$50 per pupil. The revised 1975 ceilings are \$926 per elementary school pupil and \$1,441 per secondary school pupil.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): We still aren't closing the gap.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We have examined the effects of spiralling inflation on school board budgets. It is our firm conclusion that this mid-year increase will very adequately allow school boards to accommodate unavoidable rising costs, provided of course that they continue to budget public funds in a responsible manner.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): That's a fatuous comment.

Hon. Mr. Wells: In this regard, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the whole question of teachers' salary increases is a very serious problem for school trustees in many parts of Ontario. Right now, in Ottawa, the board of education has offered its secondary school teachers a package representing a 24 per cent increase. This is an offer that is well in excess of the current rate of increase in the cost-of-living index. It represents a large real increase even after allowing for inflation.

However, Mr. Speaker, in spite of this offer, the Ottawa secondary school teachers

are out on strike to support their demand for a huge improvement in salaries, fringe benefits and working conditions. The salary demand alone represents an increase of about 47 per cent.

I have said many times, Mr. Speaker, that teachers are entitled to fair and reasonable salaries. Their salaries should reflect increases in inflation, together with other economic trends in the community. They should have the right to bargain for improved compensation and they should have the right to bargain for working conditions.

But to withdraw services to support demands that are, by any standard, exorbitant and unreasonable, is grossly unfair to students and to taxpayers, who pay 100 per cent of the costs of operating the schools.

These are unusual and difficult economic times. This government strongly believes that reason and restraint in wage increases are absolutely necessary today. We believe that all employees, those in the public sector and those in the private sector as well, must be reasonable in their wage demands. All of us should be setting examples in our wage demands in order to help stem the inflationary spiral.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): The government never says that about prices, does it?

Mr. Foulds: How about prices and profits?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It is frightening to think what would happen to our economy if everyone in Ontario walked off their jobs unless their employers gave them a 47 per cent salary increase.

Mr. Speaker, the adjusted educational spending ceilings for 1975 are totally fair and reasonable. There is not a school board in the province that should not now have funds at its disposal to maintain the present quality of education, and at the same time to bargain with its teachers toward settlements that are fair, equitable and reasonable.

Mr. Cassidy: That's a pretty large claim.

Hon. Mr. Wells: But I can say right now that the ceilings are not high enough to allow a school board to accommodate outrageously high salary increases and other excessive demands.

Mr. Foulds: The minister is really waving the big stick.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, the Ontario government's policy of education spending

ceilings has been enunciated clearly and strongly many times. This policy of limiting the annual rate of increase in school board budgets still stands firm. The ceilings continue to be a safeguard for taxpayers, while at the same time allowing school board budget increases that are realistic in these inflationary times.

Tax dollars obviously come from only one source, Mr. Speaker, the pockets of our citizens. There is not a bottomless pit, and all locally-elected school trustees, as well as teachers, must recognize this. There is another very practical incentive for every school board to keep its spending increases within the levels allowed by the ceilings. As has been the practice since 1971, the effective rate of grant for any board which exceeds the ceilings will be reduced in the following year. This penalty will be proportionate to the size of the excess.

This is a meaningful way of encouraging boards to live within their means, while at the same time recognizing the responsible efforts of school boards that do not exceed their ceilings.

Mr. Speaker, inflation is making life difficult for most people. Reason and restraint are two important prerequisites for successfully riding out this trying economic period.

The changes that will be incorporated in our 1975 regulations will enable school boards to make responsible budgetary decisions, and at the same time allow meaningful negotiations with teachers.

Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to inform the House at this time that I met this morning with the members of the Ottawa board of education and the representatives of the Ottawa secondary school teachers. I have appointed and made available to both parties Mr. Owen Shime to act as a mediator.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Good man.

Mr. Cassidy: Good appointment.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Shime will be contacting both parties immediately. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Shime is a Toronto lawyer and practising labour arbitrator and a former vice-chairman of the Ontario Labour Relations Board. He was most recently the mediator in the dispute between the Lakehead board of education and its secondary teachers.

Mr. Foulds: He did a good job.

PUBLIC SERVICE MILEAGE RATES

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, the members will recall that effective April 1, 1974, the government revised the mileage rates paid to an employee who uses his automobile on government business. The change was from 15 cents to 16 cents for mileage up to 5,000 miles; from eight cents to 13 cents between 5,000 and 15,000 miles; and from seven cents to 11 cents for mileage in excess of 15,000 miles. An additional one cent per mile is paid for mileage in northern Ontario.

The new rates were offered to the CSAO on April 4, 1974, but were not accepted by the CSAO's negotiating team. The rates were implemented as scheduled for employees excluded from the bargaining unit.

Later in the year, the increased cost of owning and operating a motor vehicle convinced the government that a further increase was warranted, and the rate for the first 5,000 miles was increased from 16 cents to 18 cents per mile. Rates for mileage in excess of 5,000 miles were not changed at that time.

The second increase was offered to the CSAO on Oct. 4, 1974, without prejudice to continuing negotiations, but was again rejected by the bargaining team.

I am pleased to confirm that the CSAO has now accepted these rate changes and bargaining unit employees will receive the benefit of the new rates as soon as the authorizing documents can be processed.

In keeping with an earlier commitment to employees, the new rates will be effective from April 1, 1974, and Aug. 1, 1974, as the case may be, and the mileage claims for bargaining unit employees will be revised accordingly.

Mr. Stokes: And made negotiable.

NORTH PICKERING DEVELOPMENT

Hon. D. R. Irvine (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to report on planning for the North Pickering project. During October and November, 1974, three modified concept plans were presented for public review. The public was asked to evaluate the planning aims in each concept.

This phase has been completed. Based on the public review and technical studies, fundamental decisions on future planning for the 25,000-acre site have been made.

Mr. Speaker, the public's review and our technical studies both recognized that agricultural land should be oriented toward

Oshawa, with a maximum separation from Metropolitan Toronto.

As a result, Mr. Speaker, the recommended plan will provide for two communities—an urban community with a population of 70,000 to 90,000 persons, located on the Oshawa side of the West Duffin Creek, which bisects the site, and an agricultural community of 17,000 acres located in the area west of the West Duffin Creek.

The urban community's location has sufficient flexibility to permit refinement, modification or growth in the remainder of the inner planning area. It not only responds to public preferences, but also coincides with provincial objectives to stimulate economic growth to the east of Metro. It demonstrates what this government has been working toward all along—the planning for orderly growth east of Metropolitan Toronto. Despite charges by some to the contrary, this government is very much in touch with the public and is planning for the future—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It is the federal people the minister is after.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —in a way that meets public priorities.

Mr. Cassidy: And in the same breath the government is putting 100,000 people into Brampton. That is their planning.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: By locating the agricultural community on the west portion of the site, we are not only providing a separation from Toronto of some 26 square miles, but also ensuring that a viable farm component will be retained in that area. The staff of my ministry, along with that of my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), is now working with area farmers to develop an innovative farm lease programme which will encourage farm production in the agricultural community.

As well, Housing ministry staff will be recommending land-use zoning to implement the two-community concept and to recognize the role of the existing hamlets of Locust Hill, Whitevale, Cherrywood, Cherrywood East and Martin's subdivision. An architect-planner is now working with hamlet residents in this regard. Mr. Speaker, the two-community concept forms the basis of the plan which will be submitted to the North Pickering Development Corp.

The corporation, if it agrees, will in turn use the plan as a basis for development and

for official plan amendments to be proposed to the municipalities which have planning jurisdiction in the area. The proposed amendments would be considered by these municipalities in accordance with established procedures under the Planning Act of Ontario, providing opportunity for further public review. This approach was the one requested by the affected municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, I have a further statement.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: A point of order.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister have copies of the first statement which he read that might be made available to us?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I will get them for the member.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It was completely incomprehensible.

Mr. Lewis: We didn't understand a word.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: That's fine. If the member reads it, maybe he will.

Mr. Lewis: No, but really—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): We are not being smart; we couldn't understand it.

Mr. Cassidy: We understand the minister is practising oratory by putting marbles in his mouth.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): That was not called for.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the point of order, I'll provide the copies.

Mr. Singer: It is all Barney Danson's fault anyway.

ACCELERATED FAMILY RENTAL HOUSING

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, as indicated in the Throne Speech two weeks ago, the government is determined to ensure that the standard of living and quality of life to which the people of Ontario are accustomed will be maintained.

Last Oct. 18, I announced several new initiatives of this government aimed at increasing the supply of affordable accommodation and which put special emphasis on the development of family rental units. Today I would like to give the House the results of our ac-

tivities in regard to one of these initiatives, Mr. Speaker. You will recall that at that time I indicated the basic approach of this government was to work with industry and municipalities to substantially increase the supply of rental accommodation. We chose the increased supply route over the rent control route because controls have not worked in other jurisdictions and, in some cases—

Mr. Cassidy: The minister's programme sure hasn't worked.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —seemed to have worsened the situation. The initiatives mentioned included: ensuring federal funding for housing in Ontario is fully utilized; introducing the concept of condominium development on leased land; expansion of our role as a direct developer; and inducements to the building industry through low-interest rates to build more family rental accommodation.

What I would like to discuss today, Mr. Speaker, is the accelerated family rental housing programme which is part of the last-mentioned initiative. I am very enthusiastic about the results of our recent public call for proposals under this programme.

Mr. Deans: This is absurd.

Mr. Cassidy: Is this a political speech?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Such developments will combine rent stabilization on 75 per cent of the units with the integration of families on rent geared to income in the remainder. As a result of the call, we have selected eight projects in five municipalities, providing us with 1,749 housing units. Of this group, 437 units will be rented to families on a rent-geared-to-income basis while the remainder will be under a rent stabilization formula.

Under this programme, Ontario Mortgage Corp. will provide loans of 95 per cent of the cost at eight per cent interest over 50 years. OMC officials will begin direct negotiations on plans and specifications with the proponents before the funding of \$44 million is formally committed. The selected submissions include three in Metropolitan Toronto totalling 795 units, one in Brampton totalling 334 units, one in Whitby of 352 units, two in Hamilton totalling 200 units and one in Thunder Bay for 68 units.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the building industry is to be complimented, not only on the extensive nature of its response to our call but on the quality of the submissions. Successful proponents will be required to enter into operating agreements specifying the levels of rents to be charged and the

maximum in-going income of the prospective tenants. OMC is applying for approved lender status under the National Housing Act so that the rents on these projects will be further assisted by legislation now before parliament. It will provide funds for rental reduction on the 75 per cent set aside for private rentals.

Rents for these units will be set out in the agreement between the owner and OMC and will be based on the size of the units, the extent of servicing provided, the below-market financing terms offered and the nature of the assistance which will be received under the NHA amendments just mentioned. Calculation of the rentals will provide for a limited return on the borrower's equity.

As well as receiving rent supplement units from this call, we will be obtaining 25 per cent of all units obtained under the recent and current federal modified limited dividend calls.

We are now looking to the municipal governments, considering the degree of urgency surrounding the need to produce new family rental housing, to help us expedite these dwellings.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions. The Leader of the Opposition.

NORTH PICKERING DEVELOPMENT

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask the Minister of Housing a question further to his first statement. Are we to gather that the 25,000-acre commitment to the North Pickering community has now been reduced so that, in fact, he finds he needs only about 8,000 acres, or certainly less than 10,000? And perhaps as an additional clarification, was the minister provided by his staff with a corrected copy of his statement, as we were? Otherwise, why would he say that technical studies "recognized that agricultural land should be oriented toward Oshawa" when his staff intended him to say "urban land"? What's going on?

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): He doesn't know.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition doesn't know what's going on, that's quite obvious, but I happen to know what's going on. I admit there was a mistake in the statement that was handed to me. It was not agricultural, it was urban land.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Doesn't the minister have enough sense to correct that himself? It was such an obvious error.

Mr. Stokes: He read "agricultural."

Hon. Mr. Irvine: The amount of development in the urban complex will be somewhere around 7,000 to 8,000 acres. Does that clarify the matter for the Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. Deans: The minister doesn't know what he is doing. No wonder we don't understand it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, having to do with that clarification: How does the minister think the taxpayers are going to respond to the fulsome statements that came from one of his numerous predecessors some months or years ago now on the requirement for 25,000 acres to be expropriated and bought at tremendous public expense, when he now tells us that he is going to need about a third of that land? He says, "Fine, we're going to keep it in agriculture." Why the devil didn't he let the farmers keep it in agriculture? What is he interfering with it for?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of the Opposition has a copy of the statement and he can interpret it much more correctly than I can, maybe he might look at page two and see what I said in the statement. Maybe he doesn't understand the fact that we don't build a city of 70,000 or 90,000 people in two or three years; it takes a long time to do that. If we're to build a further population in the area it's going to take 20 years, so what we are doing is planning for the immediate future up to 10 years, and after that we'll review what is the ultimate best use of the land.

Hon. S. B. Handleman (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): And we'll still be around to do it too.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary. The member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Can the minister tell us what will be the ultimate population of the new town, because he has mentioned figures of 200,000 or more and now is only talking of 70,000?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have answered this question about a dozen times for the hon. member. It is impossible to say at this time what the ultimate population will be. We are planning for the immediate expansion of the urban area to be around 70,000

to 90,000 population. Now that's clearly in the statement, even though the member couldn't understand it as I read it out, but I will give the member a copy so he can read it and then maybe he will understand it.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? One more supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: The minister says the two-community concept forms the basis of the plan he will put to the North Pickering Development Corp. Surely he is not attempting to suggest to the Legislature that the North Pickering Development Corp. will amend the plan? They have again, as a government, imposed a plan of 70,000 to 90,000 for a community, on the people of that area with a pretence of public hearings but without adequate input; and secondly, is the government not heading irresistibly for a quarter of a million people since it intends to continue to own the land and considers this just a first phase?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, we are not predetermining what the public input will be. We have had all kinds of hearings in the area. We will have hearings, which will be under the Planning Act, when we proceed with the plan. The North Pickering Development Corp. will submit the plan, the same as any other developer or any other municipality would in regard to the views of the people in the area; that is what the statement says.

Mr. Lewis: That is all over. It has been done.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: No, it isn't all over.

Mr. Lewis: This is not planning.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: The leader of the NDP may say in his opinion the socialists would take everything over.

Mr. Lewis: That is what got this government in trouble with regional government.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: The socialists want to take everything over and have no input. We want to make sure there is public input at all times.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Lewis: There has never been any planning.

Interjections by hon. members.

SPEECH BY MEMBER FOR ST. DAVID

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I wonder if the same minister can tell us whether he approved the

speech made by his parliamentary assistant (Mrs. Scrivener) and if in fact he agrees with the scurrilous and irresponsible statements she made with regard—

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): The minister doesn't have to answer.

Mr. Lewis: No, but he wants to dig himself out.

Mr. Cassidy: If the minister were an honourable man he would have her resign.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. minister has the opportunity to answer.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): No one can stop her from doing whatever she wants to do.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that all the members of this House understand very clearly that my parliamentary assistant and myself discuss all matters, and that I am in agreement with the parliamentary assistant's statements. As I have said, and I was quoted in the Globe and Mail—

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): The minister will regret that.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Shame.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —it is up to the federal minister, Mr. Danson, to reply very clearly, and not garbled as the official opposition has garbled up most things, and to very clearly indicate to us why he can't substantiate the amount of funding to Ontario for housing this year—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —and why he will not assist us more than he has in the past.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): The Premier (Mr. Davis) is on his way out; he is on his way out.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Bullbrook: That is the distinction between this Premier and John Robarts, he wouldn't agree with anything like that. The Premier couldn't carry his political shoes and he knows it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I wonder if the Premier, then—

Mr. Bullbrook: He was a statesman.

Mr. Lewis: Not in an election year he wasn't, let me say.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Could the Premier indicate to us if he approves the attitude of his Minister of Housing, which is stating very clearly that it is political influence from Ottawa that is in fact responsible for the problems that we are having and have had in housing in this province, recognizing the serious implications of such an irresponsible statement.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Now just watch him skate around this one.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Well Mr. Speaker, I know the Leader of the Opposition regularly looks to the east to get whatever assistance he can from his colleagues in Ottawa. I don't know why, because I don't think they are that much help to him.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I always thought the Premier looked to the east.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Heavens above, they ran his great meeting in Windsor for him. The Leader of the Opposition is getting talent from them left, right and centre; he knows it and I know it.

I will only make this observation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Doesn't the Premier wish he had some support?

Hon. Mr. Davis: When it comes to housing, this government's policy is very clearly stated.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): This government doesn't have any.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Our commitment is there. We need additional funding from the federal government and it is inexcusable, in my view, the way they have reduced the amount of their financial involvement in housing here in the Province of Ontario, and I think everybody can draw their conclusions.

Mr. Speaker: Further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Wouldn't the Premier think then that if he is going to be the leader of a party that was going to campaign on that basis, he should make the statements himself and not relegate them to one of his backbench members—is he, in fact hiding behind the skirts of the member for St. David (Mrs. Scrivener)? What happened to fighting Bill? Why does he send this charming lady out to make these scurrilous and irresponsible statements?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't send the charming lady anywhere. She is one of those, unlike those in the members party, who does things on her own initiative and extremely well. I can only say to the Leader of the Opposition, let him make the kind of speeches he wants to make, I'll make the kind I want to make.

Mr. Speaker: Further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, just for clarity: Is the Premier accepting responsibility for the attitude expressed by the hon. member for St. David—

Mr. Roy: And the words?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —supported by the Minister of Housing, or is he not? Could he make it clear whether he accepts that concept or not?

Mr. Roy: Is he in agreement or not? Just yes or no.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition is prepared, as he never is, to accept the points of view—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: Answer yes or no.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier is as irresponsible as the rest of them.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —expressed by all of his members of caucus, I'd be delighted to hear of it. And I would say here without any question I have total confidence in the capacity of the Minister of Housing and his parliamentary assistant. And if they're saying—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He won't last four months. He is going to go the way of the rest of them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —that we are not getting sufficient money from Ottawa for housing, that is factually the case and the member knows it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: In other words, the Premier refuses to answer.

I have a question that I would like—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: It is the first time he has answered in months.

Mr. Cassidy: The Leader of the Opposition doesn't recognize an answer when he gets it.

Mr. Lewis: I have a supplementary I would like to ask.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): Why is everybody putting on the member for Brant?

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary question?

Mr. Roy: Hang on, Bob, he won't be back.

Hon. J. R. Rhodes (Minister of Transportation and Communications): They're going to make powder puffs and canned ham.

An hon. member: Shame on you, Bill Davis.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: The Minister of Transportation and Communications won't be back either.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Don't worry about me, baby.

Mr. Lewis: I want to ask the Premier when—

An hon. member: Nice to see the minister back. Where has he been?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. member proceed with his question?

Mr. Lewis: I want to ask, whatever the federal government has done in not meeting certain programmes or transferring money to others, does the Premier recognize that the government of Ontario between 1970 and 1974 failed to spend \$133 million of budgeted Ontario money? And that he wouldn't need to make that kind of silly political speech if he had applied it to housing in the first place?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say this to the Leader of the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker. We have succeeded in this province, unlike some others I know, or other jurisdictions—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: In housing? What a laugh!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —in providing a higher level of accommodation for the people of Ontario than he will find in any comparable jurisdiction—

Mr. Stokes: The government didn't even spend what it had in the first place.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —show me a better one.

An hon. member: Yes, where?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: Show him? I have been challenged. Look at BC, Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

Some hon. members: Oh! oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Does the Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. Lewis: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: State your point of privilege.

Mr. Lewis: I have absolutely no proof of that statement, but I'm sure of it! I'm sure of it.

Interjections by hon. members.

LEMOINE POINT LAND PURCHASE

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. In the absence of the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) for the last day or two, can the minister report to the House on the status of the acquisition of the property in Kingston township known as Lemoine Point? And can he indicate further as to why the municipal council of Kingston township would have passed a resolution declaring their lack of confidence in the governmental representative on the local conservation authority because of the ham-handed and expensive way these negotiations have been handled?

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Mr. Speaker, I'll do my best not to say anything nasty about the federal government. This matter is about to be resolved in a very short

while. The hon. member did make some statement about the expensive manner in which it has been handled. What we are attempting to do is to make sure that whatever is done isn't going to be too costly for the taxpayers of the province. The matter will be resolved in a very short while; it is well in hand.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary question: Since the government has vetoed an attempt by Kingston township to buy this extremely valuable parkland property let's say—it's unique in every way—at a price of \$900,000, can the minister assure us that we are not going to be in a position of paying substantially over \$1 million now that he is handling it so judiciously from the centre?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I think I can give the member a fair assurance of that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Thank you That's interesting. We will see what the government pays for it.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

OMA FEE SCHEDULE

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask the Minister of Health what has happened to the generally excellent relationship between his ministry and the Ontario Medical Association which would have led the president of the association some days ago to say they were no longer going to negotiate with the minister or anybody else on their fee schedule but would enter into one unilaterally which they would proclaim next May 1 and damn the torpedoes or something like that?

Hon. F. S. Miller (Minister of Health): I am just not quite sure, Mr. Speaker. They seem to be suffering from the same disease as the Leader of the Opposition is these days.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Does the minister mean they don't like Tories?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Miller: Just a little bit of the unvented—

Mr. Lewis: The minister certainly walked into it that time.

Hon. Mr. Miller: I did that. Just a little bit of unvented spleen.

Mr. MacDonald: Why doesn't the government pass a law ordering them to negotiate?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Miller: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I have never had any letter from the Ontario Medical Association confirming the letter signed by the president.

Secondly, I have the assurance of the three members of the Clawson committee that they are not only willing to negotiate with us on a continuing basis for next year's contract but they now want to do it weekly and on an expanded area of topics. These negotiations are going on and they have told us they have had no instruction to the contrary.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is the minister undertaking some further initiative to re-establish the relationships between that important organization and his department or is he simply going to allow them to maintain this rapidly expanding distance between the two areas?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, that makes the assumption that the letter referred to was, in fact, a reflection of the association. I met with that association the day after the letter was dated. At that meeting while we discussed some disaffection or whatever it is with the fact that we wouldn't voluntarily give them more than the four per cent they agreed to take there was just no indication of hostility at all. I am not inclined to believe, until I am faced with it, that the very good relationships have disintegrated.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. Lewis: Since the OMA is a union we know a little more about it than most. I want to put to the minister, is he going to—

Hon. Mr. Miller: Are they a union?

Mr. Lewis: Sure, they are affiliated. They pay a very hefty check-off, as a matter of fact. Does the minister intend to oblige them to bargain with the government over any increase in the fee schedule since, whatever they have said to him, they have indicated publicly they will do it unilaterally?

Hon. Mr. Miller: As the member knows one must always stand back and try to resolve problems rather than inflame them. I am not particularly interested in any discussion that implies a hypothetical set of conditions. I still find they are negotiating with us. I haven't had any arguments with the president; I haven't had any arguments with the executive. We still meet on a relatively friendly basis and I even walk out of the

room with my back to them. Therefore I feel relatively secure that we will continue to do so.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How does the minister walk out of Tory caucuses?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Does he know what he is negotiating?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Yes, I do. And that we can face next year's discussions with a spirit of co-operation that no other province in Canada has managed to achieve.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? The member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Roy: Yes, to the minister; In view of the fact there are certain public discussions, if not with him, about their disenchantment, and that many of them are preparing to opt out, and his statement was that he would force them back in, what percentage is he prepared to tolerate opting out before he forces them to opt back in?

Hon. Mr. Miller: I made that statement and I don't back down on it—

Mr. Roy: I am not asking him to.

Hon. Mr. Miller: —because there are eight million people in this province who have a right, and that right is to get medical care without costing them money.

Mr. Roy: Okay, answer my question.

Hon. Mr. Miller: I am answering the member's question. Now, the doctors have a right too, and I honour that right. That right is to opt in or opt out. As long as both parties recognize their rights and both parties have freedom of choice, I will honour it; but the moment the public loses its right, then I will be prompted to action.

Mr. Roy: What percentage?

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park has a final supplementary on this question.

Mr. Shulman: Is there any significance to the fact that at OMA headquarters at 234 St. George St. they have set up a wax figure of the minister, which has a number of pins set in at strategic points?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): The member for High Park ought to know.

Hon. Mr. Miller: No, that's the boys who want to go into acupuncture. They're doing very well at it.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): The minister is feeling better?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Yes, I am. I understand the second course is on a live dummy, and the hon. member for High Park is going to be sent.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions from the Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. Lewis: It might be funny, but it doesn't solve the problem.

Mr. Singer: Place an amendment then.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

SPENDING CEILINGS IN EDUCATION

Mr. Lewis: I first have a question of the Minister of Education, if I could. Wouldn't the announcement of the revision of the ceilings have been an appropriate time to further close the gap in the per-pupil expenditure between secondary and primary schools?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I think the fact that we have raised the figure proportionately, or equally, to \$50 for both is helping that situation. As I've said many times, we are working toward that end, and I think we've made a significant gain this year.

Mr. Lewis: I appreciate in theory the percentage changes, but in fact it's still \$515 exactly, as I look at it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Can I just tell the hon. member for Scarborough West something? I don't know whether he is aware of this, but if he takes the elementary ceiling as a percentage of the secondary ceiling he will see that in 1970 it was 50 per cent; in 1975, with our revised ceilings, it becomes 64.25 per cent.

Mr. Lewis: Right, okay, good. Now, does the minister not recognize, despite the shift upwards, the maintenance of the \$515 disparity means the major changes which must take place in our school system at the primary level to reduce the kind of dropout consequence at the secondary level are never going to get a chance to take place until he changes those figures fundamentally?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I don't think the member understands the financing of education in this province. Accepting the fact, as this government has done, that more

emphasis must be put on the elementary panel—and we've shown tangibly that we are doing this—there is a limit as to how much that gap can be closed in a year.

Actually, talking about a gap is really a phony sort of thing. The main thing is the allocation of resources to do the job in the elementary panel—and they have an increase in resources this year. If they can spend all that money—based on the fact that we're going to pay 60 per cent of it and the local people are going to pay 40 per cent—then to be able to do that in one year is a significant gain. I think that the elementary people realize this. If this can be kept up, I think we are making significant progress.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further supplementaries?

Mr. Foulds: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: How can the minister call a narrowing of the gap by a mere \$12 a significant gain? How is that a tremendous additional resource to be spent at the elementary level? What the hell is he talking about?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Narrowing the gap is a phony argument. Don't talk about narrowing the gap.

Mr. Lewis: What does he mean, it's a phony argument? It's a real gap.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The real question is how do you realistically help the elementary panel?

Mr. Lewis: The government is starving the elementary schools.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I could suggest to the hon. member that if he was sitting over here he wouldn't do anything different than what we have done.

Mr. Cassidy: We sure would.

Mr. Lewis: Well, let's try it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: What we have done—

Mr. Roy: We're more realistic than the leader of the NDP.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Just a minute. Sit down. Let me just tell the members. What we have done this year is we have raised the elementary ceiling by 20.2 per cent, and then we have put on top of that another \$80.

Mr. Foulds: How about the grant as opposed to the ceilings?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Wells: This means that all of that money is eligible for their rate of grant. I don't think if the opposition was sitting over here it could do any more in one year.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions from the member for Scarborough West?

Mr. Lewis: The government's system will fail until it changes the ratios.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: A final supplementary.

Mr. Foulds: How much does the amount of money that the government has allocated to the elementary schools allow them to lower their pupil-teacher ratios in grades 1, 2 and 3?

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, that of course is up to the local school boards—

Mr. Lewis: To the individual boards. Yes, right.

Hon. Mr. Wells: They know the amount of money they have got. They have got to decide where they put their resources.

Mr. Lewis: Since he became minister, he has never thought about the schools in terms of what's inside them. He thinks about dollars, numbers, buildings.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I might just say that all I think about is how all these things will affect the classroom.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He never thinks about dollars.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I can tell the hon. member that the emphasis we are putting on the elementary panel is significant.

Mr. Speaker: Further questions?

Mr. Foulds: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: No. Order. The last one was final.

Mr. Foulds: What are the pupil-teacher ratios in grades 1, 2 and 3 as opposed to high school?

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

HEALTH AND SAFETY HAZARDS AT ELLIOT LAKE

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I have a question of the Minister of Health, if I may.

Is the Minister of Health aware that the latest dust readings at the Denison Mines, as a follow-up to the report which he tabled in this House, the readings for early 1975 show that in seven out of 11 areas of the mine the dust levels are significantly in excess of the desirable limits? As a matter of fact, there are readings as high as 465 and 547 in heavy work areas where his ministry says 176 parts per cubic centimetre is the threshold limit value.

When will Health do something to attempt to reduce the clear and continuing hazard to those who work in the mines under these circumstances?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of those figures. I can only say I've been discussing them and that we will see some positive action very shortly.

Mr. Speaker: Further questions?

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary: The Minister of Natural Resources mentioned something of that kind the other day. Is the Minister of Health planning some kind of statement in advance of the Ham commission which will limit the number of years a man works in the mine or changes the ratio or imposes standards? What does the minister have in mind?

Hon. Mr. Miller: It is not of that type, Mr. Speaker, but I or someone will have some comments on this shortly.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Why doesn't the minister hand out the report?

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Why has this minister or the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacBeth) not released the joint report that their ministries made on this very problem, the problem of health in the industry, which I know this minister has had on his desk for over a week?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, the member may have it on his desk; I haven't got it on mine yet.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, really? It is an interesting document.

Mr. Singer: The Osler report took four months to get tabled.

Hon. Mr. Miller: Yes, I will have the report very shortly, I have been checking on it, for the member's information.

Mr. Lewis: To compare it with Dr. Stewart's views?

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

ONTARIO HYDRO SPENDING

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a question of the Treasurer? Since I gather his ministry is in day-to-day contact with Ontario Hydro over the capital needs of that corporation between 1975 and 1982, where exactly can Ontario Hydro expect to borrow the latest figure, \$24 billion, which is up from \$10 billion in September, 1973? What kind of suggestions has the Treasurer made to them about the borrowing market? And, more important, what percentage of that does the Treasurer think should come out of a rate increase as a matter of social policy?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of questions there. Hydro aren't in touch with us on a day-to-day basis. They present their borrowing plans to us on an annual basis, and of course there are revisions during the course of the year. There are also close consultations when either they or we are going to the market.

The second question, which was how much should come from borrowing and how much from what I would call retained earnings—but that upsets the OMEA—or out of their surpluses, is a good question. About 80-20 is their current debt-equity ratio in normal terms. There were studies done by Task Force Hydro which indicated that that should move up somewhat. In fact, Hydro as I recall put a position in front of the Ontario Energy Board which indicated that they thought the present ratio was about right in terms of going to the market and of, in fact, raising their rates. As I recall, the Energy Board I think accepted that decision by and large. But these things will undoubtedly change from time to time. As market conditions become tighter and it's more difficult to raise money, then undoubtedly the rate structure has to be re-examined from time to time.

Mr. Lewis: Just one supplementary then, because it seems to me—and perhaps the minister can tell us if we are wrong—that this should now be a matter of government over-all economic policy rather than just Hydro or the OEB. In that context, since the chairman of Ontario Hydro assured several of us

in the NDP caucus just yesterday that the projected figures they are using are explored with the minister's staff frequently and regularly, so that his staff is obviously aware of the \$24 billion figure in advance of the public announcement, where does the minister have in mind that money like that is coming from? To what extent will Ontario underwrite it on a year-to-year basis? And since Ontario Hydro is going to the Ontario Energy Board asking for a rate increase to levy money for capital expansion, what is government policy on all of this, since the amounts are so great?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I must say I have noticed in the papers this commendable interest on the part of the leader of the New Democratic Party in the last couple of weeks. He's finally realized that money doesn't come out of the air, and he's been making speeches around the province—I think the first one was in London, Ont.—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —saying that Hydro needed a staggering amount of money. We've been saying that for some considerable time; for years—

Mr. Martel: In the last two elections the Tories have proved that too.

Mr. Lewis: I think we discussed that in the estimates many months ago.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The hon. member is a little bit upset these days because we put some money into Syncrude. He doesn't like that. He'd just put the whole \$2 billion into Syncrude. Money has to be found. There is no question about it.

Mr. Lewis: Tell us where?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is basic economics.

Mr. Lewis: Where? The Arab countries?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: He should go back and look at a textbook and read some basic economics.

Mr. Lewis: No kidding. Thank you very much.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It doesn't grow on trees.

Mr. Lewis: That's terrific. Wonderful.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: And we on this side of the House can't borrow it from the mem-

ber for High Park, like they do over there. We have to get it in the market. That's right.

Mr. Cassidy: We are saying the government should exercise its responsibility.

Mr. Lewis: Where? Where? Where is he going to get it? Now that we have dealt with McKeough's law of absurdity, let's answer the question.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In 10 years—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Everybody wants to be a Tory.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, in my time in the House, this represents an historic milestone—the NDP are admitting—

Mr. MacDonald: Deal with the issue.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —that there may be some difficulty in raising money in the market.

Mr. Lewis: Will the minister answer the question?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: And that is a great step forward.

Mr. Lewis: Where?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Where? A combination of markets; the Canadian market, the American market, perhaps in the Middle East, yes.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Perhaps in the Middle East, yes, certainly. Wherever it may be possible to borrow to the best advantage—

Mr. Stokes: Maybe even back to Germany.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —of Ontario Hydro and the people of Ontario, bearing in mind Canada's exchange problems; wherever it may be possible.

Mr. Lewis: Wherever it can be found?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That's right.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister commit himself to the \$24 billion? Does he commit himself to that figure? Does he?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The \$24 billion is not committed. The Ontario Energy Board will recommend—

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Hon. Mr. McKeough:—that staging of those projects go before the board and the board determines the timing or make recommendations on the timing—

Mr. Lewis: They have already approved \$16 billion?

Hon. Mr. McKeough:—and then its recommendations and Hydro's recommendations come forward to government.

Mr. Lewis: Aha!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: And before that construction programme is proceeded with—

Mr. Deans: Luckily we will be there.

Hon. Mr. McKeough:—out of which flows the borrowing and/or raising the rates, government gives approval to those projects. But whether the whole programme will go ahead or whether it will be more, given the rates of inflation, particularly in the capital areas, which we have today, heaven only knows at this moment. I can't say with great precision that the money will come from the Canadian market or the American market or wherever, but it is very sure that it is not all going to come out of the Canadian market.

Mr. Lewis: That's right.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This is not a bottomless pit.

Mr. Lewis: If it is right, thank you very much.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If we have got that message across to the member—

Mr. Lewis: That's twice in one day. It is a good thing they made him Treasurer, with all this interest.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This is the man who two weeks ago was saying, "What's wrong with Syncrude is that the government should do it all."

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. MacDonald: Right, because they are getting it by give-aways in taxes and gifts.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: He'd have us put up \$2 billion for one Syncrude plant.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Any further questions? The Minister of Transportation and Communications has an answer to a question.

INQUIRY INTO DUMP TRUCK OPERATIONS

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, in response to a question that was asked by the member for Yorkview (Mr. Young)—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Question time is being wasted.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: It is still being wasted. The minister will continue with his answer.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: In answer to a question asked by the member for Yorkview, Mr. Speaker, on March 14, as to the time frame of the investigation of the dump truck industry, the office of the dump truck inquiry is now located on the third floor of the Hepburn Block and has been opened and staffed since Feb. 20.

The preliminary work required before public hearings can be held is well in hand and an advertisement setting out the terms of reference and inviting written submissions from the public was put into the local press on March 15. We're requesting briefs to be submitted by April 10. Inquiries from the industry indicate that this is the minimum time required.

A letter has gone out to some 25 organizations associated with the dump truck industry with the terms of reference and inviting their submissions. In view of the uncertainty of the mails, the letters and the advertisement for the papers have been delivered personally through the facilities of the ministry.

The commission is presently studying the briefs and submissions already made to both provincial and federal governments. The commission is in the process of securing information from other jurisdictions as to how they are dealing with the problems raised by the terms of reference. Tentative plans call for the holding of the first public hearings, commencing April 21.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Carleton East.

LISGAR COLLEGIATE

Mr. P. Taylor (Carleton East): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Education: In a letter to me dated March 6, the minister states that the Lisgar Collegiate building in Ottawa has been designated as a heritage

building. Would the minister say when and by whom this designation was made because neither Ontario Heritage Foundation nor Ottawa Heritage has any such information?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I think I wrote that letter based on information told to me when I met with the Ottawa board about this project. Perhaps to use "heritage foundation" is the wrong terminology but I understand it had been declared, in whatever the National Capital Commission terminology is, as an historic site that was not to be destroyed in the capital area.

Mr. P. Taylor: Is the minister satisfied that this building will not be destroyed?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I guess in the context of what I've just said, if the National Capital Commission has decreed that it is to be preserved as an historic building, it will be preserved. Some financial responsibility, I would think, rests on them and the federal government to assist in this matter.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor West.

UAW PENSION PROPOSAL

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, Mr. Speaker. In relation to his responsibility with regard to the Ontario Pension Board, how does he react to the proposal presented this morning by the UAW that there be a pension insurance plan in Ontario to take into account those instances where there is a pension shortfall due to the companies going bankrupt before their employees' pension funds become fully funded? Is he interested in that proposal at all? Will he institute such an insurance plan or is it too innovative a concept for him to contemplate?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I did not receive a copy of the UAW brief. I was not present during their presentation and I believe the response to the entire presentation is that all of the proposal be taken under advisement and a response be given to them as quickly as possible. I'll study it in detail.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa East.

CANADIAN FILM INDUSTRY

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier. Is it a fact that he has sent the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett) to Hollywood to try to encourage the movie studio chiefs to come to make films here in Ontario? If so, why wouldn't he encourage the Canadian film industry, as is done in other provinces—for instance, Quebec? Isn't he afraid that, by sending him to Hollywood with his high ego, he might never come back?

Mr. Yakabuski: He saw the member's act in here and that was enough.

Mr. Roy: He might never come back.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Which of the Simard family owned it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for the Minister of Industry and Tourism when I note before this House how interested the member for Ottawa East is in his whereabouts and what he's doing — I think with a degree of envy, as a matter of fact, more than any public interest.

Mr. Roy: I'd love to be in Hollywood with him.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I doubt that the member for Ottawa East would love to be in Hollywood with the minister but I have no doubt whatsoever that he would love to be in Hollywood to play to the galleries there as he attempts to do here.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park. Order, please. One supplementary; the member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the foreign control of the film distribution industry, is the government willing to consider a quota in order to permit more Canadian films to be required to be shown in Ontario film theatres?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not considering that at the moment. If the hon. member wants me to make any sort of general observation about movies in general, I would be delighted to do so. That would be very simple: I would like to see more Canadian-produced, directed and financed films. I have no reservation in so saying.

Mr. Roy: Why would the Premier send him to Hollywood then? Just bring them over here.

GUELPH REFORMATORY

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Minister of Correctional Services: Is the minister aware that Guelph Reformatory has become so overcrowded it had to fill its gymnasium with beds for inmates? And is the minister also aware that as a partial result of this there is some unrest among both the guards and the inmate population because the gymnasium is no longer available and that he may have more serious difficulties there unless he relieves the congestion?

Mr. Martel: He could send some to Burwash.

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, I am aware that we are using the gymnasium at the present time for a number of inmates—not because we have a tremendous overload of inmates, but because we are doing some renovations.

Mr. Roy: Because they're good athletes?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I am not aware it has caused any undue concern to the guards or the inmates. I am aware there was one guard who was a little disturbed and got in touch with the hon. member this morning.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: What has happened to the guard?

Mr. Renwick: He is now an inmate.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre.

AUTO RUSTPROOFING

Mr. Deacon: A question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations: Why has the ministry been so ineffective in dealing with the problem of many new car buyers with respect to undercoating of their vehicles and in particular with the very frustrating case of Mr. Williams of Willowdale and his fight with Grandview Ford, which the ministry seems to have done nothing about?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is fully aware of the fact that the ministry operates as a mediator and at this present time has absolutely no legislative clout.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: When Bill 55 comes into full operation, then the ministry will have legislative authority enabling it to intervene in cases of misrepresentation—only in the case of misrepresentation. The question of fraudulent or criminal activities, of course, is another matter entirely.

There is also the question of shoddy workmanship which is not a matter for the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations at the present time. That's a matter which can in fact be overseen by our friends in Ottawa. I don't want to start getting on to that line again, but there is the possibility, there is legislation in Ottawa which enables the Department of—I think it is called Consumer and Corporate Affairs, to intervene in the cases of shoddy workmanship.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Supplementary?

Mr. Deacon: Why does his ministry pretend that it does look after these car buyers?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, there is no pretence on the part of the ministry. The ministry operates as a mediator and in most cases is quite successful in obtaining satisfaction for the consumer, but a mediator cannot impose an arbitrary settlement on anyone.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Stormont.

DEATHS AT CIP MILL

Mr. G. Samis (Stormont): May I ask the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker, what action his industrial safety branch is taking considering the tragic deaths of three employees at the CIP mill in Hawkesbury?

Hon. J. P. MacBeth (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of that tragedy. I have asked for a report on it and when I have that report I will make known the result of it to the member.

Mr. Samis: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Has that branch made any recommendations regarding safety measures at the mill?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether we have made any recent recommendations or not. Certainly I don't think we have made any arising out of this accident. I think there is quite a possibility that our standard safety procedures were not followed in this case, but I shouldn't even perhaps be saying that at this point. Before I say more, I want to see the report.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

POLICE PROCEDURES

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the acting Solicitor General. Would he tell us what, if anything, his department has done in relation to the report of his honour, Judge Pringle, as a result of his investigation into the Landmark situation and the improper search? Have any directions been given to police forces throughout the province as to how searches might be conducted and as to their procedures in matters of this sort?

Hon. J. T. Clement (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that in the course of that inquiry, evidence was tendered by a senior officer, I believe, in the Brantford police force. The commissioner in that inquiry made an expressed recommendation that the system of search as detailed by that officer be one which should be implemented by police forces conducting this type of a search. A directive has gone out from my predecessor to the police forces, directing their attention to that recommendation and the evidence tendered by that particular officer supporting the commissioner's finding, and suggesting that this should be the procedure that should be followed in this type of a search.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, and just a very brief one: that is only one recommendation. If my memory serves me correctly, there were about 20 different ones that his honour made. Has the minister or his predecessor taken action on any of the other recommendations?

Hon. Mr. Clement: I am further advised, Mr. Speaker, that the Ontario Police Commission has had some discussion with the Police Chiefs' Association—I guess that is the name of it—directing their attention specifically to some of the recommendations. There was one that touched my Ministry of the Attorney General—

Mr. Singer: Yes. There was that one about justices of the peace. Is the minister going to provide them with cabinets?

Hon. Mr. Clement: —that justices of the peace be provided with proper receptacles.

Mr. Singer: Filing cabinets.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Filing cabinets. We're taking that under advisement.

Mr. Singer: Maybe the Attorney General could get it through the Treasury Board.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Maybe I should set up a task force on filing cabinets that would carry out that recommendation. By and large, the more serious recommendations made by the commissioner in that particular matter have been examined, and I understand the recommendations will be brought to the attention of the proper police forces.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

PROVINCIAL PARK FEES

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the Minister of Natural Resources, I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. In view of the statements made by senior officials of the Ministry of Natural Resources that there is going to be an increase in provincial park fees, would the provincial secretary assure this chamber that there will be no such increase before the next provincial election?

Mr. Shulman: He'll guarantee it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I will discuss that with my colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources, and report back to the Legislature.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): He is out of the country.

Mr. MacDonald: Has it been considered as a policy issue?

Mr. Laughren: Supplementary, if I might: Would the provincial secretary be prepared to state whether or not there will be a differential in the park fees between Canadian users and non-Canadian users?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an

address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(continued)

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, in continuing my presentation in respect to the Speech from the Throne, I might just review for a moment what happened the other day when we began this process.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): We're listening.

Mr. Young: We had a discussion with certain members of the Conservative rump in respect to the present economic system. I read them a bit of a lecture on how it actually worked, not how they hoped it might be working. Then we went on to the whole matter of the collapse of the so-called free enterprise system, to say that competition has all but disappeared and that today we are in a monopoly situation where combines, cartels, and collusion in prices have taken the place of wide-open competition. The consumer today is more or less at the mercy of this new kind of a setup.

Continuing from that, I want to address myself this afternoon to a specific aspect of this problem, and that specific is in connection with the whole motor car industry. As you know, Mr. Speaker, for the last 10 years or so I've been interested in this whole matter of getting safer vehicles onto our roads and streets. I think almost yearly I have placed in Hansard a blow-by-blow description of the struggle between the consumer and the motor car industry. Today I want to bring us up to date, likely for the last time in this parliament, and put on record one of the developments which is now taking place in—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Is the member planning to retire?

Mr. Young: No, I am not planning to retire. I am simply expecting this parliament to retire before I get a chance to speak on another Throne debate.

But coming back to the subject; a development has taken place which has far-reaching repercussions and may mean a great deal to the consumers in this country, as well as throughout the continent.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, during the past decade there has been a marked improvement in the safety of North American motor cars. Ten years ago there were no safety standards as far as governments were concerned. We accepted without question the kind of vehicles the industry gave us. We accepted, too, the increased deaths and injuries and property damage they brought us on the streets and the highways. We thought of this as the price that we had to pay for progress in transportation.

Then we began to realize that at least part of this carnage and destruction could be prevented if certain fundamental changes were made in vehicle design. We saw that steering columns, for example, were spearing drivers during collisions and that collapsible ones could save a great many lives; padding on dashes and pillars would soften the blow when passengers were thrown against them; safety belts would prevent death and injury for those wearing them; and reinforced doors could help in lateral accidents.

These and other measures to save lives and prevent injury were discussed and proposed to the industry, but it refused to modify design in the interests of safety. Sales appeal and profits were paramount to them.

Finally, governments began to legislate changes in vehicle construction. New York state started it by mandating safety belts. Later, Washington followed suit for the whole nation and Canada tagged along. Collapsible steering wheels, padded interiors, elimination of sharp protrusions inside and out, and other features, were legislated for the general safety.

At every step, Mr. Speaker, the industry fought these changes right into the courts, asserting it had the right to build cars as it saw fit; and that it knew better than governments what was good for the motoring public.

Then, New York state designed a safety car which its engineers claimed would protect its riders from death and serious injury up to 50 mph in collisions and up to 80 miles in rollovers.

Mr. Speaker, you will perhaps remember that the late Sen. Edward Spino of New York was invited to appear before this Legislature to present his plans for the development of a safety car. He came here during March of 1966. Later, the Johnson regime made plans to develop and test a safety car; but the automobile industry was so powerful in the Nixon government that these plans were shelved and the safety car is still a dream.

But in spite of industry and official hostility, Mr. Speaker, progress has been made. Cars are safer than they were. The result is that death and injury ratios per million miles travelled have dropped dramatically. But property damage still soared, and it was all too often property damage occurring at relatively low speeds.

The reason was pretty obvious. While greater safety was being built into cars for the occupants, the bumpers were being designed for quite another purpose. Many cars had no bumpers at all; others had such fragile ones that they offered no protection whatsoever. Still others were built with pointed prows in the middle; sharp, knife-edged protrusions; pointed elbows at the sides; and other devices which guaranteed maximum damage to the other car in case of accidents.

More than that, the bumpers themselves were so fragile that by 1970 15 per cent of all insurance claims were for damage to bumpers alone. The crash parts business of the automobile companies soared, and as it rose so did the price of the crash parts. In fact by 1971, when the new car price index stood at 112, the crash parts index was 133.

Of all insurance payouts, 91 per cent were less than \$1,000. These, of course, were for accidents occurring at low speeds and in parking lots. Insurance rates had to rise to meet these costs, and for the most part the insurance industry, rather than the car makers, took the blame.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a public outcry for less lethal bumpers arose. The industry was asked for better design. It responded by better design for itself, more damaging that is, and more profitable in crash parts. Finally Washington, from which Canada takes its standards, proposed tougher bumper standards and called hearings in early April, 1970, on those proposed standards. They were pretty rudimentary and called only for bumpers which would protect safety-related items such as lighting, fuel, exhaust, cooling and latching systems up to a 5 mph hour impact on the front and 2½ mph at the rear. This was to come into effect on the 1973 models. Then by 1974 the 5 mph standard would apply to both the front and the rear, only for safety-related items.

At that hearing in April, 1970, the car makers were at the hearing in full force to fight those standards. Ford insisted that design be left to the industry, that they work it out on their own and without government interference. For a year or so that happened, and they sure did exactly what Ford said.

The next year, with standards still not set, bumpers were the most lethal in the history of the car industry. Then Washington acted and mandated the 5 mph front and 2½ mph rear standards for the 1973 models. Incidentally, Ford did well before the 1973 standards. Damage to the Galaxie, for example, in a 5 mph test into a barrier was \$203 for the 1970 model, \$341 for the 1971 and \$402 for the 1972 model. I'm using round figures throughout this presentation. That's twice the damage in two years, in spite of the assurance that Ford gave to the 1970 hearing.

The 1973 bumpers did come and they did protect the safety-related items behind them. But they still had the sharp prows, the bumperettes and the side elbows which still damaged the other car, and which were still too damage-prone themselves.

Another standard was then proposed. This was that bumpers should be so designed that no property damage should be done to a car, including the bumpers, up to 5 mph on front and rear impacts, and up to about 3 mph on corner impacts. This was to be determined by the so-called pendulum tests which the department would give.

This property safety standard, meaning no damage to any part of the car in these kinds of collisions, was to come into effect Sept. 1, 1974. But the power of the industry prevailed with the Nixon administration, and it was postponed to September, 1975. This, then, included a necessity for bumpers to be of standard heights, of course, so that they would meet in crash situations.

Mr. Speaker, this requirement again brought the industry out fighting. Using the energy crisis as an excuse, it persuaded the Department of Transportation in Washington that the new bumpers were costing the consumer too much and that the added weight was using too much material and too much gasoline. Strangely enough, the Department of Transportation in Washington fell for that line, co-operating with the industry. It proposed that the present 5 mph safety standard itself be lowered to 2½ and that the proposed property standard protection plan be abandoned altogether. That was the proposal coming from the Department of Transportation in Washington.

Hearings were called on those proposals in the Department of Commerce building in Washington on Feb. 18 and 19 last. These hearings were fascinating. For the first time in history the insurance people fought the automobile industry, and the divisions were

sharp and extremely bitter. Ford, General Motors, Chrysler, American Motors and Volkswagen were there supporting the lower standards. The argument in each case was exactly the same. The new bumpers cost the consumer too much, particularly in higher speed crashes when they got smashed up. They were heavy and they used up too much precious raw material; and the extra weight consumed more gas.

Richard Chilcott, vice-president of nationwide Insurance Companies, of Columbus, Ohio, summed up the attitude of the insurance industry as well as of various other groups which were there when he said this. I quote:

Despite constant prodding over the years, the automotive industry has been sluggish in building efficient and safe vehicles. Instead, it applied its technological knowhow to build bigger automobiles draped with high cost options and glittering ornamentation. The auto industry, long insensitive to vehicle safety, had to be coerced into building vehicles with minimal safety equipment. [They had to be coerced.] The auto industry encouraged Americans to waste untold amounts of their resources to fuel sorry-powered, overpowered cars. That is a sorry record indeed.

Now, using conservation and economy as a smokescreen, this same industry is asking the consumer to retreat back to the days when a 3 mph accident would cause hundreds of dollars of needless damage and increase the chances of injury.

It's long past time to send a message to Detroit that there will be no further retreat. Nationwide Mutual Insurance Co. joins with the American consumer in the demand for safer cars, for cars that will survive minor love taps without damage.

Nationwide Mutual says "no" to fragile bumpers. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration can strike a blow for the American consumer with the absolute rejection of any proposal to water down hard-won bumper standards.

And that was essentially the message voiced, with powerful documentation, by the whole insurance industry and by representatives of the public who were there.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that while still needing the property damage qualification, the safety standards up to the 5 mph limit have provided new car owners with genuine protection from the wasteful and costly damage incurred by earlier model cars in low-speed crashes.

The six domestic 1972 model cars tested had bumpers which will comply with the

proposed 2½ mph bumper standard—the one that the department, with the connivance of the industry, was proposing. The repair damage averages were this: \$256 in the 5 mph front barrier contacts; \$240 in the 5 mph rear barrier contacts; and \$475 in their front to rear 10 mph contacts—that is two cars, each travelling 5 mph, coming together.

In contrast, the 1975 models tested showed a remarkable drop in damages. In the 5 mph front barrier contact it was down from \$256 to \$39—that's 85 per cent down from 1972 to 1975. In the 5 mph rear barrier contact—down from \$240 to \$23.65; down 90 per cent. In the front to rear 10 mph contact, it was down from \$475 to \$242—down about 50 per cent from the damage done to the 1972 cars.

The industry, of course, with the connivance of the Department of Transportation in Washington, sought to abandon this rather remarkable gain and plunge us right back to the condition we knew in 1972. It would certainly be extremely profitable for the industry, Mr. Speaker, but rather expensive for the rest of us.

As a matter of fact, 18 of the 1975 models tested so far by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety already meet the proposed 5 mph property standard's front and rear barrier tests. This is the one which the industry wants to postpone indefinitely. That's the proposal to build bumpers so that all damage to cars, including the bumpers, be eliminated in barrier tests up to 5 mph, front and rear, and about 3 mph on the corners.

Perhaps it's understandable why the motor car industry, profit-oriented as it is, is becoming cornered. The sale of crash parts on new cars is dropping dramatically. Data comparisons of insurance claims on 1972 and 1974 models of the same car shows a frequency decrease of 25 per cent. The present bumper safety standards has reduced the replacement of front face bars by 37 per cent; rear face bars by 47 per cent; hoods by 35 per cent; quarter panels by 29 per cent; and fenders by 19 per cent.

The reductions in replacements were all accompanied by significant reductions in repairs to those parts. This replacement cost might be reduced much more except for the fact that most cars still on the road are the older ones with the damage-creating bumpers. As these older cars are relegated to the scrap heap and the new ones continue to come onstream with the present or better safety bumpers, the crash parts industry, which is largely generated by low-speed collisions, will gradually drop in volume and in profitability.

That seems to be worrying the automobile industry and it's desperately trying to reverse this trend by having those standards dropped, the safety standards of 5 mph down to 2½, and the property standards dropped altogether for some time to come. That's what it asked, but it's doing more than that.

As mentioned above, by 1971 crash parts had increased in price three times as fast as car prices. Since then crash part prices have accelerated; last year alone the index soared from 152 to 200, up by a third in one year. No wonder the insurance industry is concerned. With dropping repair costs on the 1973 to 1975 models, insurance rates might well be stabilized at least, if not reduced. And the insurance industry could see this; it's got a better future. With the prospect of this reduction, of repair costs dropping steadily as the older cars are phased out, insurers could see some light ahead; but the automobile industry is jacking up prices of the crash parts to make up for its dropping sales and is thus forcing the insurance industry to pay more for repair bills.

That's happening here as well; it's a matter which should be concerning the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman). If the car industry has its way and we return to the 2½ mph standards, then back we go to the former high cost repair bills for low-speed accidents. With the price of crash parts sky-high now, it would be a new bonanza for the companies and still higher insurance rates would have to meet those damages. And, of course, car owners would pay through the nose. Fortunately, part of that has been short-circuited.

But let's not fool ourselves that there's competition for the crash parts business. These parts include fenders, door panels, grilles, bumpers, lights, and other sheet metal parts most commonly damaged in automobile accidents. These are made and sold by the companies concerned. If the owner of a Ford needs a front fender, he can only buy one manufactured by Ford and he must purchase it from a Ford dealer; the same is true of the other companies. Donald F. McHugh, vice-president of State Farm, said this in his presentation to the hearing:

The degree of freedom from competition which automobile manufacturers have achieved with respect to the production and sale of crash parts in a billion dollar market is, we believe, virtually unmatched in American history. [This is the insurance industry, a free enterprise industry so-called, talking.]

It creates a climate in which pricing abominations can occur which are enormously costly. Automobile manufacturers have created a unique system which has the result of effectively tying the sale of crash parts to the sale of the automobile. The manufacturers have left automobile owners no choice but to use the manufacturer's parts in repairing crash damage to their vehicles.

There are, of course, some parts not in this category, which other companies manufacture and sell. But this does not hold for those parts directly related to a crash involving a car's front or rear.

With this kind of power, Mr. Speaker, the industry is not only forcing up the prices of crash parts, but now is trying to destroy the hard-won 5 mph safety standard for bumpers; and is still trying to postpone indefinitely the 5 mph property damage standard.

The big argument of the automobile companies, of course, was that the 5 mph bumper standard forces them to use more material adding unnecessary weight to cars. This in turn uses up more precious energy, lugging these heavy bumper assemblies around. All this means, they said, is that the added expense of the bumpers cost society more than the added repair bills that the 2½ mph standard bumpers would generate.

They were thinking in terms, they said, of the consumer and precious material in society. But this just doesn't add up. It's true that most North American car makers chose to meet the 5 mph safety standard by using heavy and expensive bumper assemblies. When these are smashed in high speed accidents, they are very costly to replace. That again means, of course, a tidy profit in the crashed car business, but some car makers meet the standard by using lighter assemblies and cheaper material.

In fact, there seems to be no rhyme nor reason either in price or weight of these assemblies. Replacement prices range, among the sub-compacts, from \$254 for a Chevrolet Vega to \$408 for the Ford Pinto. Among intermediates, it ranges from \$424 for the Plymouth Fury to \$553 for the Ford Torino. Among full-sized cars, the Chevrolet Impala bumper costs \$387 and the Ford LTD \$532. For the energy absorber part of the bumper, the replacement parts cost, for the same cars \$45, \$112, \$143, \$133, \$80 and \$133. These are all in round figures of course. It is obvious that prices of bumpers could be reduced substantially if the industry is

genuinely, as it says, concerned with consumer cost.

Weights are in exactly the same category. These range from three per cent of a car weight in the Volvo to almost six per cent in the Plymouth Valiant, with the AMC Hornet at four per cent, the Impala at five per cent and the Ford Torino at 5½ per cent.

The industry, backed by the United States Department of Transportation, claims that getting back to the 2½ mph standard could save 100 lb in bumper construction, but the variations in weight of the bumper assemblies in the different cars show that this saving could be achieved by lighter bumper construction, which at the same time would give the five miles-per-hour protection; if the car industry wanted that. There is no doubt that if the manufacturers want to save weight and cost, as they claim, then they can achieve both without in any way sacrificing the performance required by the 5 mph government standard.

William J. Haddon, Jr., speaking at the hearing of the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, put it this way:

Volvo, Opel, Datsun and Toyota are four of the many manufacturers whose lightweight, damage resistant, fuel conserving bumpers for 1975 models show that the spirit of the standard can be practically met, but other cars show choices of heavyweight systems that waste national fuel and metal resources and consumers' dollars.

The poor examples set by such 1975 model bumper systems as those of Plymouth Grand Fury, the Ford Pinto and Chevrolet Impala indicate strongly that rather than being weakened the standard should, to the contrary, be strengthened to prevent excessively heavy front and rear bumpers.

Haddon, of course, pointed to the step that should occur in bumper standards. That is, that instead of dropping the standards we should maintain them and reinforce them. Maximum weights for bumper assemblies could be mandated in terms of percentage weights of the cars concerned. Three to 3½ per cent would seem a logical figure since some cars are already within this range and meeting the safety standards we now have. But if the companies are really concerned to cut weight and save the consumer costs, then there are far more effective ways of doing it than by dropping bumper standards. The Detroit News of Jan. 30, 1975, reported that "General Motors has added between 60 lb and 125 lb of various materials to its 1975

models to reduce interior compartment noise." A very laudable aim perhaps; but let's remember that this is at the very time when GM is objecting to the added bumper weights and wanting to get back to the old standards, because it says that the added weight is bad, and yet they are adding weight for other purposes.

Then, most North American cars are capable of 120 mph, according to the speedometers. Yet no car should travel our highways at anything near this speed. Seventy mph is our top speed limit here; 55 in the United States.

This means that the very industry which seems so concerned to save weight and gas when it comes to safety bumpers, is giving us overpowered and overweight engines in our cars. This means that great quantities of metal and gas are being wasted. Significant reductions in weight and fuel consumption could be obtained, along with greater safety, by producing automobiles without such excessive performance and speed capabilities.

This is certainly the direction we are going in the future, Mr. Speaker, to smaller, less powerful cars using less fuel. The Europeans went that way long ago, and so did the Japanese. North American car makers must follow suit or lose out to the imports. This trend will accomplish what the car makers say they want without sacrificing our 5-mph bumper safety standards.

Then, of course, immense savings could be achieved by cutting out the costly and wasteful annual model changes. Some of these are becoming minimal now, but most car makers still cling to the model change as a sales and status gimmick. Again, if the industry is really serious, it can cut consumer costs by several hundred dollars a year—far more than the elimination of 5 mph bumpers could do—by cutting out these model changes.

There are rumours of expensive items being eliminated from future cars, items which were once options and which became standard with higher price tags. This, too, can help without sacrificing safety.

Mr. Speaker, the widespread and determined opposition to dropping the 5 mph standard got results. We heard just two days ago that on March 7 the Department of Transportation, following the representations in Washington, quietly dropped its request for lowering the safety standards from 5 mph to 2½ mph. It was not publicized, simply Gazetted, and no one knew about it until just about three or four days ago. A phone

call to Washington told me what had happened.

This, of course, was much to the chagrin of the automobile companies. A carefully planned campaign to rectify mile standards was met and defeated for the present at least, but the results of this battle were uncomfortably close. If the whole insurance group had not rallied, along with the other forces determined to keep present standards, then the car makers might well have destroyed the progress made over the past decade.

The industry has demonstrated throughout the years that it is tireless in resisting regulation by government. If experience is any guide, it will find new ways to use the present crisis to cut standards and the fight on behalf of the consumer will go on.

Last Tuesday we learned something further. The announcement was just made in Washington showing the next stage of the battle is already joined. The department, again with the encouragement of the industry, is now proposing that the 5 mph property damage standard be postponed beyond 1977. That's the standard which says that no damage should be done to the front or rear of a car, including bumpers, at up to 5 mph impacts.

The suggestion now is that this standard not only be postponed and weakened in certain technical aspects, but also that it is not to apply to bumpers and bumper parts until 1980. Many of the bumpers and bumper parts on 1975 cars already meet the standard. And now the proposal is that that be scrapped and sacrificed and they go back to weaker bumpers, that can be damage-prone, until 1980. This is incredible.

A hearing on this recommendation is now set for April 4 in Washington. Again the insurance industry, many of the senators and people in Washington, as well as consumer groups, are rallying again to fight this further retreat.

Since Canada has generally accepted what Washington has decreed in this field, these events again point to a need for Canada to set up its own standards for automobiles. We were in this instance very close to being thrown back into the kind of crash-part exploitation we knew in the early Seventies, along with the needless waste of time and energy which that entailed. This, of course, would have meant higher insurance rates, along with added injury and death.

If we could hold the line here in Canada with or without Washington, and improve

our standards regardless of what the United States may do, then the next few years should see insurance costs drop as older cars disappear and newer ones take their place on our highways. It's almost beyond belief that the automobile industry was able to persuade the Washington Department of Transportation that it should throw away the bumper safety programme so painfully won over the past 10 years and go back to the chaos out of which we're just emerging.

Fortunately, the opposition at these hearings prevented this, for the moment at least. But this event again underlines the need for this country to move forward independently of the United States in safety and property protection standards in the motor car field. What will come out of the April 4 hearings again will have a tremendous impact on Canadians if we still follow the Washington standards. What I'm saying is we shouldn't permit this. We should set up our own standards and we should be making our voice heard loudly and clearly.

More than that, it's almost certain now that this bumper fight in the United States will kill for some time to come the pressure for bumper standards up to 10 mph and beyond. Canada could well take up that fight on behalf of our own people here and mandate still higher standards in the safety and property field. It's time we had the courage to move on our own, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine.

Mr. T. A. Wardle (Beaches-Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, my first remark in this debate on the Speech from the Throne is to say what an honour and privilege it is to serve the people of the Beaches-Woodbine riding in this Legislature. My parents were pioneers in Beaches-Woodbine riding and we have always had close ties with the people of this area of east Toronto. It has also been my privilege to serve this area as a trustee of the Toronto Board of Education and as the alderman on the city of Toronto and Metropolitan Toronto councils. As a lifelong resident of eastern Toronto and a member of many local groups and associations, I have been able to keep in close contact with my constituents.

In 1967, the Wardle service centre was established in order that I could keep in close touch with the people of my riding. Many helpful and interesting programmes are conducted at the centre. Many people each week come to see me at this riding

office, maintained, Mr. Speaker, at my own expense. People of the riding know that they can always meet me on a personal basis.

Under the proposed recommendations for the Representation Act, 1975, recently tabled in the Legislature, Beaches-Woodbine riding will most likely see some boundary changes. I am pleased to say that the area of Monarch Park, north to the city limits and east of the middle line of Greenwood Ave., will be added to the riding. At this time, I would like to welcome the residents of this particular area to Beaches-Woodbine riding. When I served as trustee and alderman, it was my privilege to represent the people of this area to be added. I look forward to working with them and assisting them in provincial matters.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that we in Ontario can look to the future with every hope and confidence. The Progressive Conservative provincial government of Ontario has provided strong leadership and a climate that has resulted in a strong and sound economy for this province. Our progress in Ontario has not come about by chance, but as a result of the good government policies realized under Progressive Conservative rule. Let us not forget that Ontario has one of the highest standards of living in the world. Investor confidence in Ontario today remains strong. The province continues to benefit in its financial transactions abroad from the highest credit rating available.

Last year Ontario's real economic growth was 3.5 per cent, a figure higher than that achieved by West Germany, the United Kingdom, the United States and Japan. Our Progressive Conservative government has done a fine job in fighting inflation and stabilizing our economy. Last autumn the Ontario government received a triple-A rating from the Moody investors' service, one of the most influential credit-ranking organizations in the world. Ontario is the first foreign government ever to be given a triple-A rating by this firm. This rating means that we have received international recognition for our excellent fiscal management and our ability to stabilize the provincial economy at a time when most governments cannot control their economies.

The Progressive Conservative government of this province acts not just for narrow sectional interests, but for the benefit of all people. We are truly a people's party.

I should like now to review just some of the many fine programmes which this government has provided for the people of Ontario.

The government has provided commendable programmes for our senior citizens. No longer do senior citizens have to look to their retirement with fear and concern, and Mr. Speaker, I know that you and members of this House remember those days when they did not look forward to their retirement.

Health insurance premiums were abolished in 1972 for Ontario residents 65 years of age or over. The Ontario Housing Corp. administers subsidized housing programmes for senior citizens, 60 years of age and older. Rents are geared to a tenant's income, and average about \$41 per month. There are approximately 18,700 senior citizens apartments under management and a further 4,905 apartments presently under construction. We have five such buildings in Beaches-Woodbine riding, and I was happy to have a part in the acquiring or building of these senior citizen accommodations. I am hoping that we can supply more such housing in this area.

The extended health care programme was introduced in 1972 to enlarge the scope of health insurance services to people requiring care in licensed nursing homes. Bringing nursing homes into the system of health care facilities removed the heavy financial burden from those requiring these services.

There are now more than 400 licensed nursing homes with approximately 23,000 beds in Ontario. Well-qualified nurses and doctors are attached to each home. In Beaches-Woodbine I was glad that this new legislation resulted in the construction of Bestview Lodge, a splendid building on Main St. I am now pressing for another such facility, hopefully in the southern part of the riding.

Ontario's guaranteed annual income system established a programme of monthly payments to ensure a minimum annual income for our senior citizens. Since its implementation last July the GAINS programme has been increased twice, and currently provides an income of \$2,766 for a single person and \$5,532 for a married couple.

The Ontario drug benefit plan was implemented on Sept. 1, 1974. Through this plan a great many people on limited budgets, who qualify for GAINS, will receive the essential medication they require free of charge.

The Progressive Conservative government stands by its commitment to an excellent school system for Ontario. The PC principle of equality of education opportunity requires measures to ensure that no one who has the

ability is denied access to further education because of inadequate financial means.

The new Ontario Student Loans Plan will further increase provincial help to needy students who require financial assistance for the completion of their education. This Progressive Conservative government initiated the community college system and was responsible for major university expansion. The continuing policy of the government is to see that every education dollar is wisely spent.

Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservatives have always felt close to the needs of Ontario's younger people. Through innovative programmes, adults and the youth of this province have been given many opportunities to improve their skills and to realize their ambitions.

In dealing with the people of Ontario, Progressive Conservatives reject regimentation in all its forms. We believe that individuals' freedom of choice should be respected. The freedom of choice and variety of programmes in education testify to this policy.

The PC policy is to provide opportunity to our citizens to improve their quality of life through education. Ontario has one of the most forceful and dynamic programmes for summer employment for students. This year, about 10,000 jobs will be provided for students in Ontario; in addition, the provincial government is urging commerce and industry to provide summer job opportunities for our young people.

I hear from many young people about education and other matters. The opinions of young people are respected by the Progressive Party. Surely these young people deserve to be heard as plans being made now will certainly affect them in the future.

I know that the people of Beaches-Woodbine and Ontario residents generally have welcomed the plans of the Ministry of Culture and Recreation to establish a provincial lottery. This lottery will make available \$40 million to \$50 million a year to support programmes for physical fitness, recreation, sports and culture throughout Ontario. The long-established grants programmes to assist amateur sport organizations, particularly in funding, coaching and administrative functions, will continue. The huge sums to become available from the lottery will enable the province to extend these efforts tremendously.

The bold and dynamic Election Finances Reform Act was introduced in the Legisla-

ture. Ontario will be the first in Canada to provide for the effective disclosure of political contributions. As a result, Ontario will have, in terms of this issue and related matters, the most open political system in the country.

The Progressive Conservative government of this province is ever mindful of the problems faced by municipal taxpayers and those indirectly paying municipal taxes through apartment rents and on other accommodation. I believe that not enough recognition is given to those who have worked hard, brought up their families and now pay heavy taxation as they try to maintain their homes. In addition, they're often called upon to support welfare and other programmes from which they do not benefit directly.

In response to this situation, the Progressive Conservative government has again instituted the Ontario tax credit system. This year, \$375 million will be provided to offset the general burden of municipal taxation. This programme has had the effect of stabilizing municipal taxation. A special pension tax credit is also available to them.

The Progressive Conservative government is constantly amending existing legislation and introducing new measures to meet the demands of a growing and more discerning consumer populace. The new Consumer Credit Reporting Act protects Ontario residents from damaging personal information reports and gives Ontario the most progressive legislation on personal information in Canada.

The government also introduced legislation to ban referral selling practices and to regulate pyramid sales methods. The new Business Practices Act breaks new ground in the protection of Ontario consumers against deceptive and unfair practices. Major amendments to the Condominium Act have been introduced to help improve conditions for condominium residents. A uniform building code is planned, as is legislation on warranties and guarantees.

Mr. Speaker, workers in Ontario are protected by the Employment Standards Act. Among other things, the Act sets standards for working hours, minimum wages, overtime pay, pay for holidays worked, vacations with pay, and equal pay for equal work. The minimum wages in Ontario were raised last October and will rise again on May 1. All employees received four statutory holidays with pay in 1974, and this will be expanded this year to seven to include New Year's Day, Thanksgiving Day and Queen Victoria Day.

The Progressive Conservative government is concerned about preventing environmental problems before they arise and is forging a new tool for this job, a system of environmental impact assessment to predetermine all the environmental implications of a proposed development. Such an assessment will be mandatory before undertaking any large government projects. This procedure will permit the fullest public scrutiny and discussion of major projects.

The wide range of policies to protect Ontario's water resources ensures a plentiful supply of clean water, which our residents need and enjoy. An experimental waste reclamation plant is being constructed to serve as a solid waste research laboratory where ideas and methods of reclamation and recycling can be devised and tested. Since 1968, the sulphur dioxide level in Toronto has been reduced by 60 per cent and levels of particulate by 39 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the farm community of this province is becoming of increasing importance to the life of our people.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Starting to realize that, is he?

Mr. Wardle: The total consumption of food per day in Metropolitan Toronto, Mr. Speaker, is 7.2 million pounds. Included in this figure for one day are: 1,200 head of cattle, 3,200 pigs, 80,000 chickens, 140,000 dozen eggs, 23 car loads of fresh fruit and vegetables and 22 car loads of potatoes. It takes almost 250,000 cows to produce the 231,000 gallons of fresh milk consumed here in one day.

We must encourage our farmers to increase their production in order that urban dwellers will continue to be supplied with adequate and nourishing food.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): While taking more agricultural land out of production.

Mr. Wardle: Of course, Mr. Speaker, we also realize that we need this production, not only for people in this province, in this country, but for the starving millions throughout the world. So we must look to our farmers here in Ontario for increased production.

But, Mr. Speaker, unlike other workers the income of the farmer is uncertain. He is dependant on good weather, adequate labour and fair prices. Why should urban dwellers expect the farmer to produce food at less than cost? I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there

should be a partnership of understanding between the farmer and consumer.

I think, Mr. Speaker, there is a real challenge to this government to make that partnership a real one when we have the future of the people of this province in mind.

Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Heritage Foundation was established by the Progressive Conservative government to care for historic and architectural landmarks of Ontario. It is carrying out its duties with sincerity and zeal. One of the foundation's most effective programmes is the provision of professional preservation advice and information to a wide variety of Ontario organizations and individuals.

Mr. Speaker, as Ontario residents see the approaching American commemoration of the revolution against the Crown, we should be mindful of the contrasts in our historical development. Our democracy was not born in revolution but in peaceful evolution. Ontario developed on a peaceful and sound foundation. We owe a great debt to the United Empire Loyalists who were the founders of Ontario.

Our young people today, with their sense of idealism, easily identify with the United Empire Loyalists who came to Ontario as a result of high ideals. More emphasis needs to be placed in our schools on the great historical heritage of the loyalist people. These loyalists were law-abiding people who were resident in the American colonies at the time of the revolution. These people were not only of British descent but also included those of German, Dutch, Indian and other backgrounds. They came from all walks of life; professional people, tradesmen, merchants and farmers were all included in their ranks.

At the time of the revolution they wished to remain loyal to the Crown and it's rightful and legitimate government in each of the colonies. As a result of their desire for peaceful change, they were harassed and persecuted and deprived of all their property by the revolutionary government. No compensation was ever made to the loyalists. Their loyalty to the rule of law under the Crown resulted in the loss of nearly all their possessions.

In their desire to live under the protection of the Crown and its great heritage of freedom, they sought a new and better country. Many loyalists found this new land in Ontario. While most of the loyalists who founded the Maritime provinces travelled by sea, the loyalists who came to Ontario trav-

elled overland, enduring many hardships en route. I should like to mention, Mr. Speaker, that amongst those loyalists who came here was that great Indian Chief Joseph Brant, whose contribution to the early history of this province will always be remembered.

The first parliament of this province was opened in 1792 at Niagara-on-the-Lake by Lieutenant Governor John Graves Simcoe. During the War of 1812 the loyalists flocked to the colours and fought bravely to repel the American troops who sought once again to destroy the loyalists new-found freedom. By their hard work in all fields of endeavour, the loyalists laid the foundations for the prosperity that we enjoy today. These United Empire Loyalists are remembered today in the official motto of Ontario: "Ut inceptis fidelis sic permanet"—"Loyal in the beginning, so she remains."

Mr. Speaker, the residents of Ontario will be looking forward with great anticipation to the visit this April to Ontario and the Northwest Territories of His Royal Highness Prince Charles, the Prince of Wales. I am most impressed by the large numbers of our young people who want to learn more about our constitutional monarchy and its present and future role in our parliamentary system. This interest has been specially sparked by the successful visits to Ontario over the past two years of Her Majesty the Queen, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth, the Queen Mother, and Princess Anne. Our royal family was greeted with great enthusiasm on all of these occasions by Canadians of all ethnic backgrounds.

Mr. Speaker, we must not forget the constitutional monarchy is respected not only by those of British and French descent, but by people who have come here from all parts of the world. Many of the critics of the monarchy forget that most of the European immigrants to Canada have come from nations with a monarchical tradition. When immigrants chose Canada as their future home, they knew of our monarchical tradition and willingly swear allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth, the Queen of Canada, her heirs and successors. Immigrants to Canada, especially those who have fled from tyranny and oppression, feel safe and secure in Canada where the rule of law under the Crown prevails.

A distinguished former Prime Minister, the late Rt. Hon. Louis St. Laurent, on several occasions emphasized that constitutional monarchy was the most superior form of government and provided the surest guarantee of our freedom. The Queen of Canada is

a more democratic head of state than a president because she represents all Canadians. A president would owe his selection to a political faction and this would divide him from many of his countrymen and make his claim to represent all Canadians less convincing. Frequent selections of presidents would interrupt the continuity necessary for an effective head of state. The Queen and her heir have been trained from birth for one profession—that of discharging the duties of head of state. Therefore, they are the Canadians most eligible to continue in this role.

The Queen is one of the three component parts of our parliament. Royal assent is the final stage of parliamentary enactments; the Queen signs them into law on behalf of the whole country. The government of Canada is vested in the Queen and she provides the framework for the orderly changing of the elected administrators of her government. Safeguards of the Canadian constitution are centred on the Crown. The Queen's right to be consulted, the right to encourage and the right to warn provide a check on prime ministerial power. The Crown's existence in Canada ensures that the rule of law is maintained. We Canadians are a practical people. We want to keep our inheritance.

How fortunate we are to have as our sovereign a most gracious lady who, by her example, has endorsed high standards and has encouraged the worthwhile traditions so many of which vitally reflect the better aspects of civilized behaviour and living. Her Majesty has carried out her royal duties with dignity and zeal and has truly carried out her promise to her people made in 1953 that, to their service, she would give her heart and soul every day of her life.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to end with these few words: How proud we are to be Canadians and to live in Ontario, this great province of opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa East.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Thank you Mr. Speaker. I have a few brief remarks to make to complement our contribution to the answer to this Speech from the Throne.

I would like to make a few comments to you, Mr. Speaker, very personally. I find that in your attempt to regiment the order of the House, you are making a great effort to be fair to all members on both sides of the House. I see in you a zeal and a dedication in attempting to enhance not only the role of the Speaker but the role of the Legislature as well. Mr. Speaker, if I might be just a

bit presumptuous and say this to you: In my opinion, from here until the next provincial election, things are going to get hot and heavy in this place. We've seen it, Mr. Speaker, on various days in this Legislature with accusations being thrown back and forth and it's going to take all of your efforts—

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): We hope the Speaker is a law and order man.

Mr. Roy: —to be able to control the work and the decorum of this place. If I may make one suggestion, Mr. Speaker, it is that it seems to us that when questions are asked from this side of the House, not only are they sometimes not answered but the way they are answered, in our opinion, is an abuse of the privileges of the House. Most often the statements, Mr. Speaker, and the answers should not be tolerated. They are, in fact, statements that are made by ministers.

I make comment today on the statement made by the Treasurer of the province (Mr. McKeough), who stayed on his feet for some five or seven minutes, not really answering the question, but making a statement. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, with the greatest of respect—and I appreciate that I have not been around here very long—

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): An overnight guest.

Mr. Roy: —and it might well be presumptuous on my part, but it's going to be exceedingly difficult to control all members of the House if there is a group of individuals in this House who consistently abuse the privileges of the House. They must be controlled as well. I say to the Minister of Health (Mr. Miller), who is leaving, he is not one of them. I have great—

Mr. P. Taylor (Carleton East): He's a good man.

Mr. Roy: —respect for him and he's not one of them.

Mr. P. Taylor: But he should stay and listen to the Health critic.

Mr. Roy: I will have some things to say about his ministry by the way—

Hon. F. S. Miller (Minister of Health): Nice things?

Mr. Roy: —about the Hawkesbury hospital, in a short while.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, I know it is presumptuous, but I say to you in all sincerity

it is going to be difficult to have control in this place if one standard is applied to the opposition members and one standard applied to the ministers of the government and the Premier (Mr. Davis) himself. I just point this out to you, Mr. Speaker, and I do it with the greatest of respect.

I have no difficulty, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the motion presented by my leader. What can we say about the Throne Speech that has not already been said by both leaders—my leader and the leader of the NDP? But I do find it ironic, Mr. Speaker, that since our convention in Windsor we have consistently been accused of not having any policy. The distinction, you see, has not been made; on every bill, on every issue that's discussed in this House, we have consistently approached it by presenting alternative policies. In fact, on some major pieces of legislation we have saved their skin on the other side there.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): That's right.

Mr. Roy: Their land Speculation Tax Act is one of them which would have been an absolute disaster had they presented it in the form in which originally it was presented to the House. It was the work of various members of this party and of the party to my left who assisted in making this legislation workable—if it is now at all workable.

I say to the members opposite, they have accused us of not having policy as contrasted to not having a political platform for the election. A distinction must be made, Mr. Speaker. We have consistently put forward policies, but our platform for the election will be presented on our terms when the election is called.

I find it ironic that the people on the other side should accuse us of this when in fact they do the same thing. They have presented a Throne Speech which is devoid of all policy—well, they have adopted one policy, the ombudsperson, and that they have stolen from us. They have taken that policy from us. So not only are they prepared to steal our policies, Mr. Speaker—not only are these people prepared to do that, but they are stealing our strategy, in fact.

An hon. member: Come on! Get on with it!

Mr. J. Lane (Algoma-Manitoulin): The Liberals have nothing to steal.

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): They have nothing to offer.

Mr. Roy: You know, Mr. Speaker, it's ironic, for instance, that they are criticizing the federal Liberals, when at the same time they are looking to see what strategy to use to win in 1974—

An hon. member: He has the wrong year.

Mr. Roy: —and you know, it's cynical, Mr. Speaker, when you see minister after minister, day in and day out, present a new bill, present a new policy. You wonder, Mr. Speaker.

I look at the Premier sitting there today, and he must be asking himself, "Why have I lost my credibility? What is happening to us?" The people of this province are getting very cynical about what the government is attempting to do in a political framework.

This leads me, Mr. Speaker, to look at the member for St. David (Mrs. Scrivener), and what she had to say yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and you know, this is ironic. I have had occasion to watch the member for St. David. I can recall when she came into the House here in 1971 with many of us rookies; you could see her jockeying for position. The Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch) was a new minister as well, and you could see at that time, Mr. Speaker, the jockeying for position. I can still see her. Every second day she was up on her feet, asking what we used to call "pat" questions, to the annoyance of members of her own caucus at that time.

She was jockeying for position. She was asking all sorts of intelligent questions like, "What happened to the rock outside?" and, "Who is doing this?" and, "Who is doing that?" and the minister would always have the pat answer. She, in fact, I suppose made a relentless effort to get into the cabinet, and she kept asking these questions. The Provincial Secretary for Social Development was a quiet, gracious lady and, whoops, she's the one who gets into cabinet. And well she should; I applaud the Premier's choice there.

But then the second approach taken by the hon. member for St. David was to attack the press. Do members recall that whole series of attacks she made on the press? The Globe and Mail and all these people were "unfair;" they were "attacking us." In fact, in her speech of yesterday she again attacked the Globe and Mail.

Now she's got a third attack, and we can sort of see her strategy. She's somewhat the barometer of that party over there. The

strategy is, when in doubt blame the feds. Look to the feds, let's blame them. It's a dangerous strategy they have there, because the feds did pretty good in 1974. They were the last ones to go to the people and by the look of the polls the Liberals aren't all that unpopular across this province. But in any event, that is the strategy.

Let's look at some of the things she had to say in this famous speech of hers. This is not any speech, Mr. Speaker. First of all, it's got 22 pages. This was premeditated, if one was to talk about an offence or a crime. It is offensive, there's no doubt about that, my colleague says. There are 22 pages of it, and what is the title? "The Introduction of Dirty Tricks Into Canadian Politics?" Can anyone imagine 22 pages of this? Somebody's been thinking about this, because we know the intellectual capacity of the hon. member for St. David. We know that 22 pages is far in excess of her capacity. In any event we've got 22 pages of this, Mr. Speaker, "The Introduction of Dirty Tricks Into Canadian Politics?"

First of all, the first part of the speech talks about the great policies of this government in relation to housing. Nowhere in the speech is there any mention, for instance, that their objective was 100,000 houses last year and only 85,000 were built. Nowhere is there any mention in this speech, Mr. Speaker, that over \$100 million that the government allocated for housing in the last two years was not in fact spent.

But she criticizes; what really gets her dander up is the fact that the federal government has cut part of the budget, from \$78 million to \$58 million. She's talking about \$28 million. Look at her strategy in this speech. On page 10 she says:

But the federal and provincial Liberals do differ. [That's not the headline that we read yesterday, that the provincial and federal Liberals differ.] The federal Liberals have already demonstrated their political reaction, as I shall describe in a few moments. [And does she ever.] The Ontario Liberal answer to the housing shortage is to scrap the much admired Ontario Housing Corp.

The much admired Ontario Housing Corp.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex Kent): Admired by whom?

Mr. Roy: As a matter of an objective assessment or judgement, can we blame the feds in sort of hanging on to their wallets the way the Ontario Housing Corp. has been spending money across this province? We've

seen some of the investments that have been defended by the Minister of Housing, and every second day he would come up with a different answer. In any event, that is what she talks about.

Then she goes on, Mr. Speaker—I go to page 19; this was a long speech—and at page 19 she says: “Sadly, we are all familiar with the Watergate mess in the United States.” See the strategy? This party, the party in power, has been attacked consistently, Mr. Speaker, on the question of scandals, of questionable deals and this type of thing. We won’t mention them now; the people out there are not cynical for no reason at all. But in any event the approach is this, when in doubt or when you’re being attacked, go on the offensive. And that’s what they’re doing. First of all they relate Watergate and the federal Liberals, and it goes on:

Part of the investigation into the Watergate uncovered what has become known as “dirty tricks,” a theory which says no gutter is too deep, principles so firm or morals so high as to interfere with the destruction of an opponent. It is a sick, sick attitude. I think we may have in our country, right here in Ontario, a Canadian “dirty tricks” theory now in the making, and it is mostly readily discernible in the field of housing. [Then she goes on to say:]

To use federal power and the federal budget for this purpose [and the purpose, of course, is to see the election of the member for Brant as Premier in this province] in my view is cheap and disgusting, a dirty trick. [She keeps repeating the words “dirty trick.”] Worst of all is the exploitation of families on low incomes who are in desperate need of housing. Manipulating them in such a rotten political crap game means digging a gutter so deep that it will destroy political morality all across this nation for generations to come.

Mr. Bullbrook: I think Haldeman wrote that speech.

Mr. Roy: That’s right. Or the former Attorney General of the United States, Mitchell.

Mr. Bullbrook: Remember Haldeman used to talk that way? I can remember Haldeman saying terrible things. The press are after the Tories.

Mr. Roy: Can anyone in his right mind honestly believe this sort of dirty trick? It is really pathetic.

Mr. G. Nixon: Get to the point. The member has their attention.

Mr. Roy: I can see she is frustrated. It is obvious she is frustrated every day she sits in the House. She has been frustrated since 1971.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): She is frustrated by Ottawa.

Mr. Bullbrook: In the speech she says she is frustrated—and my colleague is prepared to assist.

Mr. Roy: Well, no. I am not prepared to go that far, Mr. Speaker. There are limits to what I will do to assist a fellow member.

Mr. L. Maeck (Parry Sound): Even the member’s own colleagues can’t stand it.

Mr. G. Nixon: They’re all leaving him. Where are his colleagues going?

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, can you believe that this speech received the approval of the Minister of Housing (Mr. Irvine) and the silence of the Premier? In fact, the Premier acquiesced in this sort of thing.

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): Excellent speech.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, can you imagine what a Leslie Frost or a John Roberts would have done about something like this? He would have had her on his knee and spanked her for doing something like that. Consider Roberts, whose reputation as a statesman went beyond the bounds of this province. The man was popular in Quebec and in other provinces. Can you imagine him acquiescing in something like this?

Mr. Speaker, do you want further evidence? What further evidence do we need of how far the Tories have sunk and what they are prepared to do to cling to power? I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I think it is highly irresponsible.

The only solution for the member for St. David, I think, is to get the Minister of Health to make a commitment to the House that he will pay for the OHIP coverage of her treatment on the member for Nipissing’s (Mr. R. S. Smith) couch by the member for Parkdale (Mr. Duszta). That’s the only solution I can see. How many treatments it would take, I don’t know, but I think what she needs is a commitment from all parties that we are going to assist her with her problems.

Mr. McIlveen: Does the member for Ottawa East need a doctor?

Mr. Maeck: Why is he spending so much time on this matter?

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I want to get into another aspect. Having said that, I think I have probably wasted too much time on the member for St. David.

Mr. Kennedy: Is the member for Ottawa East going to waste some more time now?

Mr. Roy: What I want to talk about, Mr. Speaker, is another problem that extends across this province. It brings to mind that the problem that I intend to discuss at this time is certainly not limited to this province.

The Globe and Mail of last Saturday, I think it was, reported:

A confidential investigation made last year for the Quebec Order of Engineers shows that all major provincial government contracts awarded to consulting engineers in Quebec are done on the basis of political favouritism.

The report of five investigators also says that the Quebec government has special advisers working for the cabinet and the Premier, Robert Bourassa, who chooses consulting engineers from politically acceptable lists prepared for that.

That is what appeared in the Globe, and it goes on to say some of the things that are going on.

I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that on the basis of that, Quebec is not leading Ontario at all; Ontario is holding its own when it comes to politically acceptable lists. I want to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, a situation that has been brought to my attention involving architects in this province.

What happened was that I got a call one day from a firm of architects by the name of St. Denis-Thibeault. These people have an office in Ottawa, and in fact they are possibly one of the few firms of Franco-Ontarian architects practising in eastern Ontario. They have experience in relation to the building of schools and hospitals; in fact, they have been working on some additions and some renovations on the Montfort hospital and are competent architects and are known to be competent across eastern Ontario.

In any event, the board for the hospital in Hawkesbury—they are going to build a new hospital in Hawkesbury—was interested in enlisting the services of this firm of architects because of their experience and because of the fact they had been working on the Montfort hospital. Unfortunately, they were advised or the board received a list of architects from the Ontario government and on this list it was suggested that one of the

architects on this list should be the one chosen to do the work in relation to the building of this hospital. They called me and said, "We're not on the list and we're told that if we're not on the list there's no way we could possibly get the job. The hospital board has said to us there is no way we're going to get the job."

I called up the Minister of Health's office and spoke to one of his assistants. I related the situation to him and he told me, "I'm going to check into that but I don't think that's the situation."

He called me back a short time later and said, "No, this list is only a sort of guideline. They can pick anybody who is on the list but they are not limited to the people or the architects who are on the list. They can pick some other architect if they find him desirable and he's competent."

That's not the way boards—school boards or hospital boards—have been conditioned across this province and there was just no way that the board was going to pick any architect not on that list. In fact, the nuns involved in the operation of the hospital would have nothing to do with that. They said, "It's always been the tradition and it's known across this province that we want to follow the directives of the government. We want to pick an architect who is, in fact, on that list." In fact, the member for Prescott and Russell (Mr. Belanger) said to them, "You're going to have trouble getting your money from the government. You're going to have trouble getting co-operation if you don't pick someone who is on that list."

It's deemed that that's the way we do business in Ontario. One has to be on a list.

I said to this firm: "Why don't you talk to the member for that area, the member for Prescott and Russell, and see if you can get on the list because you're competent. There's no reason you shouldn't be on the list. In fact, there are probably no Franco-Ontarians even on this list. There are very few people from eastern Ontario on it." Most of the architects on that list were, in fact, from Toronto and other areas of the province.

They called up the member and attempted to get on the list. He said, "Sure, I'll get you on the list. There will be no problem about getting you on the list and then you'll have a fair chance to be considered, at least, for the construction of this hospital."

He was faced with an embarrassing question. In the conversation the member said, "I can get you on the list." He was embar-

rassed even to ask the question but he said, "I've got to ask you this. Have you made a contribution to the party?"

Mr. P. Taylor: Shame.

Mr. Stokes: Well, really?

Mr. Roy: It was obvious to Mr. Thibault, to whom I spoke, that the member for Prescott and Russell was very ill at ease at asking this type of question and that he should be thrown into a situation where he has to ask someone, "Have you made a contribution to the party?" The architects said, "No, we have not made a contribution to the party. In fact, we don't contribute to any party whether in Quebec to the Liberals or in Ontario to the Tories. The member said, "Well, there is going to be a problem about getting on that list if you didn't make a contribution."

So they're not on the list and they will not get on that list, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker. I wrote a letter to the Minister of Health last week pointing this situation out to him. I bring to the attention of the members and the House that business is still done this way. There is no tendering process in Ontario to my knowledge when it involves architects or when it involves, in fact, consulting engineers or people of this nature. At the federal level, I'm told that in Ottawa the supply and services department calls for tenders from consulting engineers, unlike Quebec where no tenders are called, but both governments use special lists as to who should get the work.

I find it strange, Mr. Speaker, that in 1975 in this province, a competent firm of architects which has experience in the field of the construction of hospitals, a firm from eastern Ontario, a firm that is a French-Canadian firm, a Franco-Ontarian firm, should be denied even the right to compete by not being put on the list.

Embarrassingly, as the member for Prescott and Russell said to them, the reason for the denial is that they have made no contribution to the Conservative Party of Ontario. I find it sad that this situation should exist. I would say to the Minister of Health, whom I consider to be a fair and possibly a competent minister, if one compares him with some of his predecessors, that practice should stop, and through the tendering process that has been established since 1971 for buildings and so on, people should be given a fair opportunity. Not only are we denying eastern Ontario professionals the right to compete for institu-

tions and buildings in their own area, but we are denying people for the simple reason that they have not made a political contribution to a political party.

Another problem I want to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, is a question of purchases by Ontario Housing in the Carlsbad area. I've had a question on the order paper now for quite some time. I suppose it has been on the order paper now for some five or six months. The question appeared to me very simple. It was an inquiry of the ministry stating:

Could a list be provided of all land purchased by Ontario Housing Corp. since 1968? When was the land purchased? Who was the vendor? What was the purchase price paid?

That's not that complicated when you consider that there are some 70,000 civil servants in this province. You would think that after six months maybe I could get an answer to this, Mr. Speaker.

While I'm on that topic, why does it take so long to get an answer when one puts questions on the order paper? Some of these answers shouldn't take that long. For instance, another one of my questions was:

Since Oct. 21, 1971, have any private members of the Progressive Conservative caucus been sent outside of Canada on behalf of any ministry or agency? If so, who are the members, what was the nature of their mission and what has been the total cost of these projects?

That's simple enough. It seems to me that that question has been on the order paper for some five months. I should have received an answer.

I bring this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, because in the federal House there has been some criticism that answers on the order paper don't receive attention or replies quickly enough. In the federal House, there are thousands of questions on the order paper. I'm told that the member for Leeds alone put in some 1,500 questions in a period of a couple of years in the federal House. The workload is much greater. On this order paper seldom do we have more than 10 or 15 questions, and they sit there for months on end. There is no reason, Mr. Speaker, why we shouldn't get any answers to these questions and get answers promptly.

Mr. Stokes: There is the same trouble in Ottawa. Ask John Reid.

Mr. Roy: Yes. John Reid did make a comment about that and he got results. This is

why I bring it to the attention of this House. As I pointed out, and I'm pointing it out to my colleague, in Ottawa they have thousands of questions on the order paper, where here we have 10 or 15. You can see some time taken if you are trying to answer thousands of questions, Mr. Speaker, but not when there are so few. I suppose Mr. Reid who raised the matter in Ottawa was right, and he did get some results there. I would hope that this be brought to the attention of various ministries so that we might get some answers to our questions. In any event, I had one question here about Ontario Housing and the purchases it has been making.

I want to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, what I consider to be a problem and what I consider to be an unacceptable practice going on by real estate firms in this province. Ontario Housing bought some 5,000 acres outside of Ottawa called Carlsbad Springs. The federal government then expropriated some 4,000 acres, so there's a huge track of land purchase by Ontario Housing and by the NCC or the federal government.

In the purchases made by Ontario Housing, they got a firm, A. E. LePage Ltd., to act on their behalf. The first criticism is why would they not get an eastern Ontario real estate firm to make the purchases for them. Why does it always have to be the biggies coming from Toronto making purchases in eastern Ontario? They get LePage to act on their behalf and they have a fellow by the name of P. H. McKeown in trust, and he's called a purchaser.

As is said on the bottom of the offer here, "It is understood and agreed P. H. McKeown who is a licensed broker with A. E. LePage Ltd., is acting as a nominee only for an unidentified purchaser and has no personal interest in this transaction." In other words, it is clear that McKeown, an agent of LePage, is acting on behalf of a nominee. And in this case, he happened to be acting on behalf of the Ontario government or the Ontario Housing Corp.

In any event, McKeown is acting on their behalf in trust, and then the vendors of the property have LePage Ltd., who say they are acting as agents for the vendor. How can an agent be the agent of both parties? McKeown, who is an employee of LePage, is acting as an agent on behalf of the purchaser, which is Ontario Housing; and at the same time, LePage, is acting as an agent on behalf of the vendor.

Mr. Speaker, I see that as an unreasonable and intolerable conflict as far as real estate transactions are concerned. It seems to me to

make common sense that if you are an agent, you should be agent for one person. If you are protecting the interests of a person, how can you say in all candour and in all fairness that you are protecting your client, when you are in fact the agent of the other individual? Whose interests are you protecting at this stage? That's how the purchases went on in Carlsbad Springs. LePage was acting as agent, in fact, for the purchaser and for the vendor.

Mr. Stokes: Is it not illegal?

Mr. Roy: Well, I'm not sure that it is. I think it is still legal in this province. If it is, I feel that it should be stopped. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely intolerable that one can say that there is not a conflict.

Mr. Stokes: It is certainly unethical.

Mr. Roy: It certainly leads itself to people being unethical, if you are acting as agent on behalf of purchaser or vendor. In this case it appears that he was being paid by both; surely McKeown was being paid by the Ontario Housing for acting as agent on their behalf. LePage then turns around and charges a commission of five per cent to the vendor in this particular case.

On this particular transaction I have before me—I think the total transaction was something like \$55,000—I have here a copy of a cheque that was sent to A. E. LePage for \$2,750. That was the commission they got from the vendor.

Meanwhile, McKeown, who was acting on behalf of Ontario Housing, had written a letter to the minister dated March 10 to find out how much he got, because it looked as though LePage had a real good deal going there. Their agent was being paid by the Ontario government; in the meantime, LePage was being paid by the vendor.

Now, some of the vendors objected to this, Mr. Speaker. They refused to pay the commission. And nobody bothered them any further. But the people who brought this matter to my attention were concerned. These people are farming; they don't know. They get a letter from the lawyer saying: "Send me the five per cent commission." So, diligently they send in \$2,750 to A. E. LePage Ltd.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this type of approach—considering that they are acting on behalf of a government agency—leads itself to an intolerable conflict of interest. It should not be tolerated in this province.

If you are an agent, Mr. Speaker, you should be acting as agent on behalf of one

person and not acting on behalf of two parties, who may well have conflicting interests. I would think that anybody in business, or anything else, would see that a vendor and a purchaser might well have conflicting interests.

The vendor wants to see that he gets as much money as possible for his property, and the purchaser wants to get it as cheaply as possible. How can one person, Mr. Speaker, act adequately, sensibly and fairly on behalf of both parties? And besides, he gets paid by both. If there should be a conflict later on, should there be court action, A. E. LePage Ltd. is caught in the middle.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that first of all the Ontario government should use local agents; people from the area. Why don't they use agents from eastern Ontario? Secondly, if they are using agents, the agent should be the agent of the Ontario government and not at the same time the agent of the vendor. Mr. Speaker, I felt I should bring this matter to the attention of the House, and I've done so.

There is one further matter I should raise and that's the area of grants given by the federal government to the Ontario government for French-language education in this province.

What happens basically in the Ottawa area, Mr. Speaker, is that something like \$1 million a year is given by the federal government to the Ontario government for Franco-Ontarians for French education. I'm told that what happens to the money basically is that it's paid to the province since because of our constitutional situation it cannot be paid directly. It's paid to the provincial government and, right off the bat, they take \$500,000 of it and we don't know what happens to it. They just take \$500,000. The other \$500,000 is sent to the Ottawa Public School Board and is just used, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, for general funds and not specifically for French-language education in that area.

The problem is that in the area of French-language education, one of the biggest drawbacks and one of the biggest problems is that one needs adequate textbooks in French if he is going to teach a course, or subjects in the French language. They're sorely lacking French-language textbooks. There is a need for people who can translate them. There is also the fact that teachers try to use textbooks which come from Canada and not textbooks that come from the exterior. If one is learning the history of this province, the history of certain people

in this province, be they English or the French, is different from that in the history books in Quebec. If one is a Franco-Ontarian, one would like to know the history of his province, Ontario. This is not to the exclusion of the history of French-Canadians in Quebec, but Franco-Ontarians are people who live in this province and are proud to live in this province and want to know the history of this province. You can appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that in Quebec you don't have the sort of French textbooks which can teach history about the Province of Ontario.

These are some of the problems. When these funds, Mr. Speaker, are not earmarked for this type of process, be it for textbooks or specifically for French-language education, then you have situations where the French side is lacking. So the French-language committee in the Ottawa area has asked for moneys to have more textbooks, not only for Ottawa but to set a pattern for textbooks for other schools across the province. They have been having a lot of problems.

First of all, we've never been able to learn from the Ontario government exactly where that money goes that's earmarked for French-language education. There's never been an adequate answer since 1971. We've been asking questions on this and we really know where it goes. Even school boards are diluting the money in their general funds. If we're serious about French-language education—and we should be as there are over 30,000 students just in the secondary schools—we should make an effort to see that funds that are earmarked by the federal government for that particular purpose should be used for that purpose.

Monsieur l'Orateur, je voudrais tout simplement mentionner la question de l'enseignement en française dans nos écoles de langue en Ontario. Je voudrais attirer l'attention des Membres du Parlement sur un problème qui, d'après moi, existe depuis 1971. Ce problème est celui-ci français: depuis plusieurs années, M. l'Orateur, le gouvernement fédéral donne régulièrement à la province d'Ontario une subvention pour l'enseignement du français pour les Franco-Ontariens. Le montant de cette subvention est remis à la province qui à son tour le remet aux conseils scolaires. Malheureusement, d'après les renseignements dont je dispose actuellement, l'an passé le gouvernement fédéral a donné un million à la province pour l'enseignement du français

dans la région d'Ottawa. De ce million, apparemment \$500,000 ont été gardés par la province, et l'autre moitié (\$500,000) a été donnée aux conseils scolaires.

Alors les Franco-Ontariens se demandent régulièrement ce qui arrive aux \$500,000 donnés à la province, deuxièmement ce qui arrive aux \$500,000 donnés aux conseils scolaires.

Vous savez, en éducation, en français on beaucoup de difficulté surtout en ci qui concerne les textes. Dans notre éducation française ici, on manque, de textes français pour nous les Franco-Ontariens, que ce soit en histoire, en mathématiques, surtout si on insiste pour avoir des textes canadiens.

Du fait que ces montants-là donnés par le Fédéral ne vont pas spécifiquement pour l'éducation en français, je crois que c'est une lacune pour nous et je crois qu'on devrait avoir du gouvernement provincial une idée de la façon dont cet argent est employé, les \$500,000 que la province garde. Qu'advient-il de cet argent, de ce montant de \$500,000? Le conseil scolaire qui reçoit ce montant, qu'en fait-il?

Je crois que ces montants, qui sont donnés spécifiquement par le Fédéral, devraient être utilisés spécifiquement pour l'éducation en français de nos Franco-Ontariens parce que c'est le but de la subvention du gouvernement fédéral. Je crois que si on disposait de ce montant, on pourrait améliorer l'éducation en français de nos Franco-Ontariens et même de nos anglophones dans la province.

J'espère, M. l'Orateur, que ce problème ce règlera le plus tôt possible. Quand le Comité consultatif de langue française autre pour avoir des textes en français qu'il ne reçoive donc pas du conseil scolaire une réponse come celle-ci: "On n'a pas l'argent", parce que, en fait, on a des montants donnés par le Fédéral qui ne servent pas exclusivement à l'éducation en français. J'espère voir une solution à ce problème, M. l'Orateur.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would just want to bring one matter to the attention of the House and it's a question I have raised in the House before. Possibly it's not of pressing importance but I think it's important for any government to take care of people who sometimes receive the backhand from the majority of the community. What I am talking about, Mr. Speaker, is that some time ago I raised a question about an individual called Lee Davies.

This was a situation—and I just want to make sure I get this right—in which this person, born a female, is now through a succession of medical operations, clinically and medically a male person. Of course, you can see the problem—driver's licence and everything—involved in that. This person, Lee Davies—I have named him in the House regularly; he has gone on open-line shows and this type of thing—is facing a situation. There are not numerous people in that situation; we are not dealing with thousands of votes here. It's an indication that the governments which are elected by a mass of people should care for even certain individuals.

Anyway, the problem of Davies is this: He was able to get his driver's licence changed to reflect his change of sex to a male person; he was able to get his OHIP card changed and his social security number changed but he can't get his birth certificate changed. He can't get it changed because the Official Statistics Act of the Province of Ontario has no procedure for when there is a change of sex. One can always make an application if there is a change of name or there is, in fact, a change of statistics. For instance, a child born out of wedlock can change its name. One can always make application to change the Official Statistics Act but the Official Statistics Act records your sex at your birth and this person who was born a female is presently a male. Doctors are saying that this person is a male. He is in a situation in which as a male person now, he is living with a female and wants to get married. He has, in fact, children which were born to him when he was a she. It gets very complex but this is what happened.

This person wants to get married but can't get married with a birth certificate which would indicate a marriage between two females although he's a male. He can't get a passport because one needs a birth certificate and if one is presenting oneself as a male person, the passport should reflect this. So we have the annoyance, the difficulty that this person is going through if they want identification, and it says clearly here that he is a female and he doesn't look like a female because this person now has got a beard and the whole bit and looks like a male.

And so I raise this problem. I have brought this to the attention of the minister and the present Provincial Secretary of Justice (Mr. Clement) at the time when he was Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, this particular issue is not a thing on which elec-

tions are won or lost. But it is an indication that government should care, even though it involves very few people. And I said to the minister, it would require just a very minor amendment to the Official Statistics Act and that they should amend the Act to allow this type of change.

In other words, doctors are saying that this person is a male. If we are allowing our medical profession to do the sex-change operation, should not the rest of society adapt to this? It's clearly a situation where medical technology has advanced beyond our laws, and so the law should be changed to allow this person to change his birth certificate to reflect his present status.

Of course, the minister has not done anything on it. I recall going on a programme called "Ombudsman" on CBC television and talking about this. Unfortunately, the minister had been changed about that time. The present minister (Mr. Handleman) was not prepared to come on television to discuss this situation, and so here we are again. I bring this up as further evidence of the insensitivity of this government. Why won't they even discuss the problem when it requires such a minor amendment? So, I bring it again to the attention of the House. Make this minor change to allow persons such as Lee Davies to get this change in their birth certificate and in the Official Statistics Act to reflect their present status.

Mr. Speaker, I notice in Saskatchewan—and my friends to the left will be proud of this and I suppose I should be, being from that province originally—that the government there introduced legislation in the Saskatchewan Legislature yesterday that will enable persons who have had sex-change operations to have birth certificates altered to conform to their new sex. And they've done the same thing in BC now.

The sex designation on the birth certificate cannot now be altered in such cases. Health Minister Walter Smishek said in an interview that at least five cases of sex-change operations have come to the attention of provincial health officials.

"Well, if they've had five cases in Saskatchewan, I can just imagine in Ontario with—what?—eight times the population or maybe 10 times the population of Saskatchewan, that it affects a fair number of people. Not so much the situation of Lee Davies, where you go from female to male, but you've got the operation going the other way.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I bring it again to the attention of the House. It's a minor problem,

but it seems to me it should be the type of problem where government, even though it affects just a few people, should show that it cares. There are no votes in this thing, but it shows humanity. And I encourage the government to make the changes. They're not going to win votes, they're not going to lose votes and they're going to assist very few people, but at least they're assisting a small group of citizens of this province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Cochrane South.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to engage in this debate, and to begin by expressing congratulations to you in your office as Speaker, and to say that I am impressed by the way that you manage the business of this House. I must say that the months ahead will be difficult ones to deal with, and we wish you all the best in your handling of the debates in this House.

I must say to the hon. member who just spoke that I heartily concur in his remarks, especially in regard to the French textbooks in the French schools of this province. It is a major concern and they're just not available, I know from experience I've had in my own riding. I know the problem will be just as acute in the riding of the member for Cochrane North (Mr. Brunelle), so he can use the pressure of those of us who represent ridings like this to convince the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) to do something about it, and to get textbooks in the French language for our French-speaking students.

Now, the Speech from the Throne was a different kind of a speech. When it was over, some of us said it was bereft of substance and was rather a philosophic kind of speech where you could read almost anything into it.

I think the people out there are wondering if the statements that were made were really true, that the government is bankrupt. They are not putting forward any legislative programme, as has been the custom in the past, to give some indication of where we are going in the next few months.

I know the member who moved the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne talked about what they did last year and the year before, but he didn't say what was coming up this year. I think the Speech from the Throne is to give direction and insight as to what the people can expect will be coming forth from their Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that has concerned me for the last while, and came

out of the Speech from the Throne, is the significant debate on law and order. It suggests that there is a real fear among people that crime is growing. It perhaps suggests something about the kind of society we are living in, and whether we are providing the kind of justice and social order that makes for peace and satisfaction and contentment among our citizens. Or are we creating a situation where injustices are growing and the kind of life that people have to live is causing conflict and strife; where our policies are fostering this kind of thing? The major law and order advocate was, I suppose, Richard Nixon in his election campaigns. This was a theme that he hammered away at time and again.

An hon. member: And Agnew too.

Mr. Ferrier: And Agnew too, of course. The people sort of went for that right-wing approach and said: "Here are outstanding men who are going to do something for us in this regard."

Well, we know what they did for the people of the United States was to cause terrific embarrassment for them. The moral condition of public life there has never sunk so low. They started talking about law and order and deflected people away from what was really going on. I don't know what would happen if we were ever to follow that kind of background to law and order here.

I think the government should say a little less about it and perhaps do more to provide the kind of society where justice prevails and where people are treated right under the law; and, of course, offenders are treated accordingly.

There is some indication in this civil service freeze that is going on across the province that the Ministry of Correctional Services is telling their institutions to hold the line. As far as staff are concerned, they are cutting back in their psychiatric treatment and their rehabilitation treatment. Now, I hope that what I have heard isn't so, but this is what I have heard.

It seems to me to be the wrong direction to be following. More emphasis needs to be placed on rehabilitation and less on the punishment concept and to restore as many of these people to a useful life in society as is possible. I think that is important.

The mover of the Speech from the Throne talked about capital punishment. He wanted to see that implemented so that it is an offence to murder a policeman or a correction officer. I gathered, from what he was saying, he would like to see it brought back

entirely. I don't agree with capital punishment and I think it degrades the state to carry out the same kind of action that an offender, a murderer, engages in. I think the government is consciously thinking of a swing to the right. If this is some indication of it I think it had better look pretty carefully because if the government is talking about those kinds of programmes—and the main advocates of those in this North American continent are Agnew and Nixon—I'd run away from those kinds of thoughts if I were the government.

One thing has disturbed me and it has been referred to more eloquently than I will be able to do by the member for Nipissing. He drew attention, in the dying days of the last session, to a question that was posed to the Treasurer about what was being done about Design for Development in Northeastern Ontario. The document was tabled about four years ago at simultaneous meetings in Timmins and Sudbury. There was to be a response period then the second phase was to be presented to the municipalities up there. The member for Nipissing asked the question, "Where does this all stand now?"

Rather flippantly the Treasurer said, "When I left the Treasury 2½ years ago it was at a certain stage and when I picked it up and looked at it 2½ years later it's at about the same stage."

One wonders what the member for London South was doing. He kept saying they were doing something about it but his successor says that it's at about the same stage. Certainly, they are giving us a snow job on that one and not doing very much about the development of northeastern Ontario.

Mr. Young: Typical Tory inertia.

Mr. Ferrier: They've been telling us they're going to come out with some kind of development plan for the province. We haven't seen it as yet and maybe the inertia will get out of that branch of the ministry and it might be proposed by the time the next election comes around or just a few days before.

Mr. Stokes: I think it was George Gathercole who talked about Design for Development in northeastern Ontario some 10 years ago.

Mr. Ferrier: It could have been.

Mr. Stokes: Ten years ago.

Mr. Ferrier: There's lots of talk but there's not so much action from the government.

Another thing that has been quite a subject of controversy in my riding is the possible going ahead with a natural resources centre. The chamber of commerce pioneered the idea and came down here to Queen's Park and talked to the member for London South (Mr. White) when he was in the Ministry of Industry and Tourism. They had a pretty good concept and a pretty good plan and the government showed some interest.

Mr. Stokes: What would they call it? The William Ferrier Natural Resources Centre?

Mr. Ferrier: Just wait now. The plan looked very good and I thought it had real merit and it still does. Finally, they got to the place where the government brought in the firm of Raymond Moriyama to do a study of a natural resources centre for Timmins and they decided that it should be developed around the old Hollinger buildings. This seemed to be the last place for it. It was a big subject in the municipal election the last time around—I suppose it still is—between the chamber of commerce and the municipal council as to whether or not the council knew that this was the landsite being considered. But about this time, the municipal council, who had got the land from Hollinger, decided to sell part of it to a plumbing firm for their offices to get them off one of the main streets, which wasn't a bad idea. They also sold part of the complex to a local entrepreneur who was going to develop it into a talc mill for Johns-Manville.

If they now wanted to go ahead with the development of a natural resources centre, they'd have to buy back this property at much inflated costs. They sold it for—I don't know whether it was \$30,000 or \$45,000—but now they are talking about wanting about \$270,000 to get it back. The council has more or less decided it is not going to put up any money.

I think the idea is still a good one. I don't usually say very much in complimentary terms about the chamber of commerce, but I think their idea was good. I hope if it's not possible to develop it on that present site that it could be developed in Timmins. Some people up there take the position that they are not too keen to have it.

I certainly would like to see it in our city, because I think it would do a great deal for us in the terms of a tourist attraction and extra employment and putting in one place the history of the area and this kind of thing. The idea has a lot of merit, and I'm hoping to ask some questions of the minister in this House about it. I certainly don't want to

see it shelved. It would be a shame after the work that was done by our people up there to see that go someplace else.

I wonder sometimes at the brains in the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, at the contracts they let for reconstruction and repaving.

Mr. Stokes: They have the parliamentary assistant over there. Maybe he'll pay attention.

Mr. Ferrier: Maybe he will pay some attention. They decided that they were going to upgrade Highway 101 between Pamour and Matheson. The road was in very bad shape. What they decided to do was to put on an extra couple of coats of asphalt over the already existing road. That was good in the summer when we drove along there. It was a pretty good road and all the rest of it. The last couple of times I've driven down that road the cracks in that asphalt are half an inch thick in all kinds of places, not just one or two, but almost throughout the whole span.

It seems to me as though we are paying construction firms to do a job and they are doing that kind of a poor job on our roads. Was that the best kind of way to spend our money? If we are going to repave the present road and put asphalt over what's already there, maybe it is the most economical and best way of doing it. But, boy, to see those cracks on that road!

Mr. McIlveen: What number highway was that?

Mr. Ferrier: Highway 101. I would like the parliamentary assistant to the minister to look into that. I'd like to have him report back to me as to what his people think of that job.

Mr. Stokes: Take a drive up there.

Mr. McIlveen: I will take it out of Hansard.

Mr. Ferrier: All right, I will look forward to a response from him.

Another thing that I brought up here before in the House, and I will just reiterate it once more, is the whole matter of this lightweight, reliable and comfortable train. It is a joint project of Alcan Canada Products, Dominion Foundries and Steel and MLW Industries. Those of us who got the Dofasco magazine will have had a chance to look at it and have read a little bit about it. There was a presentation given us at the northeastern municipal association about the

possible implementation of this train on a route between Toronto and Hearst. This train can get up to 120 miles an hour and it could provide very comfortable travel arrangements for the people taking it.

I've suggested that the ONR and the government look into this concept, as I think they are doing, and implement it for that route. I would point out that it would take two years once a decision has been made to go ahead with it before it can be in operation. But it would provide the kind of quick alternative to air transportation to north-eastern Ontario that is not there right now. It's all right to ride on a bus but sometimes it's not as comfortable as it could be. As I say, I think that this concept holds a lot of promise for us. I admit that it would be a good election announcement for the government, but I wholeheartedly endorse the concept.

Another thing I've spoken about before is the possibility of getting a courthouse in Timmins. There is a great deal of inconvenience being inflicted on the people of that city by always having to go up to Cochrane to get the judge or to deal with land registry matters and that kind of thing. The Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations said he was going to Timmins during the break between the last sitting of the House and this one to look into that. Well, I don't know whether he did or not—

Mr. Stokes: Nothing happened.

Mr. Ferrier: —but I'd like to read a letter that I got from the former minister, dated June 27, 1974, in which he says:

We have been looking at the situation and note that since the creation of the district, the district town has been the town of Cochrane. The courthouse building in Cochrane also houses the land registry office. Also, we are aware that the population of Timmins in the district of Cochrane has probably always been higher than that of Cochrane.

As a result of our review of the situation, it would appear that there would be a great deal of logic in having the district courthouse in Timmins. We have no objection whatsoever to the relocation of the land registry office, except that for practical purposes I can see no advantages in setting up a second office for the district. This would mean closing the existing facility in Cochrane.

I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that I don't necessarily want to see the offices in

Cochrane closed. But I would like to see much better facilities in Timmins.

There are some other issues which would have to be dealt with, and one is cost. It would undoubtedly cost in the order of \$250,000 to build a new courthouse to replace the existing one, which has been extensively renovated during a three-year renovation programme in quite recent years.

If we were to decide that the office should be moved some time in the future, the construction of the office itself would have to take its position in the priority list in this area since there are a substantial number of land registry offices throughout the province which are in need of renovation and replacement. These are gradually being carried out as sufficient capital funds are made available to the ministry.

Again, I should indicate to you that this matter is still under consideration. However, I would appreciate your comments whether you feel it would be practical to close out the office in the town of Cochrane and transfer it to Timmins some time in the future.

I might mention, before any public discussion takes place on this matter, that I would like to personally discuss the matter with the local law society, who I think would be in a good position to assess the impact of such a move since they would be the major users of this facility.

I think that there could be two courthouses. Cochrane could still look after the northern part of the district and, with the expansion at Texasgulf going over the next few years, I think the need to have court facilities in Timmins will be that much greater.

Nowadays, when the spring assizes and the fall assizes are heard, people on jury duty have to drive up to Cochrane, 70 miles away, and spend a couple of days up there, sometimes longer, waiting to be called for jury duties. Many inconveniences result to the people of Timmins because they haven't got a courthouse in Timmins.

There was for a short time a courthouse in Timmins with a judge located there and then the government changed its mind and took that away from us. I think that they would be best to review their thinking at that time and reconsider it, talk to the Law Society up there, the people who have most to do with the contact with the registry office and the courthouse, and I'm sure that some kind of workable arrangement can

be made. After all, if we have to take our place on the priority list, if they make a decision today it might be 10 or 15 years before anything is done about it.

I see the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, I wonder if he would just take a look at that too. That's in his ministry, and perhaps we'll talk to him about it privately but I think that that has a good deal of merit and I would like to see some serious thought given to it.

One of the things that I've had a great deal to do with in the last nine months has been the labour dispute that has been going on at the South Centennial Manor, which is under the jurisdiction of the Cochrane district board of management for the homes for the aged. There had been an assessment against that home for not providing for women nursing aids equal pay for equal work with the male orderlies. It was found after an investigation that their work, was in the essence, exactly the same, but they were being paid \$100 and some less a month than the men were.

This had been going on for quite some time. In fact, a similar investigation had taken place in 1969 and an assessment was made against the board of management then. They changed the duties a little bit on paper, although they didn't change them in practice, and then they went back to paying the women less than the men for those years. About a \$25,000 award was made, the maximum possible, going back two years, to the women.

At the same time, the women got a nice little letter from the administrator, on the advice of the board of management, that their services were no longer needed, that they were going to replace them with registered nursing aids. They argued that if they had to pay the nursing aids within \$11 of what an RNA got they would get the RNAs. One wonders, if the difference in wages is so close, then there must not be that much difference in duties.

Anyway, it took a long time, with discussions with the Minister of Labour and keeping after his department, and some people who had heard some things came forward and were prepared to testify. So the ministry laid charges that those 12 nursing aids had been dismissed because they took advantage of the provisions under the Employment Standards Act for equal pay for equal work.

The matter finally came before the courts on Feb. 24 I believe—I was there for most of it—and the decision was brought down on March 10 that the judge did find that, in fact, the board of management was guilty of the offences charged. He then, in his decision, ordered that the board of management must pay these nursing aids wages from Aug. 18 to March 10 but he didn't rule that they should get their jobs back. He took advantage of some provision under the Interpretation Act and the fact that the Employment Standards Act had been changed and he ruled that he had discretion in the matter.

I'm not sure whether it's going to end there or not. I'm still looking into it and am still discussing it with various people, but I don't know. That will be another big levy against the people. There were only seven cases heard and there was a \$700 fine, \$100 in each case, but five to seven months' wages for no work is a pretty large assessment. It means that the taxpayers have been hit with a pretty high assessment because of the stupidity and the stubbornness of this board of management for the Cochrane district.

When some of them were testifying before the hearing they were talking about being a former reeve, or a former mayor and so on, and the lawyer for the Ministry of Labor said: "It seems like this board of management is sort of an old folk's home for old-time politicians," or something to this effect. Of course, these politicians were all Conservative appointments, and for the life of me I can't imagine why the Conservatives would serve themselves so badly as to have those kinds of appointments.

I have tried—I have brought it up in the House and I have written to the Premier—to make sure that none of that present board is reappointed on the newly constituted board of April 1, because any board that caused so much animosity and conflict, with such a badfaith approach to employees and such an attitude to women, as far as I am concerned is deplorable. They have caused trouble in the community. The cost of legal fees and the time in court and all those back wages is just a classic episode of mismanagement.

It has been a very, very bad way that things have been done and I hope that in the newly constituted board, and in all boards of management, there will be some thought given to putting some women on these boards.

I don't know whether, when the member for Durham (Mr. Carruthers) brought in his report on aging, there was some recommendation in that report that there should be a proportionate number of women on the boards of management of homes for the aged.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): The member can take it for granted that there will be fair representation on all 20. We are that type of government.

Mr. Ferrier: I will tell the member that the type of government the Tories exercised by appointing the people they did—not one a woman—and the kind of trouble that occurred in that area—

Mr. Carruthers: There is something wrong with the member up there if he hasn't looked after that.

Mr. Ferrier: Well the largest area is represented by the member for Cochrane North, so if the member wants to criticize him, why that's fine and dandy.

Mr. Carruthers: Does the member for Cochrane South have any difficulty in his riding?

Mr. Ferrier: It goes into my riding, but it was primarily the members of the board from his area who caused much of the difficulty. The two members from my riding were prominent Conservatives, on the Conservative executive, so I can only say that had there been some women on that board—

Mr. Carruthers: Write me a letter.

Mr. Ferrier: —even if they were Conservatives, I think if they had been women Conservatives they might have talked some sense into those stupid men.

Mr. Carruthers: Drop me a letter.

Mr. Ferrier: I think that by not providing a more comprehensive health care organization in our province, in a number of instances our homes for the aged are becoming chronic care homes. They are supposed to be homes for ambulatory patients who can come and go a little bit and move around, but because there have not been adequate chronic care facilities in the province they have had to have some place for them and they have used the senior citizen homes.

I think there has to be a lot more planning and a lot more thought given to trying to provide chronic care accommodation for people who need it throughout the province. Nursing homes will not take patients who need more than 2.5 hours of nursing care a

day or something, because the homes are supposedly not equipped for it. I think that what should happen is that the nursing homes could have some wings designated for that, and they might be paid on a different basis. But I think that we've got to resolve that problem.

Mr. Speaker, the major thing that's been going on in my riding and getting a lot of press lately has been this closing of the mine in the township of Reeves, some 40 miles west of Timmins. The majority of the workers at that mine are from my riding.

Now, my leader had written to the vice-president, health, safety and environment of Johns-Manville about this matter, Dr. Paul Kotin. And Dr. Kotin replied to my leader, and he has given me a copy of this letter. I'd like to read a bit of it into the record. I know my leader read another part of it during his reply on Tuesday, but I'd like to read this in. Dr. Kotin says:

It is well to emphasize again to you that in my capacity as vice-president for health, safety and environment, my responsibility is to make certain that the work environment throughout Johns-Manville complies with government regulations. And even more importantly, to assure to the maximum extent possible a non-hazardous occupational environment.

It was this latter consideration that initiated the steps leading to the closing of the Reeves mine. It was a decision fully in concert with our corporate commitment to do everything technologically possible to provide a safe workplace, and in the absence of that, to seek other means for worker protection.

Now, who is that doctor trying to kid about dust levels at the operation? The mine was closed down for a period when time was spent clearing away some overburden and some waste rock in the open pit. The mill was down for nine months then. But when that mill was in operation at previous times the dust level was 28 fibres per cubic centimetre. I think the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren) suggested that figure to the Minister of Health, and he replied that the hon. member for Nickel Belt might not be wrong.

The working environment was deplorable, and this company knew the dangers of overexposure to asbestos fibres and the damage to the lungs and the health of the working people. And yet they went along exploiting those workers, forcing them to work in those kinds of hazardous conditions and never bringing it to their attention that it was a hazardous situation. And then to write

a letter like that is nothing but outright dishonesty. I would say that the man is suffering from some kind of moral degeneracy. He claimed a "corporate commitment to do everything technologically possible." What a bunch of claptrap that is.

This company got some pressure because of the amount of cancer that was developing, and asbestosis in their mill in Scarborough focused public attention on it. The government began to look into it and do something about it.

When the Ham commission was meeting in Timmins, the Steelworkers union that represents the workers there made a presentation on the high dust levels and of the terrible situation in the pit itself. There were loaders without any brakes and some trucks without any doors or windows. If there were doors, they were wired shut. The men who drove those trucks in the open pit had to crawl through those wired shut doors to get into them. There were no heaters in them; there were a host of violations of working safety and violations of the Mining Act.

I raised the matter with the minister, and at that point he gave the old chesnut: "Oh, well, you fellows over there are just trying to implicate our ministry. We are doing a good job."

One thing I did hear when I met those men was that every time the mining inspector was going to show up there, the night before the management people said to them: "Make sure things are cleaned up around here because Bob Lockhart is coming tomorrow." How did the company know if the mine inspector didn't warn them?

My colleague the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) has been hammering away at the point that the mining inspectors going to these mines are notifying them ahead of time and warning them of conditions. As a result, they do everything possible to curtail operations and to clean things up. When the inspectors get there, they don't get a realistic picture of what is going on.

This is what Johns-Manville have been doing over the years. They have been subjecting workers to unconscionable levels of asbestos dust. Then when it suited their purpose, they made a corporate decision in Denver, Colo., and they said: "We are going to close that down, and we'll use this as an excuse." They closed down for two or three days and put those workers out of work. There was anxiety, confusion and lost wages.

Of course, as far as the Employment Standards Act is concerned, they do not have to pay for that temporary layoff, but they

led the men to believe that they wouldn't lose any money for that period. "After all, Johns-Manville is a benevolent company, a good corporate citizen. We will look after you." But, they said: "We will not give you a cent."

In their contract there is some termination pay, so many dollars for each year worked, and when they reopened they gave a letter to every man who was on the permanent staff, saying: "You are through on April 30. We are living up to the provisions of the Employment Standards Act." To those who were there less than three months: "Good-bye. We don't need you. Out you go." Therefore the temporary people didn't get any consideration at all.

Some men are sitting around doing very little, although the management supervisory staff will ask them what they are doing and they are supposed to sort of half look busy. But they are not really doing anything productive, even in the sense of getting the place ready to shut down.

Some of the men have hunted around and they have got offers of other jobs, and if the company would discharge them they could get their termination pay and go to these jobs that have become available. But this company, Johns-Manville, as is suggested by this Dr. Kotin, is so concerned about the workers that it is taking the serious step of shutting down operations on the basis of its commitments to employees and environmental health. Well, if it is making a commitment to its employees, why doesn't it co-operate with these employees now and lay them off, give them their termination pay and let them go and find alternative work? But no, they won't do that kind of thing.

The workers also told me there was some good ore-bearing rock on a fairly significant basis that was sent out to the tailings dam or the muck pile, that they weren't even processing it. This company has a pretty shoddy record. They know better than anybody, I suppose, what the danger is to the health of workers working in these kinds of unsafe conditions. They forced their workers for a number of years to do that with no concern for them, I submit. Then when it suits their purpose they use this kind of an excuse to shut down.

They say: "We can't meet those two fibres per cubic centimetre levels that you imposed on us in Ontario." They're doing it in the United States, I'm told. They've never proven to the Ministry of Natural Resources, or the Ministry of Health that they couldn't, but it was going to cost them a bit of money and

it suited their purpose to close down. The victims are these 120 or so men who have been abused, I suggest Mr. Speaker, by working in those kind of unsafe conditions, and now they're dislocating them in this way.

I don't know whether the motion put forward by the local of that mine is the most sensible solution. The workers have unanimously endorsed the motion, saying that they wish the province to move in and take over this mine and operate it as a Crown corporation with the understanding, of course, that it would have to be a model of safety and have as dust-free an environment as is possible for an asbestos mine. There are reserves there for five to eight years. This company is closing down and I think they're likely going to dismantle the mill, which will mean that reserve will not likely ever be processed. They are in the process of developing a talc body a little distance away and they want to use the land that was designated for the natural resources centre in Timmins to process this talc.

I would say to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) and the Minister of Health that I'd like to see the whole thing taken away from Johns-Manville, because they've shown themselves to be such a shoddy, irresponsible outfit. Let the province operate it themselves if they don't. This government is not noted for its nationalization of our resource industries. There must be some pretty sure commitments that that talc operation will meet acceptable standards and men will not be forced to work in unsafe conditions or have their health jeopardized.

Who knows what's going to happen to some of these men? We hope the worst isn't going to happen, but some of them have worked in the highest dust counts imaginable.

I came across a little letter that was written by a fellow by the name of Ted McMeekin of Hamilton in the Hamilton Spectator of Feb. 25, 1975. This letter says a lot about this whole matter of environmental health. It says:

It must be comforting to those who work in the uranium mines at Elliot Lake and with asbestos at the Johns-Manville plant in Scarborough to keep hearing cabinet ministers talk about the mine dust and the level of asbestos fibres in the air as falling within government environment and safety guidelines. It's about time the ministries responsible for health and safety in our industrial work places forgot about meaningless statistics, their so-called standards, and began to look at the important ones, namely the number of

workmen who have died or have developed terminal illnesses as a result of their work environment.

I recall the lyrics of an old Peter, Paul and Mary song which asked: "How many deaths would it take until they know that too many people have died?" If health and safety standards need to be improved, then let us improve them. Better this than creating false confidence in the minds of men and women workers who end up dying because they believe the place at which they work to be safe.

Now what value do we put upon our working people, upon our people in this province? Surely in our day of Christian culture the individual is of utmost importance and we as legislators and people in government should not be calling upon our workers to work in—or taking any chances that they are working in—unsafe conditions which are jeopardizing their health and leading them to chronic illness or to an early death.

The situation in Elliot Lake is tremendously upsetting. I read statistics the other night on a brief presented by the McIntyre Research Foundation about the situation that existed in the Porcupine mining camp in the early days when there was dry drilling and when there was not too much concern for dust suppression. The statistics are just as dramatically high as they are in Elliot Lake and the number of deaths, the number of silicosis claims, the number of impairments of workers in that area at that time was just awful. We in the gold mining camps have lived with that kind of thing for a long time.

There have been improvements in dust suppression techniques in the gold mines. There has been better ventilation and wet drilling; one of the controversial things they have done is to use this aluminum dust therapy. It is aluminum dust that is blown into the air in the dry before the workers go in and it's supposed to render harmless the silica dust that the men breathe in the course of their work underground. I've read a presentation by a man by the name of Dix of the McIntyre Research Foundation who has given the rationale behind it, saying that it has cut down dramatically on the silicosis incidence in the gold mining camps. To their knowledge they can't see that there has been any impairment in lung conditions among those who have taken this treatment although the Steelworkers feel very strongly that it has affected the men and the men themselves feel that it covered up their lung diseases.

I don't know. I hope the Ham commission will do some further review of the mat-

ter. If the McIntyre Research Foundation is right, so much the better. If they are not, then we had better—

Mr. Stokes: We had better know about it.

Mr. Ferrier: We had better know about it.

There was a little article in *Popular Science*, November, 1974, that talked about an air conditioner hazard and has some relevance here.

A mysterious film of grey dust that was spoiling experiments in laboratory cold rooms has provoked a surprising discovery. Corrosion of air conditioners in normally cooled rooms produces a level of aluminum dust in the air that exceeds acceptable standards. The finding comes from a research team, a chemist father and physicist son, working at the University of Toronto, Canada.

Dr. Dymtre Buchnea and his son Alexander were asked to find the source of dust that was ruining enzyme experiments in rooms kept at 37 to 40 degrees. The dust apparently precipitates out of the air at relatively low temperatures because there is more clean water in the dust in cold rooms. The dust acts as a nucleus around which water vapour condenses; larger particles are formed and a film of dust is deposited.

When the intrigued researchers sampled rooms with similarly corroded air conditioners, where the temperature range was 68 degrees to 73 degrees Fahrenheit, they found the difference enormous. The air contained 10 times as much of this pollutant. The reason: The aluminum dust remained suspended in the air as fine particles instead of precipitating out. Breathing aluminum powder does not directly poison the body but it can cause changes in lung tissue that eventually progress to a disease resembling emphysema according to Dr. Sam Simmons, chief of the bio-environmental laboratory branch of the US Environmental Protection Agency. Scientists at the University of Toronto are now investigating the possible health hazards of air conditioner dusts.

Well, if air conditioners cause this kind of aluminum dust in the air beyond the acceptable standards, imagine the amount of aluminum dust that these men worked in when the containers of aluminum dust are just spewed out in the dries where they change their clothes before they go underground.

I note in talking to the older miners who have chest conditions and who invariably try to establish claims for disablement due to silicosis with the Workmen's Compensation Board, that invariably they are saying: "Oh no, there are no radiological findings of silicosis. You've no problem that way. Your problem is emphysema or maybe bronchitis." Now the question that arises in my mind is, is this emphysema from all that aluminum dust? I don't know, but it's certainly worth considering.

That's a thing I am trying to follow up and I hope the Minister of Health, the Ham commission and the Minister of Natural Resources take a pretty careful look at that, and if necessary have further research done on it. Maybe the workers have been subjected to another kind of lung condition.

I hope the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Ministry of the Environment will also take a good close look at the United Asbestos plant in Midlothian township and make sure that plant meets the required safety and air sample conditions for the workers when that starts up this spring, because we could be into another situation.

The mining companies have been the greatest proponents of free enterprise and tax holidays and concessions and, "Let us do what we want," probably of any industry in the whole country. I've seen it in my area in the gold mines, particularly in the early days but to some significant degree yet. The Elliot Lake situation is a major problem at this present time. The asbestos situation is quite significant.

When the zinc refinery at Texasgulf started up, for some period of time there were health problems there too. Since then I think they have probably rectified them, but for a period of time the sulphuric acid vapours were quite significantly high and there were a number of workers who developed nose bleeds; in some cases the enamel of their teeth was eaten away; there were some skin rashes and this type of thing. There were some problems there.

Now I'm told—I hope that the information that I have is correct—that they now have three times the volume of air ventilation. They have changed the ventilation; the cell house is now relatively safe for the workers and the sulphuric acid vapours in the air are within the acceptable standards. But for a period of time there were workers who worked in really unsafe conditions.

This mining industry seems to be so callous and unconcerned about their workers. They'll put them into all kinds of unsafe

working conditions. They've got to get that ore out and make a profit; they've got to make a big impression on the shareholders; they've got to manipulate the stock markets and all the rest of it.

I think they've got a pretty shoddy record. Consider the way that Johns-Manville have operated, the way they have treated their workers, the way they've closed down that mine, the unsafe conditions they've perpetrated and the way they have not used the ore that's there—in fact, they've wasted so much.

I have never been the strongest exponent of government operation of our industries, but since we give away so much to these companies in terms of concessions in the taxation field and in view of the way the men have been treated and the injuries and early deaths so many of them have suffered, not to mention the explosive philosophy, to me it's capitalism at the worst and I have been forced to the conclusion that we should be developing our own resources through Crown corporations.

After all, Mr. Speaker, there was a report that I believe came from the select committee on economic and cultural nationalism. If my memory serves me correctly, that committee was of the opinion that any new ore body that was developed should be at least 50 per cent owned by the people.

This is what is happening in Manitoba. They've said that a company that wants to bring an ore body to production must give notification to the minister, and he has 30 days to decide whether the province wants to take a 50 per cent equity position in the operation of that mine.

I think there must be much more public involvement in the mining field. These companies will say, of course, "Well, we're not going to play that kind of a game with you. We're not going to put money into exploration and development. We'll do it in the Yukon or the Dominican Republic. We'll go here and we'll go there. You fellows will be left holding the bag."

I think it was the Porcupine Prospectors and Developers Association in their brief to the minister's advisory committee on Feb. 28 that said the way to handle the situation was to reintroduce the legislation that had existed in the federal tax Act until 1972; to reverse the white paper, to reverse Carter, to give all the tax holidays they had enjoyed and to give them all those kind of incentives. Well, they don't need it. They've got so many incentives now that we're subsidizing them.

I've heard people from this industry talk about people on welfare and people on unemployment insurance in a derogatory sense. But if there are any of the corporate welfare bums that David Lewis talks about, they're in the mining industry.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what is needed is the government to move into the whole field of exploration and development and to get involved in the way that other provinces are doing. The minister himself, a year ago, made a statement that this is what they were proposing. He has reaffirmed this in reply to questions that I've directed to him in the House, stating that they're certainly going to go ahead with this.

Even in that report, which I think was prepared by Kates, Peat, Marwick and Co., for that very noble select committee of which you know something, Mr. Speaker, the mining companies said they were prepared to work on a co-operative basis. Well, let's see the government move in this direction.

We got something like \$144 million or more from the mining industry in this last year on this Mining Tax Act that went through. I suppose \$100 million of that, if one wanted to say it in these terms, was shoved by the government into that Syncrude deal to develop oil sands away out there in Alberta to look after, I suppose, the oil needs of southern Ontario.

I would suggest that money could have been better spent in developing the resource potential we have in the mining field in this province through a Crown corporation, rather than subsidizing Imperial Oil and Gulf Canada and whoever else it was. Premier Lougheed has so much money out there he doesn't know what to do with it. Let him put the money up and let us develop our Ontario show.

One other thing I suppose I should make some reference to is that since the Mining Tax Act went through Texasgulf has announced its major expansion. That Act was designed for Texasgulf; I don't think there is any doubt about it. Once it was proclaimed, it went ahead with its announcement and by 1978 the copper smelter and refinery should be built at a cost of \$200,000 with a capacity of about 130,000 tons of refined copper every year. There will be a mine and mill expansion which should also be completed in 1978 at a cost of \$100 million and the company is also thinking about putting another circuit in their con-

centrator and of going ahead with a fertilizer plant utilizing the sulphuric acid, and so on.

It's a tremendous boost for the economy of northeastern Ontario and if one believes in free enterprise and capitalism, that Mining Tax Act, of course, was the thing that probably did the job. I am prepared to admit that but I wonder, with the kind of concessions we have to give whether that should really be developed in the private sector or whether the public sector should operate it. Anyway, this development will mean there will be many new jobs created in northeastern Ontario and there will be significant demands on the whole of the area in terms of transportation.

Highway 101 was reconstructed but on a two-lane basis. I suggest it will have to be done very soon on a four-lane basis. There will have to be thought given to a bypass around Timmins. These pressures will be so great that we will have to see these things done. The company wants to have the road to Smooth Rock Falls completed that much sooner because it sees a source of employees living in Smooth Rock Falls and in Cochrane and Iroquois Falls and Matheson. It feels that road would provide jobs and homes for people in Smooth Rock Falls. It may be right and maybe it should be facilitated in that.

As far as housing is concerned, the shortage is acute now and it will be more acute. Private developers will do some

and the city is trying to work to meet the crisis and so on but I suggest—and they are doing something in this regard—that Texasgulf has some responsibility itself to see that housing is built in this area. Hollinger did it; it built houses. Dome has done it and I think it is proposing maybe to do more; I don't know but I think maybe. I think Texasgulf has some obligation to provide home housing for its employees as well.

Other mines have moved into an area—they have moved into the wilderness very often—and have had to see the public develop all kinds of facilities and services for them. Texasgulf was lucky that it moved into an area where many of these things were and I think now that there is increased pressure for more housing, Texasgulf must be prepared to show some leadership and spend a fair amount of money and come up with some kind of plan to provide housing for its people.

Mr. Speaker, the time is nearly 6 o'clock and I have covered quite a number of subjects. I spoke at greater length than I intended to, but I think I have wound up my speech and would yield the floor to some other hon. member to resume at 8 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: It will be the hon. member for Essex-Kent (Mr. Ruston).

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

ERRATUM

No.	Page	Col.	Line	Should read:
5	179	1	34	Mr. Lewis: I presume that the member for

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 20, 1975

Education grants, statement by Mr. Wells	199
Public service mileage rates, statement by Mr. Winkler	201
North Pickering development, statement by Mr. Irvine	201
Accelerated family rental housing, statement by Mr. Irvine	202
North Pickering development, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Lewis	203
Speech by member for St. David, questions of Mr. Irvine and Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis	204
Lemoine Point land purchase, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. R. F. Nixon	206
OMA fee schedule, questions of Mr. Miller: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Roy, Mr. Shulman	207
Spending ceilings in education, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Foulds	208
Health and safety hazards at Elliot Lake, questions of Mr. Miller: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Shulman	210
Ontario Hydro spending, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis	210
Inquiry into dump truck operations, question of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Young	212
Lisgar Collegiate, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. P. Taylor	212
UAW pension proposal, question of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Bounsall	213
Canadian film industry, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Roy, Mr. Cassidy	213
Guelph reformatory, question of Mr. Potter: Mr. Shulman	214
Auto rustproofing, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Deacon	214
Deaths at CIP mill, questions of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Samis	214
Police procedures, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Singer	215
Provincial park fees, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Laughren	215
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Young, Mr. Wardle, Mr. Roy, Mr. Ferrier	216
Recess, 6 o'clock	244



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, March 20, 1975

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 1975

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(continued)

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Good speech.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): He hasn't finished yet.

Mr. Foulds: Oh.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, this reminds me of a social function I attended when I was back home a few weeks ago and some of the people there asked me what went on here at different times. I said, "Well, I think one person spoke for seven hours. And I can assure you there weren't very many people listening for the seven hours he spoke, although it wasn't all at one time."

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): Let that be a lesson to the member tonight.

Mr. Ruston: It would appear that we don't have too many listeners tonight, but I guess that is one of the problems here.

Mr. B. Newman: We have the cream of the crop tonight.

An hon. member: Call in the troops.

Mr. Ruston: I had thought of speaking on that particular item a few weeks ago, but when I got to lining up some of the things I wanted to talk about I thought I would leave it until a later date.

Mr. McIlveen: Take a lesson from it.

Mr. Ruston: Having listened to the Throne Speech, I must say it was very well read, and it was rather nice to have Her Honour attending this year. There is only one thing that disappoints me a little, and that is that I had a number of people tell me they couldn't hear her in the galleries. I'm sure it

wasn't any fault of hers, but I did notice that the microphone was quite a distance from her when she was speaking. It's really too bad, when we had people come so far on that occasion, that they couldn't hear her properly.

I suppose I could be facetious and say there wasn't anything in the speech anyway. But really that isn't what they came for. I think they came to see the ceremony and the Lieutenant Governor reading the speech. With the assistance she has, I think someone should see to it in future that the microphones are set properly so that everyone that comes can hear her speak.

At this particular time, I suppose some people say we're in a world recession. I don't know that we actually are in a world recession. I would think we are probably more in a recession of the United States since we're so close to them. I think that no country, especially one the size of the United States, can expect to lead the world when it has had no one to lead it for probably a year and a half or two years. It is sad indeed when one sees the way their government deteriorated until last August the president had to resign and prior to that the vice-president resigned. All this despite their population of 220 million people and the resources, the vast power and resources and manufacturing capabilities and so forth, that country has.

In fact, on the radio tonight—or on TV news I think—they stated that the Senate had finally passed a bill lowering the income tax by \$30 billion. The president had talked about that last fall but their method of parliamentary procedure is so much different from ours that they still haven't got anything done over there to try to stop the recession. I don't know whether lowering taxes always stops it; it certainly does help to some extent and it is only one of the things they are trying now.

Looking at our own parliamentary system I suppose we are much more favoured here in that the government carries on; and if the Prime Minister doesn't have the backing of the majority of the members of parliament, of course, he has to resign or call an election. In the United States, in the case of the president resigning, there was no necessity for an election because their system gives the ap-

pointment to the president. It so happened in this case that the president resigning was appointing the new president.

I don't know—as much as I have a certain amount of respect for the new president he seems to be tarnished by the old president, and I am not sure that really is a good system to have, either. I would think they would be much better off if they had a system whereby when the president resigns they must call an election to elect a new one—an election by the people instead of by appointment, especially when the retiring president or the one that has to retire appoints the new one.

I suppose this reflects in the automobile industry since it is a main part of our industry in Ontario, the whole southern part pretty well. From Oshawa through St. Catharines, Stratford, Windsor and all the way through, the automobile industry is more or less tied into all that area.

We have, of course, felt the recession in the Windsor area as well as in Oshawa and other areas where the automobile industry is located because of the reduction in the sales of cars in the United States over the past six months.

If one looks at the sales of cars in the United States, 1973 was their banner year when they sold about 11.5 million cars and in Canada we sold about 1.2 million. I give these figures as being as accurate as I can get with the statistics I have been given. It certainly points out that when you begin reading the different statistics you can use statistics in different ways, in all ways and to your own advantage. I will say that all the statistics I got didn't give me exactly the same figures as I am quoting, so I tried to pick a ballpark figure in between all the ones I got. I think I am within five per cent of the ratio. I suppose I am as close—or closer—as a Gallup poll is when it comes to predicting elections.

At the time the auto pact was brought in it was supposed to be, and probably still is, serving the purpose of giving Canada a fair share of the total production of cars sold in the United States and Canada and giving us the total production more or less for our use.

There have been some problems in that, and in the last few months it has shown up more when there has been vast unemployment in the United States. In fact in the city of Detroit, the core part of the city of Detroit I think has about 40 per cent unemployment. In the State of Michigan, I think it is about 19 or 20 per cent. The unemploy-

ment situation is very high there with the automobile industry.

There is pressure, of course, on the United States companies from many people in the United States, not from just the people laid off but from people affected in all ways. They are wondering whether, in effect, we are producing cars in Canada and sending them to the United States. Well we are, there's no doubt about that; but we certainly import a great many too. In fact I think there are two lines of cars at the Chrysler plant that are selling so well thank goodness we are making them in Canada. It's about the only place they are being made. The Chrysler Cordoba and the Dodge Charger are selling well, although again the price is not cheap by any means, but they are the type of car that people seem to want to buy. They are selling well, so it's keeping some of the plants going, especially the Chrysler plant, which is the company that suffered the most in our area.

I don't know whether the management of Chrysler is quite as well controlled and so forth as the other two big ones and the fourth smaller one, because Chrysler seems to fluctuate more in sales than some of the other companies. They seem to go on mass layoffs and house cleanings, in all departments, white collar and all. I don't know, maybe they need a Ford or somebody from General Motors to show them how to run some of their departments.

Anyway, they employ a lot of people in Windsor and we certainly do need their operations. They are the largest employer of people in Windsor, they employ about 11,000.

I think sales in 1974 in the United States were down, from what I can gather, to about seven million units; and in Canada they were about 1.1 million. That's estimated for the full year in Canada. So the sales in Canada in 1974 are almost the same as in 1973, but as members will notice there were about four million cars less sold in the United States.

Really, in effect, the fact we are tied into the export of cars to the United States really had most to do with our unemployment in the automobile industry. If you live around the Windsor area, you will notice the big car transports lined up day in and day out going over the Ambassador Bridge hauling the cars over to points in the United States.

We can look back, I suppose, and wonder what caused this. Really, the main reason would be the gas and oil embargoes last winter and the increase in price of crude

from the Arab countries. That would be the main cause; plus, as I mentioned, the general conditions of the political system and the political situation in the United States. This would probably balance with the main cause as well.

Also, pollution equipment was the "in" thing about six or seven years ago, and heaven help us we know they needed it in some areas more than others. I've never been in Los Angeles, but I have a brother who lives there. He told me about eight or 10 years ago that in the smog and so forth, with the vast expressways, it was pretty heavily polluted. I guess it was necessary that the car industry change its systems to clear up the air, since cars were one of the causes of pollution.

I think we may have jumped on the bandwagon kind of fast. It is interesting to note that when we have engineers who build something and then somebody else comes in and tells them they've done this wrong or they've done that wrong, that the one who tells them they have to do something different is not necessarily the one who has to do it. He isn't necessarily the one who has to take it back to the drawing board, put it to new tests and find out what can be done with it.

If you look at gas mileage in cars over the past number of years it would appear that 1973 was the worst year we've had. In 1974 it might have been a little better, but not too much. With the 1975 models, many people are stating they are getting the same mileage they were getting on their 1972 models or those of previous years. After working on the engines with the extra emission control equipment on them, the automobile companies apparently figured out a way to get the gas mileage up some. Many of the models are still pretty high in fuel consumption and it means a lot of improvements are still necessary.

I was reading an article in one of the papers the other day about the catalytic converter that has been used on a number of cars and which is supposed to be quite an improvement. It is datelined Washington and says:

Sulphuric acid emissions of automotive catalytic converters pose a very real health hazard, administrator Russell Train of the Environmental Protection Agency said Thursday. Train told a congressional subcommittee that the catalytic converter controls three automotive pollutants, carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides. But he said the dangers from the

sulphuric acid could outweigh the benefits of the converters in two to four years as more cars using the devices are produced.

Train made the comment before the House health and environmental subcommittee which is holding six days of hearings into the Clean Air Act. Last week the EPA recommended a freeze on automotive standards because of data indicating the danger of sulphuric acid emission from automobiles using the catalytic converters. Train said that health scientists from both the EPA and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare agree that the sulphate emissions create a very real health problem.

I suppose that's hindsight. On the other hand, I don't think that when any engineer produces something he can have someone else tell him he has to do this or he has to do that, until he has time to take it back and come up with improvements.

Another thing would be the increase in price of the cars, which no doubt had a bearing in the last two years. In the wage settlement that the automotive workers made with the Big Four a year ago last fall—that would be October, 1973—their wage increase was really only about three per cent. There were many of the workers who said that that was a terrible increase. I know many of the people who work there—some of our own family—and they said they were getting a very low increase. There was one consolation in there. It was that they did pick up COLA, which is a cost of living allowance. This is the only thing that saved the auto workers over the last year or two with inflation and the increased cost of living.

Just to give you an idea of what it does mean, Mr. Speaker, I have an article here from the Windsor Star, in which it says:

Chrysler Canada Ltd. hourly workers and their families can enjoy one of the few rewards of inflation this week. Ray Lebert, acting financial secretary of the UAW local 444, said more than 9,000 union members will be picking up hefty cost of living allowance [that's COLA] cheques when they complete their shifts tonight and Friday.

Mr. Lebert said the COLA cheques covering the period from Dec. 2 to March 3, are worth at least \$260 gross if a man worked regular shifts for the 13 weeks. Some cheques are worth as much as \$350 gross depending on the amount of overtime and weekend shifts.

Local 444 members who have been on layoffs will receive COLA cheques based

on time worked between Dec. 2 and March 3. The COLA payments are based on the increase in the consumer price index and the COLA cheques have been rising steadily with the increasing cost of living. The June cheques are expected to be worth at least \$360 gross for a worker.

This of course is helping. It is not actually tied into their salary. It is a separate cheque that comes out every three months and that certainly is a great improvement to the worker.

General Motors and other auto companies say that their costs are going up each month. I suppose we can understand that because that's one of the places where it's going. Mr. Speaker, if you look over the price of cars compared to what they were a number of years ago the price of cars really isn't that bad if you take the industrial wage scale into effect.

In the industrial wage scale of 1952 the weekly wage was \$69 or \$3,590 yearly. At that time a 1952 Ford four-door V-8 sold for \$2,400. That was a standard size car with a 112 in. wheelbase. That was two-thirds of the yearly wage in 1952.

In 1964, the weekly industrial wage was \$130 or \$6,700 yearly, and in that year a 1964 Pontiac four-door automatic with radio and a V-8 motor was \$3,300, so that took half of a person's yearly wage in 1964.

In 1974 the weekly wage was \$229—that seems a little high for general work in the auto industry, but anyway this is what we get from statistics—and the yearly wage was \$11,900. A 1975 Dodge Monaco, a fullsize car, 122-in. wheelbase, equipped, is \$4,363. That is 40 per cent of the yearly wage. Actually it was two-thirds in 1952, 50 per cent of the annual wage in 1964 and in 1974 it's 40 per cent.

I'm quoting the prices of cars that I happen to know in the years I mentioned previously, having purchased them in those years, but the price on the Dodge Monaco was given to me by a large Chrysler dealer. The key thing in some of the prices of cars, though, was that the smaller cars generally cost almost more than the medium-sized car. If they are not more, they are just as much as a medium-sized car, maybe not quite as well decked out. A Dodge Dart four-door—it's not a big car—with 111-in. wheelbase and steel belted tires is now \$4,300. The 1952 Ford had the same wheelbase as that particular car had, so they are actually making a car the same

size as in 1952 but of course it's \$1,900 more—it's double. The Chrysler large cars are \$4,800, but I would think that people who are working are as capable of buying a car now as they were 10 or 20 years ago.

Probably the key thing is that the cost of other items has gone up, and this is what has taken incomes up to what they are now. I would suppose that if we look back a quart of milk was probably about 15 cents in 1952 and now it's 50 to 55 cents, so it's gone up much higher. However, at the time the farmer was selling it then at 15 cents he wasn't making any profit. At the price of milk today I think dairy farmers are getting more or less a fair return for their investment and their work.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the so-called gas shortage last year I'm not sure that it was a genuine shortage. I think maybe there were areas where it was made up and maybe poor management too. I think the distribution of gas at that time—I am speaking of oil and gas—and they distributed it on the basis of sales of the previous year or two. In many areas where there was a larger population and so forth, they ran short and yet other areas might have had a surplus. So we are not sure what that problem was.

Of course, one common thing that we read in different places is that the Arab countries say, "Well, you put your exports up in price so much that we had no alternative; we used to buy a bushel of wheat for \$1.50 and now we pay \$4.50 or \$5, so we put oil up \$10." I don't think they needed to go quite that high. I think they are ripping us off, but I think that what we have to do is sit down and figure out why we can't produce a car that is much more economical on gas and I think it can be done.

If we look at some of the engines that have been built in the last few years and the economy that they gave in the late 1960s and the early 1970s—a 250 cu. in. six-cylinder motor for a standard-size car weighing around 3,000 to 4,500 lb, at 60 miles an hour would probably give about 25 miles to the gallon and maybe even a little better; a 318 cu. in. V-8, which is a popular motor, or the 283 or 289, were probably as economical a motor as you can get on gas.

I really think that those engines are powerful enough. They have the cubic displacement to power any car of 3,000 or 3,500 lb and with a little ingenuity and research into these motors that I'm thinking of, I think the automobile industry can certainly take these

back and improve them even with the facilities they have today.

I think there was an announcement made on TV news tonight about some new process to be put in motors to make them easier on gas. I think the stock exchange in the US had to take the stock off the market because of the rush.

I think the key thing needed in the automobile industry is concentration on building a motor that can be brought up to about 30 miles per gallon in a medium-sized car. I am sure people would be willing to buy it, and certainly it would improve the economy a great deal.

Mr. Speaker, I had a number of articles I wanted to speak on. I didn't intend to go quite as long on this item but I think it's very important this time since so many of the people in Ontario depend on the automobile industry for a living. We think of just the big plants where there are 10,000 people employed and they're rolling cars off the assembly line at a rate of 1,100 a day, I think, in the Chrysler plant in Windsor, and General Motors in Oshawa is probably similar, along with Ford in Oakville and St. Thomas. But there are a great many more people involved.

In the tire industry, the rubber companies are finding right now that their main sales of tires are going into the farm machinery business because the farm machinery business has picked up in the last couple of years and there is a shortage in that business now. So the rubber industry is putting a lot of its stress and priorities on tires for farm machinery because of the automobile industry having slowed down somewhat.

We might just run into a couple of items with regard to agriculture, Mr. Speaker. When one looks back over the last few years—and I was looking over some of the remarks made in the Legislature from 1968 and 1969, and especially 1969, 1970 and 1971—farmers were leaving the farms pretty rapidly because prices were so low that they just couldn't make a living on them or earn anything worthwhile. They were trying to sell corn for \$1.05 a bushel and the cost of producing it then was about \$1.20.

I suppose the members wonder how anybody can sell something for less than it costs to produce. The farmer is about the only one who can do that, because he may have bought a tractor a couple of years before and he lives on depreciation a lot of the time. I see one of the farm members looking up when I mention that. I think he's quite aware of how that works.

Mr. J. Riddell (Huron): Are there some farmers over there?

Mr. Ruston: Yes, I think there are some over there, in fact.

Of course, another thing that might be affecting some of the business in western Ontario, and I think of the soya bean industry—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): The member means southwestern Ontario.

Mr. Ruston: Yes, southwestern Ontario. Pardon me. The soya bean market has been fluctuating in the last number of years. I can recall back in 1972 and 1973 when the price of beans went up to such an enormous height that most of the money was made in the futures market and not made at that time by the farmers who grew the beans. I think the average price for beans to farmers in that year was \$3.90, and it went up as high as \$11.50, I think, in the spring or summer, so it was in the futures market that all the money was made.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Four ninety-five.

Mr. Ruston: The member for Waterloo North just informed me that the price of soya beans was \$4.95. I can recall last fall—

Mr. Good: Didn't make much this year.

Mr. Ruston:—when I was home for a day or two—the House wasn't in session—and I went over to give my brother a hand to combine beans. I took some beans up to the elevator for him on the wagon, and I said when I left home: "Do you want me to sell them?" And he says: "Oh, I don't know. Maybe you should store them. I don't know; whatever you think."

So when I drove up I said: "How much are beans?"

The fellow said: "They are \$8.40. Are you going to sell them or store them?"

I said: "Oh, I guess you had better sell them."

Well, they did go up later on to \$8.99, but a lot of people stored them—for two reasons, of course. The price was good; there is no doubt about that. But when you sold the previous year's beans, already you had your 1973 crop and held on to them until 1974, and then when you take off the 1974 crop, it is not very good. You are not sure what you are going to get in 1975, so you like to hold them over and sell them in 1975 in case your other crops are no good, or you don't have a crop to keep the income tax down.

I guess all those who kept the beans that were \$8.99 that day—if everybody had sold them that day, I guess they could have paid all their income tax and been farther ahead. But, of course, that is something you don't know in the market. Maybe the member for High Park has some secrets on that, since he has been in the futures market. But it's a gamble. There is no doubt about that when you are wondering about world prices.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): The member's leader thinks it is a sure thing.

Mr. Ruston: The futures market?

Mr. Shulman: That's what he accused me of.

Mr. Ruston: I think my leader feels the same as I do. I think we should handle our soya beans the same as our wheat. The ownership of them should remain with us until they are in the processor's hands and he has bought and paid for them. I think we should keep them until then, and I am in favour of that. That's marketing right from the soil, right to where they are used, and that's the way I would like to see them. However, we don't have it that way yet, and maybe we will.

Mr. Stokes: Who supervises the futures market? Is that federal or provincial?

Mr. Shulman: It's provincial, but nobody supervises it at the moment.

Mr. Ruston: Now, Mr. Speaker, in regard to farm land, there have been discussions as to planning and how we should save our soil for future crop production. Many are aware of the amount going out of production at the present time. I spoke about this three or four years ago. I said at that time, when prices were so low, that if we wanted to keep farm land in agricultural production, all we had to do was to pay the people to produce. I said if the people who were producing got a profit, they wouldn't be taking the land out of production.

Now, I think that is still the case. There are many more farmers coming back on to the land. Many young people are making applications for farm credit loans. I think there is a new bill in Ottawa now introduced by the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Whelan, increasing the amount that a young farmer can borrow to get started in farming.

There are now a number of new people starting into farming, but it is still a pretty unsettled situation. Look at what has happened to the grain market in the last few

months. China, Russia and some other countries had ordered a lot of grain from the United States, but since then they have not taken delivery of it, for some unknown reason. We are not sure why, but a number of those orders have been cancelled.

Mr. Shulman: A bumper crop.

Mr. Ruston: Yes, a bumper crop; but there is also one other thing. The president of the United States said he wanted grain down in price. He wanted the cost of living down. I have a feeling that he said to people in some of those foreign countries: "We want you to cut down your purchases of grain so we can have a surplus in the United States to put the price down." I think that would be much closer to what has happened on that particular item.

Mr. Shulman: Does the member mean the Russians are helping him out to control inflation?

Mr. Ruston: Well, the Russians took us down the drain there a few years ago when they came over and bought all that wheat and grain from the United States. They bought 25 per cent of the total production in one day from six different jobbers, and they offered to sell it back to us a year later at \$3 a bushel more than they paid for it. You never know what goes on in the inner sanctums of government, Mr. Speaker. I just don't think that I would trust them that much, having known what goes on over there in the last few years.

Mr. Shulman: Are the Russians helping the USA?

Mr. Ruston: Now, of course, there are two problems. When you have high grain prices, of course, the beef farmers have their problems. Right now, beef is about 40 cents or 41 cents for top-grade live beef, which is really low, compared with the cost of producing it.

The other day I asked a farmer, "What's going to happen to soya bean prices? They're down to about \$5." He said, "Well, I think they'll go back up." But that isn't really what I'm worried about. What I'm worried about is all the money I'm losing on the 150 beef cattle I'm feeding out there. I don't know what I'm going to do with them. I can't just kick them out. I've got to feed them, fatten them up in some way and hope that the price will go up." Therefore, if anybody has an empty freezer, I don't think they'll ever buy meat any cheaper than they can today. The one who is suffering, however, is the man who produces the beef.

A new stabilization Act is being presented in Ottawa, and in the Throne Speech here there was a slight mention of a guarantee for farmers. I don't know whether that will come about, but we certainly need something. Probably it should be combined with the federal plan, but at least it should be a provincial plan because a couple of other provinces already have provincial plans. I think we certainly should have one here, since more than one-third of the population of Canada is in this province.

Mr. Speaker, in looking over the motion by my leader for amendment of the Throne Speech motion, I was interested in all of the points it contained, but the one in particular that interested me is the one that reads: "The absence of action to improve general labour-management negotiation procedures, which have been so detrimental to our economy."

Mr. Speaker, this matter has been mentioned before by different people in the House. I know the hon. member for Sarnia has mentioned a number of times that we should have a select committee of the Legislature or someone to really study our whole approach to labour relations and labour-management negotiations. We are in a bad situation, not only in government bargaining, as we have seen lately with the federal employees and the provincial employees, but also in industry. I think we are going to have to take a new look at our problems with labour relations, especially when one considers the strikes that result.

I noticed in the newspaper the other day that grain shipments from British Columbia have been cancelled because of a dockworkers' strike in one area and because some government inspectors are on strike.

Japan has been sending urgent Telex messages to the Wheat Board in Winnipeg [this newspaper said], and the tone of the language this time suggests that country's patience with Canada is just about ended. Grain trade sources in Vancouver reveal that Japan has told the Wheat Board in so many words that unless the grain begins moving again quickly, and there is some guarantee of a continual flow in the future, they will have to look elsewhere for supplies.

Thank goodness, both those strikes have now been settled, and we can get back to shipping. But this kind of situation reflects on the farmers in western Canada who depend on shipping their wheat out.

With regard to the labour situation, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to quote a few remarks made by Mr. Robert L. Houston, president of

the Japan Trade Council. I'll just quote a small part of his remarks:

One of the most frequent causes of disruption in our distribution system lies in the area of labour-management disagreement. In my opinion, this is due to an archaic concept of labour-management relations which has become entrenched in the thinking of government, of labour and of management. This system, involving, as it does, confrontation, is sadly out of tune with the times and with the circumstances prevailing in this country. The adversary system cannot serve when there are no true adversaries.

In the first 10 months of 1974, 8.9 million man-hours were lost. For October, 1973, the figure was 491,140, while in October, 1974, it was 752,800.

For management to regard workers as stupid and stubborn is as inappropriate as for labour to regard all management as heartless and selfish individuals, intent upon exacting as much work as they can for the lowest wage possible. The trade union philosophy is possibly 50 years out of date, and management philosophy has kept pace with it.

As for governments, they appear to have bought both views and have obligingly maintained a context in which they continue to flourish. The vast majority of workers today are educated, perceptive, reasonably affluent, and fully participating members of their own particular community. To picture them as sweaty and oppressed workers exploited by cruel and domineering bosses is ludicrous. It may serve the ends of certain career labour leaders but there is a large body of evidence that it is no longer believed by the workers themselves.

As for the bosses, most management consists of a multiplicity of managers as opposed to owner-managers or proprietors. The old individual entrepreneur of the turn of the century, the buccaneering type, is long gone. Workers today want decent wages, but they also want recognition as individuals with something besides work to contribute on a 9-to-5 basis.

It is no longer possible for one side to score off the other without damaging the economic health of the enterprise which provides increased benefits for both—not to mention the city, the province and the country in which they carry on their work.

I wanted to mention an item or two, Mr. Speaker, with regard to Hydro. We are very

concerned with Hydro installation of new power lines. We have them down in our own area where Hydro was in for the last two or three years trying to buy up properties for new rights-of-way.

Mr. Speaker, we admit no one wants the hydro line, or big cable line, going down in front of his house, but somebody has to have them. On the other hand, I think, Mr. Speaker, when we start thinking about where we are going to put these we should study it a little more thoroughly than we have in the past.

Hydro will have a line going through an area and say, "That's a great place there, so we will just put another one alongside it." In the case of this one in Raleigh township in Tilbury East, they decided they should put a new line through there. They talked to one or two people and put on the pressure, saying, "You know, you've got to sell to us." I guess they sell.

What they are doing is going into a township that has the best of land close to buildings. Some people there have large beef herds. They grow corn for seed, tomatoes and many vegetable crops. They sometimes have to get in there with airplanes for dusting and so forth. Then Hydro comes along and says it wants another right-of-way.

The people in Kent county and Raleigh township and Tilbury East did ask for a hearing of necessity, which is proper under the Expropriations Act. The officer appointed for the hearing of necessity studied it very carefully. He had one or two meetings and then adjourned them, and went back about a month later and heard more evidence on it. His recommendation was that Ontario Hydro had not looked over other possible areas, and did not consider the environment when it was recommending the new line go alongside the other line.

In the meantime, this made the people feel very good. They thought they were not going to have these big lines coming down by their feedlots and so forth. But the ministry felt otherwise and sent the then Minister of Energy (Mr. McKeough) down to inform them that the line was going through on the present route.

Another thing that concerned the people and also the hearing officer was that the order in council set a 600-ft right-of-way but Hydro was telling them that it only wanted 120 ft. I think there is a right way to do these things and there is the other way. I think the right way is that there has to be a real discussion with the people

involved, with alternate plans, and the people involved should realize that Hydro has to have certain power lines and they are necessary, naturally, if they are to get the power into the city of Windsor and the surrounding territory.

Hydro should sit down with these people. I find most of the farmers are very reasonable people. They realize that they can't stop progress and they don't intend to stop progress, because it's a part of their business too. But there were areas there, either along Highway 401 or along the railroad, that already had high tower lines, or down the blind line, the lot line between two concessions, which could have been considered.

In Essex county a lot of them run in that area. In fact, about 2,000 ft from my house there is a large tower line and the farmers there agreed to allow the next one to go through without too much trouble. They got a fair amount of money for their land, maybe not quite enough, but they agreed to let it go through because it wasn't going to interfere with their farming that much. It was in an area that was not close to the buildings and so forth.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that Ontario Hydro certainly has to improve its image when it comes to setting out power corridors or it is going to have an awful lot of people mad at it. They have a good number right now.

I have taken a little longer than I figured, but I don't think the next ones who want to speak are in that big a rush, so, Mr. Speaker, it might be an opportune time to discuss a couple of things on government in general.

One thing that I take objection to is the proposed new housing development in the riding of Essex-Kent. It is located in the township of Raleigh, on a large western Ontario centre formerly called the Cedar Springs Hospital. It has about 200 acres of land around it and that hospital, members may recall, was built for about 1,500 but they had about 1,000 boys and girls in it and they want to cut that number down to about 600.

Anyway, on this 200 acres of land the proposal by this government and the present Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) was that 150 or 175 acres be used for a housing development which would hold about 800 homes. That doesn't sound too bad if it's going to supply housing. The thing that concerns me is that we have many towns and villages in the area, not more than six or seven miles away, that are now putting in sewage sys-

tems, sewage treatment plants, sewage lagoons, and improving their water systems. They have to do this with the present population.

I say what they should be doing is expanding those towns and villages and allowing for the new homes to be put in there. We can add this many homes in three or four towns within seven, eight or 10 miles, without any disruption of the farmland, because they are in a general area where there is quite a lot of room for expansion without really disrupting good farmland. I'm sure that the 185 or 200 acres of land next to the former Cedar Springs Hospital is probably of better quality than the land in Filbury, Merlin, Wheatley, Blenheim and areas like that.

I think that to start up a new town with other towns in the area that already have their schools, churches, services, stores, and so forth, is absolutely foolish and we should be concentrating on the areas we have and building them up.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other item that I want to say a word or two on, and I will be quite brief. We get resolutions from some of the municipalities in the area that they are very concerned about the crime rate. Police chiefs and police commissions in these areas are saying that the Bail Reform Act is allowing people out on the street who have been picked up, charged, and released and then commit a crime while they are released without bail. I've read or heard, that someone might be charged as many as three or four times after being released.

This is not bail reform the way I understood when it first came out. I recall at the time reading a couple of articles in which one or two judges had said that it was strictly within their reasonableness as to whether a person would be allowed to be free without bail or with a small bail. It was up to them to decide. If the attorney for the person charged insisted he be released, it was still up to his discretion.

We wouldn't object, I'm sure, on a first offence or on a charge that wasn't too serious. They certainly should be allowed to be let out. But if it is a second or third charge I think it is utterly ridiculous that this should be so. I don't have the clipping with me but I read a couple of articles where judges said it was within their discretionary power to keep them confined. There certainly are quite a few people very concerned about that.

Another thing they are concerned about is

the type of sentencing that our county judges and provincial judges are giving. I recall a letter the other day that was sent to the present Attorney General (Mr. Clement) about this from one of our municipalities. He said he couldn't interfere with the judges, and he's right. As long as the laws are there, it is up to the judge to interpret them.

The thing that we noticed and some of these people noticed is that the judges in many cases give the very minimum sentence. I recall sitting on the select committee when we were writing our report. Some of us had said that should be a \$25 minimum fine and a maximum of \$300. Somebody else said that maybe it should be a minimum of \$50 and a maximum of \$500; I said, "I guess it is up to the discretion of the judge." From what I can gather in most cases the minimum is used instead of the maximum.

In making new laws we are going to have to look at what the offence is. The legislators are going to have to look at the offence and decide then whether the minimum should be so low and whether we should make it much higher than we have in writing the laws. That would ease the problem for the judges. They would then know what our intentions were at that time.

I suppose everyone here in the House wouldn't agree with me on this, but I think that the appointment of judges provincially and federally is something to be desired. I've thought this for a number of years before I ever got into politics, and maybe it was because I was so close to the United States.

A number of years ago, in conversation with somebody, I said I wasn't sure which system was the worst, ours or the one in the United States. In Canada over half the judges are defeated candidates for the two parties, and probably would be for the third party if it ever wins—and in some provinces they must be appointing theirs. In the United States they are elected. I'm not sure which is the worst system.

At one time, years ago, they'd elect a hanging judge in some areas. If the judge would hang people, then they'd say, "We'll elect the hanging judge." In other areas they would elect a judge who was easy on people. Maybe right now with the mood of the people in some areas, if it was an election, I'm afraid they'd be electing a hanging judge. I don't think that's the answer.

I think the matter of the appointment of judges certainly should be given a new look

at, completely. I think they should be appointed according to their ability to interpret laws. Who can decide on that I don't know but I would imagine that there are groups of people who could certainly come up with recommendations instead of the present system, I think that is all I have now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Durham.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity of joining with my colleagues in this debate on the Speech from the Throne. In extending congratulations to all those who obtained new offices of responsibility I want, in particular, to extend personal congratulations to you, sir, because you and I have shared over the years a great deal in common being representatives for the two sister counties, the united counties of Northumberland and Durham. We have ridden the rods together for a number of years on a day and night basis and in assuming the duties and responsibility of Speaker, you have not only brought honour to yourself but honour to the great and historic county of Northumberland of which I am now a resident.

Mr. Stokes: Is this one of the member's swan songs?

Mr. Carruthers: It could be my last speech so the member had better listen.

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): He might learn something.

Mr. Carruthers: Mr. Speaker, your skill in administering the office and the affairs of the Legislature have been justifiably recognized by your colleagues in the Legislature and I join with them in extending very sincere congratulations.

Indeed, sir, you are rather fortunate in your position in the Ontario Legislature in comparison with the office of the Speaker in some of the other jurisdictions. I had the pleasure of having lunch with the representatives from Ottawa who are touring the globe and studying the operation of the various parliaments throughout the world. They were speaking about the parliament in Canberra, Australia, and there I understand the Speaker's responsibilities aren't really to the Legislature—his responsibilities are to the party in power.

Mr. Shulman: One might get the same impression here.

Mr. Carruthers: No, one doesn't get that impression.

Mr. Shulman: Only when they count the votes.

Mr. Carruthers: One outstanding feature of this present Speaker is that he is very fair.

Mr. Shulman: He can't count.

Mr. Carruthers: He's very fair.

Mr. Shulman: He can't count. He never counts right.

Mr. Carruthers: He's unbiased.

Mr. Shulman: Next time we call a vote, let's see how he counts it.

Mr. Carruthers: If there is any partiality shown it is to that side of the House because it's very difficult to get his eye on this side.

Mr. Shulman: We have not noticed that.

Mr. Carruthers: In the Canberra parliament, as I said, the Speaker's allegiance is to the party. They said while they were there the Speaker took the liberty of bringing one of the members of the cabinet to order and the Prime Minister of the day—it is a labour government by the way, too; a group of socialists—said, "You goofed it. You goofed it. You've had it."

Mr. Shulman: Here they take them in a back room.

Mr. Carruthers: And I expect the next day he was out of a job.

Mr. Shulman: Here they call him out. The last independent Speaker got fired by a prime minister. His name was Bill Stewart; not the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Carruthers: Mr. Speaker, 1974 has been a very eventful year in the riding of Durham and one cannot help regretting that in the redistribution proposal it now appears that the riding of Durham will be fragmented. My own township of Hope and the town of Port Hope go to your riding of Northumberland, sir. The township of Cavan goes to the riding of my hon. friend from Peterborough; the township of Manvers goes to my hon. friend from Victoria; and the township of Cartwright goes to the new riding of North Durham. This leaves the riding with the town of Bowmanville and the village of Newcastle, the township of

Clarke and the former township of Darling which now form the town of Newcastle. In addition, the riding of East Durham has now added 34,000 people out of the city of Oshawa, which makes it rather an urban riding.

I do say this, Mr. Speaker, that those members from Cavan, Peterborough, Victoria, and North Durham are receiving a very fine part of Ontario as an addition to their ridings. They are receiving a very fine and a very loyal group of people; very fine people.

There have been problems, Mr. Speaker, and I wish to bring them to the attention—in fact I have already brought them to the attention of the minister—within the new town of Newcastle. There has been confusion and I have had some representation from that community.

Mr. Stokes: Which of those riding is going to get the dump?

Mr. Carruthers: I will get around to that in a few minutes. I thought the member would want to hear about that.

Mr. Shulman: They are going to divide it equally and put it in each of them.

Mr. Carruthers: In the town of Newcastle there is a bit of a problem in the fact that we have the town of Bowmanville inside the town of Newcastle. When people come out from Toronto and see that sign reading: "Town of Newcastle, 24,000"—up near Ajax someplace—they look for the main street in Newcastle.

There is a difficulty. I would recommend that area be given a different designation, be it a borough or a district. As far as I am concerned I would favour the area municipality of Newcastle. I have been assured they are going to give this consideration and I have asked the municipal council of the town of Newcastle to give it some thought. I have suggested a number of designations to them and I trust they will be passing a resolution to that effect.

At the present time, development and restructuring studies are taking place in the county of Northumberland. I am sure in the days and months ahead that study will result in the establishment of a restructured form of regional government in the county of Northumberland.

Mr. Stokes: That Garden Hill is a fine place.

Mr. Carruthers: It is indeed.

Mr. Stokes: Lovely walnut trees there.

Mr. Carruthers: I said I would bring the member some of those walnuts. I shouldn't mention this but—

Mr. Stokes: That is another broken promise.

Mr. Carruthers: No it isn't. The fact remains that for once, for the first time that I can recall, and some of those walnut trees are very old, the walnuts were inedible this year. That's a little sidelight.

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): Sounds a little squirrely.

Mr. Shulman: Things are turning bad for the Tories everywhere.

Mr. Carruthers: Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to regional government, because this has been one of the issues in the riding of Durham. It's not easy to create a new government. It takes leadership, and thank goodness we have leadership on this side of the House.

We all tend to resist change, and in the establishment of the regional municipality of Durham and the restructuring of the new county of Northumberland, this resistance to change has been the basis for concern on the part of both the elected representatives and the taxpayers.

We live in a pluralistic society, Mr. Speaker, where many people have different views and different ideas and different values. There are not just two sides to many of the issues confronting us today, there are a dozen sides. In the process of resolving them, no politician can afford to be behind the people nor can he be too far in front.

Effective and relevant local government is a key indicator to the health of any society. It is essential that action be taken to assure it is equipped do to the tasks which must be done; that's the secret and that's the whole concept of regional government.

In order to accomplish this, local autonomy must be maintained by centralizing, to the greatest degree possible, power and authority, supported by increased unconditional grants, within the orbit of the strengthened local government. We have heard quite a bit in the last few days about local autonomy, and I am going to come to that in a few minutes. It is perhaps appropriate to review some of the basic reasons for local government reform, because we have many counties now in the

process of restructuring. These reasons can be defined.

There is the reduction through amalgamation of municipalities with limited resources. And one of the problems facing municipalities today is the limited resources they have to provide the services required by their people. The number of municipalities has decreased from 964 in 1968 to 838 in 1974.

Now, Mr. Speaker, through amalgamation, we avoid the annexation battles which have prevailed in the past and under which assessment resources of one municipality were sacrificed to the benefit of a neighbouring municipality. This has been prevalent throughout the province and it has been a live issue in the area which I have been privileged to serve. You eliminate the destructive and inefficient competition between municipalities for industrial and commercial assessment, and this is a very important point when we consider regional government.

The pooling of municipal resources under a regional form of government provides a strong economic base for the construction of sewer, water and major road projects. In other words, it restores to a major degree, Mr. Speaker, the local autonomy of the area. Otherwise, without that good economic base, it cannot carry on and provide the services required without depending upon some senior form of government.

It enables the establishment of a co-ordinated transit system, not only within the restructured municipality itself or the region, but also in co-operation with other restructured communities. This is the key to the concept of regional government as it relates to Metropolitan Toronto.

The setting up of the inter-regional transit commission is one of the major steps and decisions made by this government. Again, I say it shows real leadership against considerable opposition.

Although I regret that up to this point it hasn't participated, I am very sure that within a short period of time the new region of Durham will be involved in that inter-regional transit programme, because it all goes back to the MTARTS report and the Toronto-centred region. The key to the whole thing is transportation and communication throughout that horseshoe region around Metro Toronto. We have done a great deal through regional government to control growth and at the same time provide for the people an excellent transit service.

Regional government relieves the pressures of burgeoning urbanization. It deals with

problems arising therefrom, including pollution control, land use planning and waste disposal. And this is very important. You know and I know, Mr. Speaker, that no municipality can plan unto itself. There must be planning over a large region.

This is the difficulty we have experienced in our area, where one municipality will plan for a housing development just across the border and the neighbouring municipality plans for something else. And if the senior government tries to, shall I say interfere or advise, then they are always accused of using the big stick. You hear the cry for local autonomy, and rightly so.

Again, I repeat that the objective of regional government is, through good leadership, to restore local autonomy to the municipalities of this province. It provides a permanent staff to deal with problems, such as planning, which require a continuity of experience. I think this is very important, Mr. Speaker, very important.

In municipalities which I have represented over the years, we have had to hire consultants after consultants. One municipality hires this group of consultants; somebody hires another group of consultants.

In the new regional municipality of Durham, we now have a permanent planning branch which will provide good planning on a continual basis in the years ahead. Debate and concern with respect to local government will continue and should continue, but the fact that 150 to 160 municipalities in Ontario over the past year or two have been placed under ministerial orders is not only a blunt comment on the capacity of small communities to deal with their problems, but it is also, Mr. Speaker, an indication of the urgency for municipal reform, particularly in those rapidly developing areas of the province.

I become very concerned when I hear the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon) decrying the steps taken by this government to promote and develop regional government in this province. It's a sad reflection on their part.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): The member must try to control himself.

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Right on.

Mr. G. Nixon: He doesn't know what he's for.

Mr. Bullbrook: If he is going to be provocative we might have to interject, and we wouldn't want to do that.

Mr. Morningstar: Give them some more fire. Let's go.

Mr. Carruthers: Another issue that has received considerable attention—and this is what the hon. member for Thunder Bay referred to—has been the proposed CPR waste disposal site in my township of Hope, designed to accommodate, in particular, Metropolitan Toronto's waste. This has been one of those emotional issues, Mr. Speaker. It has created a great deal of controversy, and I would like to place on the record some of the background of that proposal.

Public opposition to the proposal has been ably presented by the local groups, and particularly by the local press. The local council of the township of Hope has also opposed the project. While an environmental hearing board has reported favourably, but on a conditional basis, it is perhaps in order that we do put this report on the record.

The Ministry of the Environment has, in addition to studying the report of the Environmental Hearing Board, made a very deep and extensive study of the site itself to see if it is environmentally adaptable for a waste disposal facility.

Mr. Morningstar: Right on.

Mr. Carruthers: It should be noted that the site, if approved environmentally—and that is the responsibility of the Ministry of the Environment; I regret that in many instances they are trying to put the responsibility on the minister to turn that project down.

Mr. Morningstar: Shame.

Mr. Carruthers: The only responsibility he actually has is to decide whether that site is environmentally suitable or whether it is not. If it is decided that it is not environmentally sound then that's the end of it. But if the research and the investigation prove that site is environmentally sound, then he and his assistants, or his staff, can be taken into court to prove it if the CPR wants to take that action.

In the final analysis, that area of the site will require rezoning if approved environmentally, and there it comes back to the responsibility of the local municipality. No doubt if that is the case there will be a hearing before the Ontario Municipal Board.

I think I should place on record what the proposal was, so that members have an idea of what the background of the proposal really is.

We are inclined to oppose everything these days, but I am of that school that likes to

take a real good look before I say no. I want to look at both sides of the situation very carefully. I want to look at all the factors that may affect it in the future.

Mr. G. Nixon: Right on; that's the way to do it.

Mr. Carruthers: I want to put on record what the proposal of the CPR was. They proposed to dispose at the site all delivered domestic waste generated in the township itself without any charge to the municipality for the lifetime of the landfill. In other words, they were prepared to provide free use of that landfill site for the township of Hope. The area comprising the sanitary landfill, which had been used for the disposal of waste, will be turned over to the township when completed, subject, of course, to the Environmental Protection Act. This will include the resodded area and the wooded screens around these areas.

I have toured the area and I have to be honest, I have to be frank. The area has many large stones as large as many of the desks in this room. It has never been agricultural land; it is wooded with some beautiful gorges which must be protected. An Environmental Hearing Board, as I said before, made its decision conditional that all that protection would be provided. It is all very clearly outlined. After it is completed it will be turned back to the municipality as a park site with full protection of the natural features. CPR agreed to negotiate with Hope township in good faith for the payment of a royalty on each ton. They were prepared to pay so much a ton for the waste material which would be disposed of in the sanitary landfill site; or, in lieu of that royalty, they would make a payment of money to be used for the benefit of the citizens of Hope township. Now that wasn't bribery, I don't think.

We all realize—as I said before I like to look on all sides of this—and I realize the city of Metropolitan Toronto has a problem. If members read this morning's financial page of the Globe and Mail they will have noted there that recycling the waste—for example paper—is almost a lost cause until they develop some new techniques.

With the hon. member for Dovercourt and others we visited Continental Can; we visited Dofasco; we visited a number of industries which are doing a major amount of recycling. They all stated the same problem: the problem is in the collection and the separation of the materials. That can only be done,

Mr. Speaker, by having a large amount of the waste available so it can be separated with the equipment. We can't have expensive equipment here and expensive equipment there, all over the place; it must be employed on a full-time basis.

Mr. Stokes: Where does the member suggest it be?

Mr. Carruthers: We have set up six places in the province, and we have one here—just wait until I finish. The company was prepared to discuss and negotiate commercial arrangements with other municipalities in the region—

Mr. Stokes: That could be a whole new industry for Hope township.

Mr. Carruthers: —for the use of the site for the disposal of the waste. Practically every municipality in the area is having a problem with waste disposal and I think this is general throughout the province. At the present time a study is underway in the county of Northumberland, which now includes the town of Port Hope and the township of Hope, to develop a facility for waste disposal for the municipalities in the area. The province is financing that to a major degree.

It is difficult. I have to be very frank and very honest. It is easy to discuss these things; it is easy to plan and say we must do something about it, but when it comes down to the final analysis and a decision has to be made, it is very difficult for a number of municipalities—say 14 municipalities—to decide which municipality is going to have that waste disposal site.

Mr. Stokes: It is like the weather. Everybody talks about it and nobody does anything about it.

Mr. Carruthers: That's right; everybody wants it over there. Let's be honest about these things and let's be very frank. That is a problem and I am going to be very interested to see, after many thousands of dollars have been spent, who is going to make the decision. I hope the decision will be made at the local level; I hope that local autonomy will prevail and I hope the local municipal councils, their reeves and deputy reeves and councillors will make that decision in the true democratic style.

Mr. Morningstar: Right on.

Mr. Carruthers: The company was prepared to make available land and other assistance at the Hope township site to further research

the programme, and this is the point the member for Thunder Bay raised. They were prepared to put in a research station there and a recycling plant. They were also prepared to participate in the development of a recycling plant at the site with the government, and that could be another site. They were prepared to do further research in the programme on solid waste separation and recycling which is being undertaken by the province. Then the company stated they were aware of the great necessity for control of pollution and they were interested in operating an excellent landfill site and the opportunity to participate in the control of the environment and practical recycling schemes.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that many people in my area wouldn't agree with them. I have to be honest and I have to be frank. I have visited that site. I have walked over the whole area. I see the advantages it offers. I can sympathize with the people who don't want waste from another source, particularly a large area like Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Stokes: I thought there were too many big boulders there.

Mr. Carruthers: There are big boulders too, very large boulders. The area has never been farmed.

So what do we do? We have Metropolitan Toronto with a very great problem. Due to the immigration policy, which I will mention a little later, some 50,000 or 60,000 new citizens are added to the population of the city every year. Figure that at so many tons of waste per person and they have a growing problem. I think we have to accept some responsibilities and we have to look at these things from every angle.

While realizing Toronto's predicament, I also realize that the rights of the local people must be respected and every assurance must be given that those rights will be protected. I think we have to have some faith. Mr. Speaker, you know and I know when we visit some of the waste disposal sites presently existent in our rural areas they are not very acceptable. I think people judge modern sanitary waste disposal sites by those undesirable and certainly not picturesque waste disposal sites that we see around the country, some of them burning, some of them with rats; I know one that is half full of water. Talking about pollution, I think there would be pollution from it.

Mr. Stokes: Wind him up.

Mr. Carruthers: I didn't get the opportunity to hear the Leader of the Opposition in his Throne debate speech, but I did read his

speech very carefully and I'm going to refer to it in a few minutes. But I was in the Speaker's chair for the speech of the leader of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Stokes: Fine performance.

Mr. Carruthers: I'm going to say I congratulate him on his effective, and I may say very clearly enunciated policy of the New Democratic Party. He enunciated very clearly that it was certainly a policy of socialism, which has brought England to its knees, and down which road we are heading very rapidly.

Mr. Stokes: Is the member saying he is heading down the road to socialism in Ontario?

Mr. Carruthers: No. I congratulate him on his effectiveness and I say this, he clearly drew a sharp line between the policy of his party and the policy of this party. But I have to say honestly that I, together with the people of Ontario, still find it very difficult to determine what the policy of the official opposition really is.

Mr. Shulman: They are against the government.

Mr. Carruthers: May I suggest that the government will do well to heed the leader of the NDP's speech. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the cabinet ministers in their respective roles will be prepared to reply to that speech, because it was effective. I thought it would have got more newspaper copy than it did. No doubt it was a repetition of a great many jewels of the past, but still it was effective. He brought up a number of points which I think called for rebuttal. I hope that the government members do get involved and present the government's side.

Mr. Stokes: Please do.

Mr. Carruthers: We are going to hear a lot about leadership in the days ahead. I can see that, because both the speakers referred many times to leadership. I think this originates with Watergate—destroy the leader. This is the old Communist tactic. It goes back to the very early days of communism when their policy was to destroy the people's faith in their leaders.

Mr. Stokes: That's what Bob Stanfield did in the last election.

Mr. Carruthers: This doesn't apply just to this party or to the Premier of this province (Mr. Davis). It applies to federal people as well. There seems to be a determined effort,

a policy on the part of many groups to destroy leadership in our democratic system.

Mr. Shulman: The leaders are co-operating with that.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Carruthers: They are not. It is a dangerous move in a democratic society.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Carruthers: Mr. Speaker, leadership calls for objectives. A leader must have some objectives. The only objective that I can see that the official opposition has is that it is over there and we're over here and its members want to get over here.

Mr. Stokes: That's dirty. It is called politics. It is a dirty word.

Mr. Carruthers: But they don't tell us how they are going to do it. I think they should tell us how they are going to do it.

Mr. B. Newman: Tell us what was in the Throne Speech.

Mr. G. Nixon: Didn't the member read it?

Mr. Carruthers: Certainly the objective of the New Democratic Party is very obvious. It is to nationalize and to—

Mr. Shulman: When we come to power we are going to socialize all the women.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. B. Newman: Tell us what was in the Throne Speech.

Mr. Carruthers: I'm going to refer to that Throne Speech in a minute.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Carruthers: It is no trick to be captain of the ship when the waters are calm, but I'm telling you, Mr. Speaker, it takes leadership when times are difficult, and we are going through difficult times. I join with my colleagues, and I think the very large proportion of the people of Ontario, in thanking our lucky stars that we have real leadership in the present government of Ontario.

Mr. G. Nixon: Right on.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: We are happy it is there also.

Mr. Carruthers: That leadership goes back over many years. We had Mr. Frost. He was condemned over the northern pipeline. It was going to be a flop or a failure. It has been a success. I sat in this House and listened to the opposition to the Pickering project and the Candu system. Certainly the government stuck its neck out. They took a chance.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): But it worked.

Mr. Carruthers: But it worked. It's the greatest success. People of little faith over there condemned it and said it wouldn't work.

Mr. B. Newman: Tell us about Krauss-Maffei.

Mr. G. Nixon: Give it to 'em.

Mr. Shulman: Let him be careful. He may go off the rails here.

Mr. Carruthers: I'm just coming to Krauss-Maffei.

Mr. G. Nixon: He is on the right track.

Mr. Shulman: Krauss-Maffei wasn't.

Mr. Carruthers: We had the same cry we've heard over the years, that Krauss-Maffei would be a failure, a flop. Krauss-Maffei is not dead. It is not dead.

Mr. Shulman: It may not be dead, but it is well buried. Go over to Exhibition Park.

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): The member for High Park will rue those words.

Mr. Carruthers: Even in England, in the economic condition we find that socialist state today, they are still experimenting with that same type of a system.

Mr. Shulman: They will be experimenting after we are all dead, but it won't go.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is what they said about the airplane.

Mr. Carruthers: One of these days it's going to be a success. That's the same story I've heard over the years from these people. I heard the former leader of the NDP condemning it. It wouldn't work, he thought. Let's have some faith for a change.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Think positively.

Mr. McIlveen: They said the same thing about Candu.

Mr. Carruthers: That's real leadership when the government is prepared to take such a risk. That's just the difference, Mr. Speaker. Maybe I'm taking too long.

Hon. Mr. Snow: They are negative thinkers over there.

Some hon. members: No, no.

Mr. Carruthers: That's the difference between socialism and our free-enterprise system—

Mr. Foulds: Does the member really believe that?

Mr. Shulman: Of course, we don't pay any taxes!

Mr. Carruthers: The socialists say the government must run everything. "Let's build up a real bureaucracy," they say, "and let the professors lead it."

Hon. Mr. Snow: Think positively.

Mr. Carruthers: One of these days the bureaucracy is going to run the government.

Mr. Shulman: It does now.

An hon. member: Oh, no.

Mr. Carruthers: Not yet, but it is getting close.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It says put in the NDP and make it official.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): It's run by the bureaucracy now!

Mr. Carruthers: Mr. Speaker, the member for High Park knows, and I know, that he doesn't belong there.

Mr. Stokes: It's just a matter of degree.

Mr. Carruthers: He's a free-enterpriser.

Mr. Shulman: I am the only socialist.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Durham has the floor.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Carruthers: Sir John A. Macdonald said: "The reason I have been able to beat George Brown is that I have been able to look a little bit ahead." And that has been the policy of the Progressive Conservative Party down through the years.

An hon. member: Right on.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Carruthers: Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to another area which was covered in the Throne Speech. The leader of the NDP, in his criticism of the Speech from the Throne, stated: "This House regrets the failure of the Ministry of Housing to pursue policies which could combat the drastic decline in house building now occurring."

Mr. Shulman: Does the member agree?

Mr. Carruthers: I am not going to defend the Minister of Housing (Mr. Irvine) at this time because he can defend himself and he has outlined a very progressive programme. But in the next few minutes I do want to outline some of the problems that we face in housing. It is not just the Province of Ontario—

Mr. Shulman: But that is the major problem.

Hon. Mr. Snow: We heard the leader of the NDP—

Mr. Carruthers: The federal government is involved. The provincial government is involved. Every municipal council is involved. Every developer is involved. And the general public is involved.

There are five groups we've got to work with. Certainly it has become very obvious. Mr. Speaker, that housing is going to become a major issue in the next election.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): It is now.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, that's going to be a very big issue.

Mr. Carruthers: And we are going to be very proud of the programme and the progress that has been made by this government, against great odds, I may say.

Mr. Morningstar: Compared to other jurisdictions we have done well.

Mr. Carruthers: Mr. Speaker, I think it would appear perfectly in order at this time to review some of the problems involved in developing the housing programme.

Mr. Shulman: First there is the minister.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): And Hydrogate here.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Carruthers: All those programmes, Mr. Speaker, are based on the principle of shared responsibility. Let's not forget that.

This includes the other levels of government, which I mentioned, as well as the private sector and the public.

The provincial government cannot single-handedly solve all the housing problems which exist in this province. Financially it would be an impossibility. This year alone, the province has increased the provincial housing budget from \$101 million to \$284 million—

Mr. Shulman: But the government doesn't spend most of it.

Mr. Carruthers: —and it is expected this figure will double again in 1976.

Mr. Stokes: In the last three years \$130 million remained unspent.

Mr. Carruthers: Last year—and this has been referred to before today—the federal government returned \$130 million of our own tax dollars for housing. This year we have been told that the federal government, in spite of its wide-open immigration policy, which is flooding vast numbers of people into this area, will actually reduce its allocation of funds for this use—

Mr. Shulman: That is not true. They are increasing it.

Mr. Carruthers: —from \$78 million in 1974 to only \$50.4 million in 1975 for socially assisted housing in the lower-income field.

Mr. Shulman: The member has been listening to unreliable sources.

Mr. Carruthers: Socially assisted housing, as the provincial government recognizes, is the area of greatest need; I think we all recognize that fact. This group is made up of lower and moderate income-earners, those earning \$12,000 a year or less. These are the people hardest hit by rising costs.

The federal government has seen fit to make other cuts. Funds for non-profit rental housing have been reduced by \$9 million and money for land assembly and development has been cut by \$20 million. The neighbourhood improvement plan loans have been reduced by \$7 million, from \$9 million to \$2 million, which is more than three-quarters. One of the major reasons, Mr. Speaker, that this province requires so much new housing is because of immigration, as I mentioned before. Of all the immigrants who come to Canada, 75 per cent or more indicate Ontario as their first choice to start a new life. And why? I don't need to answer that—we know why.

Mr. Shulman: Because they can't speak French.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Carruthers: It's because of our favourable economic and cultural environment that approximately 60,000 new citizens—as I said before—come each year to this area of the province and Metropolitan Toronto. That means we have to provide housing for these 60,000 new people every year. The federal government controls immigration, and yet it does not see fit to provide this province with the necessary funds to house these new citizens.

We are faced with problems from the local municipalities. A few municipalities are hesitant about approving housing because of the education costs and the social services to accommodate more population. Under our present provincial housing policy—and this is apparently unknown to a large number of municipalities, although directives have been sent out—when a municipality accepts a new development which is low in assessment yield the grant rate is increased.

For example, for OHAP houses proposed in Oshawa, the Ministry of Education would pay 95 per cent to the annual capital debt charges for school facilities. They weren't aware of that fact. But they are hesitant, and I can understand this from a municipal point of view. There's that feeling that they are going to be left holding the bag. And certainly with all service costs rising, you can appreciate the feeling of municipal councils: "What would happen if suddenly the province and the federal government withdrew and left us with the costs of servicing all this new housing?"

Education, of course, is a major cost in any new housing development; and few municipalities appear to be aware of the programme of the province. However, I feel the real reason is the unwillingness of middle- and upper-income communities to accept as neighbours people of lesser economic means. I don't think that it is a serious problem, but it does come into the picture. Because people of low and moderate incomes do not live in these communities, they have no political base from which to influence local policies.

There is the general question of developers, and we bring the developers into the picture because they have their problems and they have their responsibilities. The general impression of developers held by the public would seem to be that developers are making a lot of money—and they're to blame to

a degree themselves for this image. The general suspicion is that developers are making huge profits. And the highly inflated prices which they apparently are prepared to offer for land would give one that impression.

When developers come along to a farmer and offer him many thousands of dollars for land at very inflated prices, it leaves the impression that they are rolling in wealth. But they do have their problems and the image may be correct or it may be incorrect. I think it is largely exaggerated, but it has an effect on the housing programme.

We're all aware that developers are deeply involved in housing programmes. They have expressed great concern over the fact that municipalities are imposing municipal levies, and this varies from municipality to municipality. This was brought home to me the other day.

For example, in your region, Mr. Speaker, the York region, I don't think there is any levy. I think in the region of Peel the levy is a very moderate amount. But in the city of Oshawa it is a levy of \$1,500, and that's been reduced from the original figure. On top of that, I think there is a levy on the part of the region of \$1,250. That total amount added into the price of a house creates a problem.

The result is that people will move from a high-priced housing area to an area where there is no levy and where housing is more reasonable. This, in turn, creates another problem. You then have a traffic problem and a road problem. For example, many people from Oshawa, a high-cost area as far as housing is concerned, are moving into the Port Hope-Cobourg area or into Peterborough even, and commuting back and forth, because of lower-cost housing. The result is we have growth problems. The result of all that is increased cost of housing when you add the regional and the municipal levy to the cost of a housing unit.

When the developer is limited also in the number of housing units—due to a number of factors, not the least of which is the lot size—the cost per unit of housing is increased again. The developer then tends to cut corners as far as building codes are concerned. I think we have all experienced this.

I have been called in many times in the last 12 months by people who have bought new housing and found the floor shaking and the walls were cracked. There had been no money held back. I appreciate the fact that the contractor in 90 per cent of those cases came back when requested and corrected the situation. But it's a patchwork job, because

once a basement wall is cracked, it is very difficult to correct the situation.

There's another problem and this involves the general public. They say, "Why should we carry the burden of taxation for new housing because we all know that the average new house just does not pay in tax revenue for the services that it requires." In a community like my own the public says, "Why should we pay for the services for new housing for these people?"

I think they should remember, though, that many of them did not pay for all the services they enjoy. With the new government grants, this has been alleviated to a major degree. But it is one of the problems and it should be recognized, I think, that it is a problem and it is something we have to deal with. We have to accept that it is one of the arguments they use to oppose growth. But the public's attitude toward new housing is not only based on the cost of housing, it's based on the fact that there is an opposition to growth in our smaller communities, and it is understandable. In recent years, many people have moved out of the cities, particularly out of Metropolitan Toronto. They have moved into Port Hope, Cobourg and Bowmanville, as far as I am concerned. They all are enjoying a very fine life in a semi-rural area, a nice quiet town, and they want it to remain that way.

They use this argument: "I moved to Port Hope because I wanted a nice quiet rural town to live in." The fact they moved to Port Hope doesn't stop a thousand other people from moving to Port Hope. We look at these things from a parochial point of view, not considering the problems that have been created, largely by immigration. We are going to house people in highrise apartments in Metropolitan Toronto or we are going to do something in the development of growth in communities surrounding Toronto.

Here again, we see leadership in the North Pickering project and in the areas outside of Metro. At a meeting in Courtice the other evening, which is east of Oshawa, 600 people turned out. Many of them were in opposition to the Courtice concept, which is the development of a planned community, largely on land that is not agricultural. Really, the community of Courtice is a scattered community and the plan of the region is to fill in the vacant areas with housing. But there is that opposition—"It is a nice quiet community and we want it to remain that way."

Time is running out, but I would like to refer to another issue that has been raised by both leaders of the opposition and that is

local autonomy. I have mentioned it several times in my speech thus far, but it is being promoted these days as an issue of political significance. There are those, I won't mention any names, who are aspiring to take over power in this province who are proclaiming they will restore local autonomy to the people of Ontario. Now I want to know what they mean when they say they're going to restore local autonomy to the people of Ontario.

Mr. Shulman: We will explain that shortly.

Mr. Carruthers: Local autonomy is defined in the dictionary and is interpreted as a self-governing community. In the extreme this would mean that municipalities would plan, operate and finance all matters of importance lying within their jurisdiction.

Mr. Shulman: It would be a change.

Mr. Carruthers: But there's a fly in the ointment and I'm going to refer to it. They can't dispute this, Madam Speaker, that major efforts are being made by this government through the restructuring of municipal government to grant, to the greatest degree possible, local autonomy and control by the municipal councils over their local affairs.

This was a decision that should have been made, maybe, long ago; but one has to give the present Premier of this province credit for going against public opinion to a major degree indeed in making the decision that something had to be done about municipal government in this province.

No one was more emphatic that something should be done than the present Leader of the Opposition. I can recall many speeches he made criticizing the government because this government had done nothing about restructuring local government. But as soon as we started doing that, as soon as there was a reaction on the part of the public, the opposition got on the bandwagon; there was public dissent and they were going to ride on it.

Mr. Morningstar: Right.

Mr. Carruthers: Don't let them kid themselves; that public dissent is limited. In the final analysis, the people of this province have too much common sense. They think; they realize all the factors involved and when that day of decision comes the opposition will still be over there and we'll still be over here.

Hon. S. B. Handleman (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): The people always decide the right way; they always make the right decision.

Mr. Carruthers: As long as municipalities are organized as they are now on limited boundaries with a limited economic basis they do not have a sufficiently large base, from an economic point of view, to provide through taxation the services required. Therefore, they're dependent to a major degree on the senior level of government through subsidies and grants. With larger economic tax bases through the regions and restructured counties, we have municipalities in a good position to provide at least a major degree of services through local autonomy.

Some questions should be asked of the opposition members about local autonomy. I say this: One of those questions would be should provincial moneys, collected in various ways from the people of Ontario, be handed out unconditionally to municipalities?

Mr. Shulman: No.

Mr. Carruthers: The member doesn't agree with that? I don't agree with it either because they're collected. I don't understand how the Leader of the Opposition can say: "We'll take the ceilings off education; we'll reduce taxation and we'll restore local autonomy."

Mr. Shulman: That's irresponsible.

Mr. Carruthers: Should municipalities be granted the sole right to plan their respective areas—I think this is a question opposition members have to ask themselves—without consideration of the impact that planning is going to have on the neighbouring municipalities or even on the province? Members know and I know that in the past such action has proved completely disastrous.

Should ceilings on education and health services be left in the hands of local governments; do members think so? I can't see it. This would obviously result in a variety of standards for services and in inter-municipal competition. Yet there are those who, as I said before, would remove the provincial ceilings and at the same time guarantee a reduction in government spending.

Mr. Shulman: That produces bankruptcy.

Mr. Carruthers: It's unbelievable.

There is an old proverb that says: "He who pays the piper calls the tune." Now we are trying to get that piper back on the local level, and we are trying to get the man who calls the tune back on the local level through regional development and through restructuring of local municipalities.

It is very interesting to note, and we have some prime examples of it, that when a

municipal government is faced with a major problem, what happens? It turns to this government for a decision, because they know they can get a decision. A good example, I think, was the Spadina Expressway.

Mr. Shulman: The member had better not use that as an example. The municipal government didn't feel too happy on that one.

Mr. Carruthers: Better not mention Spadina? I am going to mention it.

Mr. Shulman: The member had better not mention that one. Metro isn't too happy about that one.

Mr. Carruthers: It couldn't be decided at the local level; it couldn't be decided at the OMB. I don't know whether the cabinet split on it or not—

Mr. Shulman: They did.

Mr. Carruthers: But in the final analysis it turned to leadership and the leader was the present Premier of this province. He made the decision and—

Mr. Shulman: It was a brilliant political decision.

Mr. Carruthers: —he has been abused ever since by a certain group of people, but it will be proven to be the right decision, and the member knows it is the right decision.

Mr. Shulman: It won the election, what more can the member expect?

Mr. Carruthers: Yes, right; but that is a good example, that is a very good example. I have seen that happen time and time again in the final analysis. We saw it with the OPAD study in Oshawa. They studied for several years; at least three or four. They spent thousands of dollars; I have volumes of research material in my library at home on the OPAD study. So what happened? They came to the province for a decision. When the province made the proposal, I regret to say that my own area of Port Hope, Hope township, decided to remain out of it. I think it was a mistake and I go on public record as saying it was a mistake, and I think some day we are going to recognize that fact.

Mr. McIlveen: I will vote for that. The member for Durham and I were the only two.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): The member for Oshawa wasn't too happy with things at the time, when it was put through

this House. He was even going to vote against the government.

Mr. Carruthers: I never varied from my stand on that and I never will. If one looks at all the factors involved and the research that had been done by the province, it was a sound proposal.

The degree of local autonomy presently granted the municipalities is very large when one considers who holds the purse strings. At the present the province has allocated \$2.29 million in road building and maintenance grants in 1974-1975 in my area, and of this amount \$1.7 million is to assist the smaller municipalities in financing their road needs.

Mr. Morningstar: Wonderful.

Mr. Carruthers: The Ontario government has committed to local government some \$124 million in new grants and \$115 million in increases to existing grants, bringing the total provincial aid to municipalities, Madam Speaker, to \$2.1 billion. That is a lot of money to hand out to municipalities.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. G. Nixon: Right on.

Mr. Morningstar: Good government.

Mr. Carruthers: And when we think of that amount let's also think about local autonomy. The province increased its operating subsidies for public transit from \$20 million in 1973 to \$35 million in 1974; and in addition the province assumed 75 per cent of the capital cost of municipal buses, etc., and shares on a 50-50 basis the operating losses of their transit systems.

Mr. Morningstar: Wonderful.

Mr. Carruthers: Now just tell me how members opposite are going to increase the degree of local autonomy under those conditions. I am waiting with bated breath to hear the Leader of the Opposition come forth with his great new programme of restoring local autonomy to the people of this province.

Mr. Ferrier: He doesn't have a programme.

Mr. McIlveen: That's what he is saying.

Mr. Carruthers: He is out looking for one.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: He can talk about the non-existent programme.

Mr. Worton: Just like the Throne Speech.

Mr. Carruthers: We have seen education ceilings revised upward. Every day we have seen greater and greater emphasis and greater assistance provided, not only for elementary and secondary, but for university education as well.

I would say to those who are advocating greater local autonomy that they review the municipal bankruptcies that have occurred in the past. Members are aware of some of them, where municipalities because of lack of experience have got into very difficult financial circumstances, and in some instances have had to be taken over by the province. There has to be that guiding hand in there. There has to be somebody that can make decisions. Get 15 or 16 women or men together and try to get them to make a decision. We all know within our caucuses that that is very difficult to do.

Mr. Shulman: We don't have that problem. Our leader just tells us what to do.

Mr. Carruthers: That's right.

An hon. member: We all speak with one voice.

Mr. Carruthers: I don't think the member for High Park knows, because I don't think he even attends the caucus. Am I right?

An hon. member: He's right.

Mr. Turner: He doesn't follow his leader's instructions.

Mr. Carruthers: I say that those who are advocating local autonomy had better take a look at the past and what has happened to many municipalities because they were given too much rope as far as financial assistance is concerned.

It is very difficult for municipalities, in groups, to make decisions. I can understand this, and it is not showing any disrespect to local councils. I have a very fine rapport with all the councils in my area but I do know the problems they face in trying to reach decisions at a local level where they're close to the people and they're being affected by the next door neighbour and all the people that they have known for years.

I wasn't going to say anything about agriculture, but agriculture is a major industry in my riding and we are all concerned about the agricultural situation. Yet in my own area I have some very happy farmers. It is one of the finest farming areas in the province as far as I'm concerned. We have practically every type of agricultural enterprise. We have Christmas trees which are grown in the Manvers area in very large numbers. We have

tobacco. We have some of the finest beef herds and some of the finest dairy farms in the provinces.

Mr. Ferrier: Are there any Charolais cattle there?

Mr. Carruthers: Yes, we have. We have some very fine Guernsey cattle which are famous in the whole area around us. We have some very fine vegetable growers.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Sheep farmers?

Mr. Carruthers: Yes, we have sheep farmers too. It lends itself to that type of farming because we have a great variety of soil, from light sandy soil through loam to heavy clay soil.

Mr. L. Maeck (Parry Sound): What about Garden Hill?

Mr. Carruthers: Garden Hill, of course, is a joy.

Mr. Maeck: Next to the Garden of Eden.

Mr. Carruthers: That's right. I didn't like to say it myself. This is where I want to refer to the Leader of the Opposition. I quote from page 89 of Hansard of last Friday where he said:

In agriculture there were 127,000 fewer farms in 1971 than a decade earlier, a loss of more than seven farms a day.

Isn't that startling? That's serious.

Mr. Bounsall: What they need is an airport in his riding.

Mr. Maeck: It is too far out.

Mr. Carruthers: The Leader of the Opposition said:

Canada lost 1.7 per cent of its farm acreage, and Ontario during that period lost 14.1 per cent of its acreage, eight times the national average.

Then he goes on to speak about the reduction in acreage and the reduction in the production of farm produce, which of course is due to a number of reasons, overproduction for one thing and the price of farm products for another.

I do want to refer to this, and reiterate that figures can be readily used for one's own purpose. I would like members to think about these figures for a minute. This is taken from "The Grower." I found these facts, but I'm not going to delve into them—I might at a later date. Reference is made to the loss of farms in Canada and Ontario. I'm going to look at the totals in the census. In 1961 there

were 480,903 farms. In 1971 they had gone down to 366,128, which was a reduction of 29 per cent. On paper that looks pretty serious. But let's look at it.

Farms with sales of \$2,500 or over were reduced by .3 per cent; farms with sales of \$5,000 or over increased by 39.2 per cent; but farms with sales of \$10,000 or over increased by 127 per cent. And yet he says the number of farms are decreasing at a very rapid rate.

Do members know what is happening? I know what's happening, Mr. Speaker. Farms are being amalgamated. There are not as many farms, but there's just as much acreage. At the present time we've got land coming out of our ears that isn't being farmed at all. You know and I know, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. G. Nixon: Terrible.

Mr. Carruthers: We are not anywhere near the productive capacity of our farms today, and I can go on for a long time on that.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Carruthers: But I want to point out that figures can be very deceptive. You can say that the number of farms has been reduced, yes; and perhaps in Ontario more than any other area, because we have a great number of small farms.

Mr. Stokes: The member can work all afternoon and all evening with figures, but land is going out of production at 26 acres an hour.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Carruthers: The member knows better than that. He knows better than that.

Mr. Stokes: Talk to the Ontario Federation of Agriculture.

Mr. Carruthers: I know what's happening in my own area. I know land that hasn't been farmed for years, and is now in production.

Mr. Stokes: It is 26 acres an hour.

Mr. Ferrier: Is that the result of improved drainage?

Mr. Carruthers: Those figures are not true. Mr. Speaker, I've taken longer than I intended and I know the member for High Park is just itching to get the floor.

Mr. G. Nixon: Right on.

Mr. Maeck: Keep going.

Mr. Morningstar: Keep it up. The member is doing all right.

Mr. Carruthers: So I'm going to conclude my remarks. I hope to have the opportunity of participating in the budget debate. It might be my last opportunity to speak in this Legislature.

Mr. Morningstar: No, no.

Mr. Turner: No; heaven forbid.

Mr. Carruthers: But I have appreciated it. So I surrender my—

Mr. Maeck: Let the member for High Park sit. He is never here. Let him sit for the evening and come back to make his speech.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Carruthers: No, that wouldn't be right. I think I'd better surrender, Mr. Speaker, unless you would like to hear about—

Mr. Morningstar: Snowmobiles.

Mr. Carruthers: Snowmobiles?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Give it to them. Lay it on.

Mr. Carruthers: No, I'll sit down. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Just before the member for High Park starts, I recognize the member for Brantford for one moment.

Mr. R. B. Beckett (Brantford): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to draw to your attention and to the members of the House that in the Speaker's gallery there are 25 members of the Brantford Junior Chamber of Commerce. I would ask you and the members to recognize their presence.

Mr. Speaker: Now, the member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, as I gaze about me at these crowded benches I have some cause to regret having announced—

Mr. G. Nixon: Where is his leader?

Mr. Shulman: I regret having announced in caucus this morning I was going to speak tonight.

An hon. member: Oh, is that what happened?

An hon. member: They've all gone and left him.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): There was one in here a while ago.

Mr. Shulman: Well, we will struggle on without them.

An hon. member: Hey, I'm here.

Mr. McIlveen: Just goes to show you.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Just goes to show what they think of him.

Mr. Shulman: I have a couple of subjects I want to discuss that are of some minor importance. But before doing so, perhaps I should deal with the ministers who are here. They have taken the trouble to come and receive their praise that is due them. I suppose I should start with my favourite, our "Slow Sidney," the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, because he's in charge of the two departments which are of some interest to me and in which—

Mr. Stokes: One of them is booze.

Mr. Maeck: We know.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I thought I was his favourite.

Mr. Shulman: One of them is booze. I must confess, we all have weaknesses. Some of us like women; some of us like politics. I have an interest in fine wines, and I must say this has caused me some difficulty over the years with the various Ministers of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I am in charge of that too.

Mr. McIlveen: And women too.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Colleges and Universities): The member for High Park has a paper cup there we can't see through.

Mr. Shulman: His predecessor, John-John, long John, or whatever his name was—now he was a fine speaker. Periodically he would get up in the House and he would announce: "Next month we are bringing in the new liquor bill." And this went on for a long time. He was the minister for two years. And every three months he would announce that, "Next month we were going to get the bill." And I really believed him. I must confess that was in my younger days. I was innocent; I didn't realize what politics was all about and when the good minister got up and said, "We are going to bring in a new, radical, wonderful liquor bill; we are going to solve all these problems—"

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member doesn't want that. He wants local option; he voted for it.

Mr. Shulman: Oh, I want local option in High Park, of course. We don't want to change that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Liquor in everybody else's backyard.

Mr. Shulman: That's right. Okay. Not in High Park. We voted on that.

But anyway, the thing that interests me is that he phoned Jim Mackey one day and he said, "This is terrible, all this confusion. One fellow can have Sangria; one fellow can't have Sangria. One fellow can stay open until 10; the other one has to close at 9. Somebody else can stay open until midnight. What I want you to do is write down all the rules so the owners and the public and everyone can know exactly what they can do and what they can't do."

Well, that's all right saying it to Mackey. He also made the mistake of announcing it to the public. After a while, all the people in the public started phoning up and saying, "Where is this book of rules?"

I do not want the members to think Chief Mackey did not write them down, because he did write them down. After all, when a commissioner is given instructions by his minister he doesn't say, "No, I'm not going to do it." He says, "Yes, sir, I'll do it right away."

He put all the inspectors to work and they wrote out all the rules and they sent them up to the minister's office. The minister read them and he blanched, I am told—I wasn't there unfortunately; I am told that when he read them he blanched. That's the present minister's predecessor; the present one needn't shake his head. The previous minister said, "Oh God, we had better not publish those." So as we all know, of course no rules have ever been supplied, published or made public, and I suspect no rules ever will be supplied, published or made public.

I also tell the House that that bill that the previous minister kept promising us every three months—as the members will recall, I asked the new minister when it would come; he said in the fullness of time—that bill just isn't coming. The minister won't deny it either. He knows it is not coming.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: That's the greatest help I have ever had from the member. I'll make sure it is coming to make sure his prediction is wrong.

Mr. Shulman: Well, all right.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: It is not coming. The minister knows it's not coming and I know it's not coming, because somewhere in there they looked at the new bill and they had horrors. They said, "We can't do that. The people of Durham will vote against us." And that's exactly what was said.

Mr. Bounsall: They outlawed apple cider.

Mr. Shulman: So I announce tonight, and I challenge the minister to deny it, there isn't going to be any new liquor bill. The minister is silent. He does not deny it.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I deny it.

Mr. Shulman: All right, we'll go on. We've got the old liquor bill. I don't mind, mind you, because even though I am not going to be in politics I hope to write a column in the future and there is enough material in the liquor board to keep me supplied for at least four more years, and then we can discuss it again.

What I want to talk about is something the minister can do something about—but some people are slower than others and he may not get around to it—and this is the problem of commodities. It may be a surprise to the House but that thing that the member for Essex-Kent and I were discussing earlier—commodities—comes under the minister of consumer protection; at least, it is supposed to come under the minister of consumer protection but he hasn't got around to writing any law about it.

I want to tell the House that the situation in the commodity field right now is on the brink of a massive disaster—not the type of disaster the Liberals were talking about, but an entirely different type of disaster; a disaster that is going to cost tens of millions of dollars, and all because the minister and his predecessor have certain problems that are associated with snaildom.

The situation is this: Anyone—the member for Durham if he wishes—may go out tomorrow and open a commodity house. He doesn't have to have any capital. Hey, that's what he should do. You don't have to have any capital, you don't have to have any knowledge of the business, you don't have to have any—no, I won't say that.

Hon. Mr. Auld: The member has a conflict of interest.

Mr. McIlveen: Is this another chapter on how to make a million?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is a chapter on how to lose a million.

Mr. Shulman: This is a chapter on how the government might save many millions. My commodity broker—the chap I deal with here in Toronto; the firm's name is Friedberg and Co. Ltd.—is one of the more conservative types. They keep a very close rein on their salesmen. Some four months ago they found one of their salesmen was absolutely incompetent. He couldn't understand the business. As a result of things he was doing, the firm lost many thousands of dollars and this salesman's clients lost many thousands of dollars, so they fired him.

What did the fellow do? If you are fired in another business you search around for a job. He tried but couldn't get a job in any other commodity firm. No problem; he just rented an office downtown, opened it up, put his name on the door and said—I won't mention his name because it would cause me more difficulties—"So-and-so, Commodity Broker." The public doesn't know the difference. How are they to know? He started sending out cards and advertising, and people are flocking in there and he is becoming one of the busiest brokers in town.

I will guarantee the House that within a year he is going to go bankrupt, because he didn't have the capital nor does he have the knowledge, and he is going to take with him some dozens, or, if he is successful, some hundreds of people who are investing their money there. It will all go down the drain.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Speculators — gamblers.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, all of those people are speculators.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: When you gamble, you take a risk.

Mr. Shulman: Doesn't the minister feel any responsibility? Let's suppose we had the same situation on the stock market. People who go in and buy penny stocks are taking risks, but don't they expect the stockbroker will still be there next week if they want to sell their stock?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The stock exchange will be there.

Mr. Shulman: Well, I'll tell you, that commodity broker isn't going to be there; he's going to be in Florida with the money. I'll give another example. There's a fellow by the name of Bartlett, Pat Bartlett, who managed

Carleton and Co. here in Toronto for some time—

Hon. Mr. Handleman: That's a good name.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, it was a good name, but they ran into some problems. The problems were that a few of the clients were slow in paying, so they brought in a couple of huskies from Dallas to beat up the clients and collect the money.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: That's against the law.

Mr. Shulman: Well, it may be against the law, but there's no law regulating commodity brokers. The OPP came in and they hustled these two heavies and the heavies went back to Dallas. I got in touch with Carleton and they fired Mr. Bartlett. So what did Mr. Bartlett do? He opened a new company; it's called Bartlett and Co.

Mr. Turner: Commodity dealer?

Mr. Shulman: Commodity dealer.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Where?

Mr. Shulman: On Eglinton Ave., I believe, here in Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Is he doing well?

Mr. Shulman: There are no regulations, no rules, no financing required, no inspectors, no government supervision. He is the minister responsible. Where's the legislation?

Mr. Worton: It is just like an offtrack betting setup, isn't it?

Mr. Shulman: "Slow Sidney." Well, we'll get the legislation, but first we're going to have a massive bankruptcy. This is what bothers me about knee-jerk ministers. They move when there's scandal. Well, now they've been given warning. Right here. In fact, the minister's predecessor was given warning two years ago in a letter, and he said, "I'm looking into it." Well, he looked into it and looked into it and finally he went to his great reward; he became the Attorney General. Okay, now I'm telling the minister to look into it. I suppose he's still looking into it. I know he has a whole committee looking into it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He wants to become Attorney General.

Mr. Shulman: Well, maybe, I will tell him something. If he doesn't do something about it fairly quickly as Attorney General, he's going to have lots of business and lots of

people to prosecute. He's going to have to extradite a lot of them because they're going to grab the money and run when things turn sour.

One can't allow a business which is taking in quite literally tens of millions of dollars, on the one hand, and which, secondarily, can affect the price of many foods and other commodities in the world, to be unsupervised. It's criminal. This is the only jurisdiction in North America or Europe where one can open up a commodity business with no capital. One can open up with a one-dollar bill. Well, the same thing happened in California before they had such control.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Not in Europe?

Mr. Shulman: Nowhere in Europe.

Hon. Mr. Auld: With a buck?

Mr. Shulman: In California, one could do it without capital until, I guess, two years ago. They had a bankruptcy there which took down \$48 million from one firm and \$35 million from another firm; then they rushed to get in legislation. Do we have to do the same thing here? What in the world is holding it up?

Hon. Mr. Auld: What about Majorca?

Mr. Shulman: Where? Majorca? I must confess I'm not familiar with Majorca. Perhaps it can be done there; I don't know. Certainly in England, in France, in Spain they cannot, and certainly not in West Germany.

Mr. Worton: Or on the island of Skopios.

Mr. Shulman: There may be some little islands where one can do things, but surely we're not going to compare Majorca with Ontario. We are supposed to be responsible and grown up financially.

I want to say a word about "Fast Rene," the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Brunelle). He was here a minute ago.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: "Fast Rene?" Come on. That's like saying that the Attorney General was blanching, which is impossible.

Mr. Ferrier: Wait until he gets to the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have heard the worst.

Mr. Shulman: Actually, I cannot come to grips with the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick in his new ministry. It's such an amorphous thing, I'm not quite sure—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: First, the member has to learn the name of it.

Mr. Shulman: I honestly don't even know the name of it, and I suspect he doesn't either. However, that's another matter. When he was Minister of Correctional Services, I really liked it, because then I could grab him. There was no fun in grabbing the present minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We had a ball then, didn't we?

Mr. Shulman: Anyway, to come back to the minister of patronage, "Fast Rene." We had a bit of a Conservative mini-scandal last year. Members will recall that we discovered when cheques were to be handed out the Conservative MPP, if it was a Conservative area, would hand out the cheque. If it was a non-Conservative area, they would have to import a Conservative MPP.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What a scandal. That's enough to destroy the system.

Mr. Shulman: No, it really wasn't a Conservative scandal; it was mini-patronage, sort of petty stuff. So we embarrassed the government—

Mr. Turner: We just didn't trust the post office.

Mr. Shulman: We made a list of all the donations and the gifts that had been given out across the province, and by some coincidence—I guess he just hadn't got around to it—no Liberal and no NDP member had ever got to present a cheque—

Hon. Mr. Handleman: They just got the money.

Mr. Shulman: The ridings got the money. But every day without fail in 1974—and it is continuing in 1975—somewhere in Ontario there was a Conservative back-bench MPP handing out a cheque saying, "Your government is doing this for you."

Mr. Maeck: What is wrong with that?

Mr. Shulman: I think it's wonderful patronage, but it is bad politics.

Mr. Turner: It is not patronage.

Mr. Shulman: And, you see, I just want to warn the government again—and I am here as a friend to it only and that is the only reason I am doing this—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You always hurt the one you love.

Mr. Shulman: —to point out from the kindness of my heart it really should repent.

When this came out, I went up to the Minister of Community and Social Services and I said: "Rene, I don't care about those other fellows, but when there are cheques to be given out at High Park, please don't send Nick Leluk in, let me present the cheques. I feel a little embarrassed when I got to these meetings and Nick gets up." So he said: "Okay, any time, any time." So, no cheques but he is very friendly.

Actually he is very friendly. When I was travelling up to Moosonee with my family on the Polar Bear Express, he let us come back to his private railway car to have a drink of water. We spent a couple of minutes there and then he sent us back. But, anyway that's another story. I am telling the members opposite we are making up a—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Shame, shame. What would the hon. member have said if he found out that the minister had done that for some Tory friend?

Mr. Shulman: I would denounce him!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member would call it a mini-scandal.

Mr. Shulman: A mini-scandal. Please, I just want to warn those fellows—and this is meant only in friendship—that we are making up a list again and a week before the election we are going to publish the list.

It is bad tactics, so I have a suggestion to make. Pick some token member of the opposition—perhaps me—and let me present a few of those cheques. In that way the government will be able to say there have been exceptions and so it won't look so black and white when it comes to election time.

Mr. McIlveen: The member can come down and give some of mine.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Hasn't the member for Thunder Bay ever presented a cheque?

Sure, there you go. Member for High Park—he has presented a cheque. One of his colleagues.

Mr. Shulman: Okay.

Hon. Mr. Auld: And it was a good cheque.

Mr. Shulman: I want to point out there has been a great deal of research done—and perhaps I shouldn't make this public and I

am embarrassed to do so, but the truth must out in these things. Before the last election, the Premier did a brilliant thing. He stopped the Spadina Expressway. It was outrageous in a way. It was a break with tradition. It was a break with the past and it was such a bright, brilliant, progressive outrageous thing to do that he swept the people of Ontario with him and that won the election. I agree with the member for Durham, that's the thing that won the election, that brilliant act.

Mr. Ferrier: That was Dalton Camp's idea.

Mr. Shulman: Now there's a terrible problem now. What do we do for the 1975 election? I understand—and I know the cabinet hasn't been informed of this yet, but I want to be the first to reveal it. It is a little premature and I apologize, but there has been a meeting of the Premier with his secret advisers and they said: "We need another great thing, a thing that will strike the imagination of the people of Ontario. Something we can get up about which we will say, 'Nobody else would have done this'."

Mr. Stokes: To capture their imagination.

Mr. Shulman: Yes. "Something that will capture their imagination. Something that we can take into the election campaign which the opposition will not be able to criticize."

They argued and they argued and they argued—and I understand cabinet is to be told about it next Wednesday, but I have to break the news first because one of my confidants told me they have this fantastic new bill and they are going to have the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick introduce it. I have a copy of it here. It's a bill to ban pay toilets.

Well, it shows imagination. Now who in the opposition is going to quarrel with that? I must give them credit again. Once again they have shown genius, ability and they may yet pull the election off with that.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: What has that got to do with law and order?

Hon. Mr. Auld: It is a request from a limbo dancer with a back problem.

An hon. member: I think it is federal jurisdiction.

Mr. Shulman: Okay.

Mr. McIlveen: I thought the member for High Park wanted to be the ombudsman?

Mr. Shulman: I am going to talk about that tomorrow. My speech on going to be an ombudsman is going to take about three hours so there is no use starting that tonight. I

have really an exposé as to why there is only one man for the job, but we will do that tomorrow.

I want to turn to a slightly more serious matter, Mr. Speaker. The major thing I want to talk about is the situation at the university of Toronto, but there isn't time to start that tonight so I will save that until tomorrow morning. My apologies for those doctors who are here because of that, but the other members—

Mr. McIlveen: I came just for that.

Mr. Shulman: I am sorry. Come back tomorrow morning.

I want to talk to a serious matter that has taken place in the borough of York. Some six weeks ago a delegation of builders came to my office with a rather frightening tale of corruption involving a number of officials in that borough. There have been certain charges laid in the court and I am not going to say anything about that, for obvious reasons; it is sub judice. But the matter is so serious that there are some things I wish to discuss tonight with some apologies. I attempted to have this matter settled without it being made public but unfortunately the officials I spoke to did not agree with my point of view.

Briefly, what these six builders had to say was that in order to get anything done in that borough, they had to pay off. The process of getting a building permit I'm not going to discuss tonight because that matter is now before the courts. The reason it's before the courts is that we supplied these men with \$5,000 in marked money and sent them out to test their story.

However, once they had their building permit—incidentally, the way they said this was done, and this has nothing to do with the charges against the people being charged, is that when they applied to have something done a certain alderman, who has not been charged, would appear and protest against it. They would win what they wished in front of the board of adjustment but they were then contacted by someone who said, "Unless you want this alderman to put in an appeal, you will pay so much money." Of course, the danger of an appeal is that it would tie things up for some six, eight or nine months and when one has \$100,000 or \$200,000 tied up for that length of time it costs a great deal of money and it's better to pay off.

Above and beyond that, the other things they said I found extremely upsetting. They said, "If you wish to put in a drain once you have your permit you pay the inspector. If you wish to put a wall you pay the inspec-

tor. If you wish to put in a foundation you pay the inspector." These are extremely serious allegations. This is the sort of thing that's happening in New York, Detroit and other areas where gradually corruption has crept into the building industry, forcing the cost up tremendously. If this is allowed to proceed here the same thing is going to happen.

I've turned that information over to the police and I presume some investigation is taking place. However, there is one thing I want to deal with tonight and this has to do with the board of adjustment itself. The chairman of the board of adjustment is a Mr. Cecil Foreht. He's a lawyer; he's a QC.

Mr. Foreht, who is the chairman of the board of adjustment in the borough of York, is extremely active in real estate in the borough of York. I have here the minutes of the meetings of the board of adjustment for the last two years, and I find that quite literally since—well, let's go back here.

Meeting No. 6, April 23, 1974: Chairman declares a conflict of interest, application at 1179 Weston Rd. Next meeting, absent. Meeting No. 8, June 4: Chairman declares a conflict of interest, 79 Snider Ave. Next meeting, No. 10, July 16, 1974; Chairman declares a conflict of interest, 144 Marcotta. Next meeting, No. 11; Chairman declares a conflict of interest, 38 Miranda. Next two meetings, no conflict of interest. Meeting 14, Oct. 8: Chairman declares a conflict of interest at 38 Miranda. Next meeting, Oct. 29: Chairman declares a conflict of interest re Donald Ave. Next meeting, Nov. 19: Chairman declares a conflict of interest re 43 Bloem Ave. Next meeting, Dec. 10; Chairman declares two conflicts of interest, 149 King St. and then one on the north side of Black Creek Blvd.

There is no proof and there is no suggestion that there have been any illegal activities on the part of the chairman. But I think it is fairly obvious that when a man is on the board of adjustment of a municipality he should have enough sense not to put himself in a position of constant conflict of interest and to have to constantly declare it. Here's a man who, meeting after meeting, has to get up and say, "I or my partners are involved in that transaction." He is very, very busy in that borough in real estate and he should not be on that board of adjustment.

I phoned him a week ago, last Friday actually, and I laid all the facts in front of him and said, "I don't wish to make this public. It appears to me you should give

up either your position on the board of adjustment or your position in real estate in the borough. Even though there is no conflict of interest or you say there's no conflict of interest or when there is a conflict of interest you declare it, the feeling has gone abroad among many of the builders that if you want to get a problem through you go to this particular lawyer. He declares his conflict of interest and the other members then vote for it."

That isn't entirely true because I've gone down the list. Most of the ones he declared did go through; some of them didn't so obviously that isn't insurance. But that is the feeling among many of the small builders and it is all smaller builders in the borough of York. Surely it's common sense that when we have builders going constantly to these meetings and hearing the chairman, meeting after meeting, saying, "I have an interest in that," then grave suspicions arise, and surely they shouldn't put themselves in that position. I can understand if it happened once, but to be happening time after time after time, that man should not be on the board, that is what I am saying.

There is nothing illegal here; this is not a matter for police action. I suggest it is a matter for action by the Treasurer. I did take the matter to the mayor and he said he would speak to Foreht, but that was also a week ago and, inasmuch as nothing has occurred, there is some provincial responsibility here, not only to make sure that everything is done legally in the borough of York, but also that everything is done so that it appears to be proper, so that the public or the builders or others do not feel that there is an inner circle that gets things its own way.

I want to speak very briefly about the problem of loan sharking. Members may have read in the paper yesterday that a gentleman made the mistake of not paying back a loan shark and was killed on a contract murder. A charge has been laid in that, so we can't discuss that either. The thing that bothers me about that whole affair is that the police knew in advance that this man was going to be killed. They didn't know who was going to kill him, but they received a tip a week ago that he was going to be killed, and what bothers me is that they weren't able in this province to protect him; they weren't able or they didn't.

Something is very wrong. We have come a long way since the days when the police were

instructed that there was no such thing as organized crime. We have improved tremendously and we were on the verge of another big improvement. The former Solicitor General (Mr. Kerr) promised me he was going to fight for more money, more equipment and more personnel for the intelligence department of the police but they didn't get it. They haven't got it yet. They have got promises, but what do the promises mean when he isn't in the cabinet?

Is the Attorney General (Mr. Clement) going to fight for it? He doesn't know anything about the department, he is busy with his Attorney General's job and he has problems with his health to boot.

Here we have a situation where the intelligence departments of our police are still so undermanned—that is the only answer I can give, because their quality has been upgraded tremendously—they are not able to give proper protection to someone they know is going to be assassinated. Yet when that man is assassinated they are able to make an arrest, we have come that far.

In the old days the death would occur—we know how many of them took place here time after time—or mysterious disappearances—the Teddy Yanovich case was a perfect one, and the Leo Kerwin case—and nothing happened. Well, we have come further. They have made an arrest, they have a suspect, and we will just have to see what happens there. But they need more personnel, they need more equipment, they need more money, and as far as I can find out nobody seems to be listening.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to the major address which I wish to make, but we seem to have run out of time. I wonder if I could adjourn the debate and continue tomorrow?

Mr. Shulman moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the business for tomorrow will be the continuation of this order, and the House leader proposes to call the government notice of motion No. 1, standing in the name of the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Snow).

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 20, 1975

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Ruston, Mr. Carruthers, Mr. Shulman	249
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Shulman, agreed to	277
Motion to adjourn, Mr. McKeough, agreed to	277



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Friday, March 21, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MARCH 21, 1975

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

TORONTO BUILDING HEIGHT BYLAW

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in December, 1973, the council of the city of Toronto passed bylaw 347/73 to adopt amendment No. 25 to the city's official plan. It also passed bylaw 348/73, which has been referred to as the 45-ft bylaw, and which would have restricted height and density in the city core. Amendment No. 25 is broader than bylaw 348/73 because it would have permitted the city to pass similar bylaws for any part of the city.

The Ontario Municipal Board, in the fall of 1974, conducted a lengthy hearing dealing with both the official plan amendment and the zoning bylaw. On Dec. 9, 1974, the OMB issued a decision not to approve either the amendment or the bylaw. The city of Toronto subsequently petitioned the cabinet to vary this decision.

The city of Toronto has indicated that it passed the two bylaws because it had concluded "the existing zoning bylaw was insufficient to regulate and control growth and stability in the central core area of Toronto in that it was excessively permissive, most notably in the wide use permissions and high density available in industrial and commercial areas." It was felt that such development would have created problems in the provision of adequate transportation and community facilities and would have led to a deterioration in the quality of the urban environment. The city's objective was, therefore, to put a temporary hold on the core area to permit the completion of planning studies leading to the development of new planning standards.

This was recognized as a legitimate objective by the OMB. The board did, however, criticize the means of achieving this objective. Amendment No. 25 would have resulted, in the opinion of the board, in

the abrogation of the official plan and in arbitrary powers being acquired by the city council. It criticized the failure of the city to establish objective criteria for exemptions to allow appropriate developments during the period of the hold and for its failure to study and consider the economic effects of the bylaw.

The government of Ontario shares the concerns of the OMB. At the same time, it is clear that elected councils have not only the right but the duty to establish appropriate land-use controls and to re-examine such controls from time to time to determine their adequacy.

In addition, it is clear from decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada that section 35 of the Planning Act empowers municipalities to pass holding bylaws, if such bylaws conform to the municipality's official plan.

In arriving at a decision, this government has closely examined the expressed intent of the city, the comments submitted by the interested parties, and the conclusions arrived at by the Ontario Municipal Board.

The government supports and is in full sympathy with the objectives of the council of the city of Toronto in relation to control, preservation and planning of the core area of the city. At the same time even the most worthy objectives can only be legitimately achieved in a democratic society through the orderly process of law. Of fundamental importance in our system is the right of an individual to know or to be able to ascertain where he stands in relation to the law.

This is not to say, in the case under consideration, that the city council cannot change its zoning bylaws and its official plan. However, when doing so council must give expression to its policies in terms of objective standards which can be understood by the people affected. Any system which attempts to substitute the subjective opinion of council in the place of objective criteria would be open to abuse and cannot be supported.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): That sounds like a Globe and Mail editorial.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The criteria must be public information so that a property owner

may know the basis on which the decisions affecting his property are being made so that he may be reasonably confident—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Wouldn't be a bad idea if the government followed that.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —of fair and equitable treatment and so that he may exercise his lawful rights in the event of a dispute.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): The lawful rights of developers are pretty tender here in this government.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Having regard to all these factors, the cabinet has decided to deny the petition of the city in regard to the 45-ft bylaw, and to confirm the decision of the OMB.

In the case of amendment 25, cabinet has decided that the substantive objections set out by the OMB can be met by varying the proposed amendment to the official plan. One concern expressed by the OMB was that the amendment applied to the whole of the city of Toronto. To meet this objection, cabinet has reduced the area of coverage to the official plan amendment 347 to coincide with the core area of the city. Cabinet therefore upholds the OMB decision as it relates to the area of the city outside the core and accepts, in a modified form, the petition of the city as it relates to the core area.

Cabinet has also modified amendment No. 25 to require that a part 2 study be undertaken by the city in all cases where a holding bylaw is enacted. Such holding bylaws may be passed for the period ending Sept. 30, 1975, rather than the two years originally provided for in amendment No. 25.

Amendment No. 25 (347/73) is further modified to remove excessive dependence on subjective opinion and will require instead that city council adopt by resolution objective criteria by which exemptions are to be considered. Such action will be required within 30 days of the adopting of such a holding bylaw. This requirement should provide adequate safeguards until Sept. 30, 1975, at which time the city has indicated that it will bring into effect revised permanent planning standards for the city core.

As the amendment to the official plan is developed, it should be recognized that the core of the city of Toronto is of great significance, not only to the city but to the Metropolitan region and, indeed, to the province. It is most necessary, therefore, that matters such as the Toronto-centred region plan and the transportation alternatives of the

Soberman report be considered as the plans for the core are developed.

The views and opinions of the Metropolitan Toronto council, the Toronto-centred co-ordinating committee and the province should be sought so that all may provide assistance in the planning of this area that affects the lives of so many people.

In conclusion, we believe the legitimate concerns of the Toronto city council, the Ontario Municipal Board and the government of Ontario can be met through these amendments to bylaw 347/73, which will give the city until Sept. 30, 1975, to adopt permanent planning standards.

CREDIT UNIONS

Hon. S. B. Handleman (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House today about my consultation with credit unions on proposals to change the Credit Unions Act.

In the past four weeks, 15 regional meetings have been held with credit union presidents from all over Ontario. Both the Credit Union League and the Federation of Caisses Populaires have also been consulted on a series of proposals developed by my ministry.

Our proposals were drawn primarily from the select committee on company law report of 1969, with updating to reflect changes in other provincial legislation and the growing sophistication of credit unions themselves.

The main proposal was for a guarantee fund to insure individual member deposits and to provide emergency funding to credit unions needing assistance. The proposed fund would have included all Ontario credit unions, each of which would make a contribution related to its size. Protection provided by the proposed fund would have been superior to that of the Canadian Deposit Insurance Corp., which does not rescue financial institutions or their shareholders but merely protects depositors up to a set dollar figure.

Our proposals also provided for features such as open membership, new investment opportunities and the power to purchase life insurance and other group benefits for the membership. With the guaranty fund in place, we would therefore have facilitated additional growth for the credit union movement.

Mr. Speaker, I feel these proposals reflected our genuine concern that credit union depositors receive protection equivalent to what is offered by banks and trust companies.

In my meetings with credit union presidents, concerns were expressed as to the nature of the guaranty fund, its costs and the

fact that it would be controlled by the provincial government.

I have made a commitment that this government would not force any unwanted controls on the credit union movement and so there will be further consultation with the movement over the next several months as we strive to reach a consensus.

One alternative which will be considered is the possibility of working with representatives of the credit union movement to enable full participation in the Canadian Deposit Insurance Corp. I have promised the movement every possible assistance in negotiating this matter with the federal authorities.

I will keep the House informed as we proceed with our discussions. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

TORONTO BUILDING HEIGHT BYLAW

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to ask the Treasurer, since he has refused to reverse the Municipal Board ruling but apparently has authorized changes in Toronto bylaws which in fact have almost precisely the same effect, is there a hole in the net through which a developer might claim legal approval for the building of a structure which would in fact not comply with the intention of the bylaw, which has now been reversed, or the intention of the government in giving a restructure to the powers of the Toronto government in order to permit them to have these city powers, which we all support? My question is: Is there any place that a developer can build up through the net?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The bylaw has been varied, not bylaws. I just make that comment. I think the member is referring to the period for which the bylaw has been quashed by the board, now confirmed by the cabinet, to the date at which time the city actually gave notice of intent to pass a new bylaw—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Before which, certain applications were made?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —which was Dec. 9, 1974. What the position is of those applications which were, in effect, denied during that period—how many there are I don't know—is something to be sorted out between the city and the applicants. If there is a dispute

then ultimately I suppose the courts are in the proper position to sort it out.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Since the province must see itself involved in any disputes evolving from that hiatus, has the cabinet looked at any alternatives whereby it can support the expressed intention of the council of the city of Toronto to hold development at the 45-ft level and, in turn, the statement that the minister made, which we support, that the city must have the powers to make such control measures if it so chooses to do?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I'm not entirely sure that I follow the question.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The question is: Isn't there anything else the Treasurer can do but say it is between the city and applicants?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, because that's where it properly is. It is not cabinet's position to get involved between any council and the applicants.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If the OMB hadn't reversed the bylaw they wouldn't be in this mess.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): That's a key point.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is a point, it is not a key point.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, it means the government is involved.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is not, however, the basis on which the cabinet decision was made.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary, the hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: Has the Treasurer now accepted as the core area, the definition which the city of Toronto gave it in the original bylaw? When he says "in a modified form," what does he mean by the phrase "in a modified form?" Finally, is he saying, in effect, that in the core area the 45-ft height bylaw obtains as the city requested, and he is giving the city the right within certain newly defined parameters to extend holding bylaws outside the core area as long as they don't apply beyond Sept. 30, 1975?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Let's take them one at a time.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The answer to the first question is that the core area as defined in the variance is roughly Parliament to Bathurst from the Lakefront up to the CPR, which is something less than the city had originally defined as the core, but we believe it is sensibly the core area. Now give me the next one.

Mr. Lewis: All right. The next one was, what does the Treasurer mean—oh I see, that's what he means by modified form; that he has narrowed the core slightly.

Mr. Deans: What was the reason for that?

Mr. Lewis: My colleague from Wentworth asks a very appropriate question: Why did the Treasurer redefine the core if he accepted the city's argument on the one hand?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That essentially is the core area. There is nothing sinister about that. That is essentially—

Mr. Lewis: No, no, I am not saying there is anything sinister.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —the core area as defined by the city and other places. I'll put it that way. There is a confusion here between core and the central business district. That's the way it used to be defined in the old bylaw and that's what we chose on this one, on the variance.

Mr. Lewis: The other point that hasn't been answered is, the Treasurer has given the city the right to pass holding bylaws on the basis of objective criteria up to Sept. 30, 1975, beyond the core area. In other words, the OMB decision is effectively reversed despite the sort of definitive statement here. He is giving the city everything it wants in stages.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No.

Mr. Lewis: No?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No.

Mr. Lewis: No? It is what they said.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He has obviously come to a conclusion which is so confusing that nobody can understand it. It will take them until after the election to understand it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: My friend from York South says we have come to a decision which is so confusing that no one will understand it. I think it will be understood.

Mr. Lewis: Yes?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I want to make it clear that it does take careful reading. Undoubtedly there will be matters which will have to be decided between applicants and between the council, and ultimately may well have to be determined by the courts, but which this cabinet has not looked at nor is it involving itself in.

Mr. Lewis: The government is just re-defining the core, that is all it is doing; it is just setting out the new boundaries.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, take another look at the statement.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for St. George has the final supplementary.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I have just quickly glanced at the statement but I wonder if the minister would elaborate on the statement with reference to the necessity of obtaining the views and opinions of Metropolitan Toronto. Is this something new and additional which is being added? If I may, I would like to add that we now appear to have had two changes in the Metropolitan Toronto authorities while we are still waiting a report from the Robarts commission. I wonder how far we are going to go before we really know what the Robarts commission says.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I don't think that the Robarts commission particularly has a bearing on this. I suppose the Robarts commission ultimately might recommend, and this Legislature might approve, structural changes either in planning or in terms of municipal organization which might eliminate some need for the kind of consultation which we feel is necessary and have suggested—suggested is the correct term, because that is not part of the cabinet decision.

What we are attempting to point out is that the core area of Toronto has a significance—in fact, if not in law, if I can put it that way as a non-lawyer—far beyond the approximately 700,000 people who live in the city of Toronto. What happens in that area has an enormous impact in terms of the rest of Metropolitan Toronto, the regional municipalities on either side and to the north, and indeed the province as a whole.

I have no idea what Mr. Robarts may or may not suggest, but I think what the member is suggesting is that if Mr. Robarts, at the extreme, recommended the amalgamation in a one-tier municipality of Peel, York, Durham and Toronto, then some of the consultation which we have suggested is necessary

wouldn't have to take place because it would happen in that arena. I don't think that is a possibility.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

CREDIT UNIONS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations if he considered the possibility of reactivating the Ontario Deposit Insurance Corp., which we put on the books back in the 1960s at a time that it was felt certain trust companies needed underpinning. Since the Provincial Auditor drew our attention to that just a week ago, saying the structure was still there, would it not have been an alternative that we reactivate that corporation, rather than saying to the credit unions that if they want deposit insurance then get it from the federal corporation, since these credit unions are provincially established?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, yes, we did consider it. I think the hon. member knows the history of the Ontario Deposit Insurance Corp. It was set up to meet a certain need. That need has now been met by the Canada Deposit Insurance Corp. There is no longer a need for a provincial one with small resources and a smaller base. Quite frankly, I have studied it, and I've discussed it with the members of the movement. I have pointed out to them that in my view there wouldn't be any need to set up a bureaucracy simply for Ontario savings institutions when there already is a national institution set up to serve the country from coast to coast; and that the cost of the bureaucracy would have to be met out of the contributions, as it is in Ottawa, and the contributions simply wouldn't carry the cost.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: On the other hand, the minister was prepared to establish a bureaucracy to fund the financial support for these credit unions, which they have been doing independently and which they objected to. I don't see the difference, but since the minister is so concerned about bureaucracy, can we expect a bill repealing that Ontario deposit insurance since it never was used even by the trust companies?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I'm certainly in favour of removing redundant organizations and I will discuss it with my cabinet colleagues.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE ON ENERGY

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask the Premier if he can tell the House what communications he has had with the government of Canada, in planning for the federal-provincial conference on energy which is coming up and which is certainly going to be of such importance. Is it going to be an open conference and, if so, would it be possible for representatives or observers from opposition parties to see what goes on?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion. I can't tell the Leader of the Opposition what ultimate decision has been made yet with respect to a part of it being open or whether it will be closed. I expect we'll have that within a few days and I shall inform the members of the House as to what the plans will be.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The position that has been expressed by the Premier—and I don't know whether the Ministry of Energy (Mr. Timbrell) has said it, but certainly the Treasurer has—that Ontario is going to stop agreeing with any further escalation in the prices since we're the consumers, is certainly a good position. Has this been put forward by means of an official statement of government policy and made known to the other provinces, or is this so far just simply comments and statements made by officials from the government?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, until we're familiar with exactly what is to be on the agenda and the form of conference it is to be in terms of whether it's public et cetera, I don't think that we are going to be presenting any prepared positions in advance of the conference. I doubt this. As I can recall, we've had no communication from other provinces as to what their positions may or may not be.

There is an item on the agenda, Mr. Speaker, as it relates perhaps to the economic situation generally, and I am sure individual provinces will have individual points of view. I doubt that we will have, say, several days before the conference, a printed or prepared statement and I doubt that the other provinces will either. I don't think it will be that kind of conference.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: However, this government's position has been publicly announced and is fixed. Is that a true assessment?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as I say, the agenda covers more than just energy in

terms of suggested increases in costs as it relates to energy. While we have not stated our position, and I think we should do so at the conference in a very formal way, I believe the Treasurer and perhaps the Minister of Energy have, and I think I have on one or two occasions, indicated that Ontario will not be accepting a significant increase in terms of the cost of energy coming from two of our sister provinces.

Mr. Lewis: Does the Premier think the federal government's raising the prices is a dirty trick, in an election year, to do him in?

Hon. J. R. Rhodes (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Yes, sir.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if that is a supplementary question, I would say that if the federal government on its own substantially increases the price of energy, I don't say it is a dirty trick in an election year, but I think it would be certainly inflationary and irresponsible, if I can phrase it that way. I'm sure the leader of the NDP couldn't help but support that point of view.

Mr. Lewis: Without question. I just wanted to know how paranoid he was.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Any further questions?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as I always say, it takes one to know one.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier is right, but we don't talk about it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is there a supplementary on that last question?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Supplementary, Mr. Speaker; Does the Premier think the federal government, as an anti-inflationary measure, should try to cut back its expenditures in all fields?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think once again the chief economist of the NDP has asked me a question that relates to economic considerations.

Mr. Speaker: That was not a supplementary question, but if it is a short answer we will allow it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am always prepared to give a short answer but when I'm asked such a complicated question by the member for High Park, which really involves a detailed analysis of the total economy of

Canada at this precise moment, I can't do it in very short order. If I go beyond five or 10 minutes, I would be quite prepared to have you deduct anything over the 10 minutes from the question period. I wouldn't object to that strenuously. Now what was the question?

In general terms, if one is covering all federal government expenditures, the answer would probably be no. I think that in terms of the economy one has to weigh the social need for housing, the need for stimulation of the construction industry to provide jobs, against the impact of inflation.

If I were asked by the member for High Park to try to sort out some of these priorities, I would have to say that further expenditure in the field of housing, while it may or may not have an inflationary impact, depending on what settlements are made related to both the wages and whatever happens to prices for building materials, the benefits derived from further impetus in the housing field in terms of jobs and the social need—the requirements of people for housing—I think, Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of decision that I would make if I were in the federal government. Yes, we would spend more on housing if we had the decision to be made at Ottawa.

Mr. Deans: Why didn't the government just spend what it had?

Mrs. Campbell: That's right. Let it spend what it hasn't spent.

BED SITUATION AT LONDON HOSPITAL

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask the Minister of Health why it is that patients are being turned away from the University Hospital in London—they have come from the outlying districts to use the special facilities there—because of a shortage of approved beds when actually there are 60 beds which the hospital has never been allowed to make operational because of decisions here at Queen's Park? What is the rationale in that procedure?

Hon. F. S. Miller (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, on that basis I would assume the Leader of the Opposition is not in favour of any attempts to constrain costs in the health care system.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I am certainly not in favour of 60 beds being built at public expense and then never being used. What is the saving there?

Hon. Mr. Miller: There are many times when we plan ahead—something the member's party seldom does—and we planned for a change in the pattern in that city.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Besides which, it is the federal government's fault.

Hon. Mr. Miller: It is a beautiful new hospital but at this point in time this hospital, like many other hospitals in the province—

Interejections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Miller: —was designed as a shell, and to have more beds than we currently need. We will—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The government doesn't need them but the sick people in Western Ontario need them.

Hon. Mr. Miller: Any number of beds at any point in time can be filled with patients. The Liberal critic for health—if the member reads his comments and I am sure he must—has consistently told me I haven't had the courage to close more beds. If the member is turning around telling me we should open up every bed we have the competence to do, then I don't agree.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Can the minister really be attempting to make a virtue out of the fact that the deplorable planning, the responsibility of his predecessors—not his as yet—has left this fantastic hospital there, one of the largest and most expensive in the world, with 60 beds that he will not permit to be opened when the whole concept of the hospital is to be a medical centre for the whole of western Ontario? These patients come in from the smaller communities and are turned back. That's good planning?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, the city of London, as far as I am concerned, is one of those points in Ontario where we have probably an unequalled opportunity to make some of the savings in the health care field we have talked about. The member knows we are negotiating with the federal government right now. He knows we are negotiating with them on Westminster Hospital.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes.

Mr. Singer: I knew it had to be the federal government's fault somehow.

Hon. Mr. Miller: In fact we are getting co-operation from them.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Another dirty trick.

Hon. Mr. Miller: It is not a dirty trick at all. As a matter of fact, it's good common

sense because the Province of Ontario is charged with the responsibility to deliver health care. The federal government has been delivering it at Westminster to a selected group of people. In a very sensible way we are discussing the amalgamation of facilities, the elimination of redundancy and the saving of many millions of dollars per year in costs.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: In the meanwhile, the patients are turned away.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Shulman: In view of the statement the minister has just made—that he plans ahead—can he explain the form of planning that allowed the Mount Sinai Hospital to build—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is far removed. You may ask it as a new question.

Mr. Lewis: It is not.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. leader was asking about a particular hospital.

Mr. Shulman: Well, then, I will reword it.

Mr. Speaker: No, it is not your turn yet.

Mr. Shulman: May I reword it? Can the minister explain, in view of the fact that this particular hospital is not allowing those beds to be used—

Mr. Speaker: Now it appears to be a supplementary.

Mr. Shulman: —how he plans so well ahead that he allowed new hospitals to be built and before they were even completed, he was shutting down wings in other hospitals?

Hon. Mr. Miller: No, I wouldn't like to answer that question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? The Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary: Is the minister using the 60 beds for anything?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Were there further questions from the Leader of the Opposition? All right, the member for Scarborough West.

TIMISKAMING AREA HOSPITAL

Mr. Lewis: Let me ask the Minister of Health a different kind of question. Is he going to respond favourably to the request from the communities of Cobalt, Haileybury, Latchford and probably from a large number of people in New Liskeard, who would

appreciate a public inquiry into the fashion in which he has manhandled the entire Timiskaming area in its effort to locate, rationally, somewhere, a hospital? Does the minister not now think that their collective request for a public inquiry is legitimate in the terms of what has happened?

Hon. Mr. Miller: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: No. Well then, may I ask the minister how he allows himself to do such violence to the democratic process as to stack a hospital board—deliberately stack a hospital board—in order to have a political decision made? Is there no other authority or power a Minister of Health has than to manipulate a community?

Hon. Mr. Miller: The member has made two statements. One is true and one is not true.

Mr. Lewis: That's not bad.

An hon. member: That's usual.

An hon. member: That's good—50 per cent right. That's better than usual.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): He ought to get his facts before he spouts off.

Hon. Mr. Miller: Did I stack a board? Yes.

Mr. Lewis: Right. Then everything else follows. That's called manipulation.

Hon. Mr. Miller: It is not.

Mr. Lewis: It certainly is.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Hon. Mr. Miller: I have certain authorities given to me as Minister of Health—

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Miller: —which, reluctantly, I have used in that area, after attempting every other form of discussion. To say that the reaction or the original decision was right is wrong. To say that it was political is wrong. As I was quoted quite accurately in the *Globe and Mail* today, no one could accuse me of having made a political decision in this area, because I won't win a vote with what I did; and I will lose many for the party I represent.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Miller: All right, I face that fact. But that does not stop me, once in a while, from doing what in my opinion is correct.

Mr. Singer: Usually it does, but once in a while it doesn't.

Mr. Lewis: We're talking to the minister about health needs.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If the community doesn't agree with him, he still goes ahead.

Hon. Mr. Miller: So, I have very seriously assessed these things. I have made two or three trips to the area to discuss the problem. I have found two groups of people unable to resolve their differences. I have looked at many reports in the area. Look, I wish I could say I know I'm right.

Mr. Lewis: None of the consultants agrees with the minister.

Hon. Mr. Miller: Life is always simple if you know you're right. I believe I'm right.

Mr. Lewis: I understand that.

Hon. Mr. Miller: And having believed I'm right, I've gone ahead on what I think is the proper course of action; and I have used my ministerial authority.

Mr. Lewis: Surely, apart from all the reports by the consultants and the votes, in regard to the board, does the minister not recognize that the appointments are seen publicly as Conservative Party appointments?

Mr. Havrot: No, they're not.

Mr. Lewis: That's right. That's how it is felt up there. That's why there are demands for a public inquiry from people who would never even have countenanced it before. There has to be a better way than to offend entire communities of reasonable people. Is the minister saying that he has exhausted every avenue open to him other than the stacking of a board? And in that case, is it worth it?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, it had got to the point where having gone up and discussed this thing, as I say, two or three times, and having received a number of conflicting reports, the board had got to the point where no issue was being dealt with. If the members from New Liskeard turned up, the members from Haileybury didn't. If the members from Haileybury turned up, the members from New Liskeard didn't.

Mr. D. W. Ewen (Wentworth North): Shame, shame!

Mr. Lewis: That's not quite true.

Mr. Havrot: The leader of the NDP should get the facts.

Hon. Mr. Miller: The decision was geographic. There were nine people representing the Haileybury interests geographically. There were six people representing the New Liskeard interests geographically. The hospital is on the town line, the new site that I've chosen. That board was created out of two boards with only one objective in mind, to select a site and build a new hospital. They all accepted that as their terms of reference. They'll start denying it at this point in time, but they did accept it until the decision was made—and then the place fell apart.

Mr. Lewis: They made several decisions. The minister reversed them.

Hon. Mr. Miller: I reversed one decision.

Mr. Lewis: The minister reversed all of the choices and he made his choice.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Miller: I reversed the one. I chose site No. 3. I have seen it and I believe it is correct.

Mr. Lewis: This is not the way to deal with small communities.

Hon. Mr. Miller: I can only say this, we determine that a new hospital is required and there is no way of resolving the local differences. Look, when they had to put the Haileybury fire plaque up they put it up in Earlton and called it the great fire, for the same reasons. So I didn't have much chance of getting much reaction.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions, the member for Scarborough West?

MULTI-SERVICE CENTRES

Mr. Lewis: I want to ask the Provincial Secretary for Social Development what, if anything, is ever going to happen to the request from the Agincourt Community Services Association for a grant from this government—from one of the ministries of the government of which the minister is a part—to which request she responded enthusiastically in June of 1974 and October of 1974? It is now March of 1975 and no grant has yet come through and the service is faced with collapse.

Hon. M. Birch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): Mr. Speaker, the Agincourt Community Services Association falls into a category that has no established government policy, which is a multi-service

centre, and that is under active consideration in our policy field at the moment.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask her colleague, the Minister of Community and Social Services, why, when support was sought from him in December of 1974, the minister did not reply to the group, despite knowing that his colleague had had much contact with it?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): Policy on this whole matter, Mr. Speaker, is being considered. The Ministry of Health and my ministry have funded, on an experimental basis, the North York multi-service concept and I believe this is in its third year. But a policy decision on this whole question has not yet been made.

Mr. Lewis: One further question: Does the minister understand that this association, which has done extraordinary work—as acknowledged by the Provincial Secretary for Social Development—has been at the government's door for nine months now, begging, and it cannot get a policy decision and faces closure on March 31? Can the minister not give them a decision in this instance?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I also would like to add that there was a meeting held last week, I believe it was last Thursday, with representatives from the Ministry of Culture and Recreation to look into whether some assistance could be given to it as an information centre, and also there are other avenues that are being approached. We are in agreement that it is a very worthwhile organization and we are trying to find ways and means to assist it in the meantime.

Mr. Lewis: Well, I don't understand this. I want to press it because they are all in limbo out there, these organizations. They have seen the Provincial Secretary for Social Development, they have seen—

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Is there a question?

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, the minister says to me that they have gone to Culture and Recreation—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That's for information centres.

Mr. Lewis: That is three successive ministries in nine months. Will it ever end? Will the multi-service centre ever have funding? That is what I am asking.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I would hope so. I think the hon. member appreciates that the

whole question of the funding of those types of organizations is a very complex one. As the hon. member knows, we have under review right now the whole question of assistance to social planning councils. The green paper should be out within the next few weeks. There have been meetings throughout the whole province and this again relates to this question—that is, a relation with the multi-purpose centres.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question: When will the minister's special study on multi-service centres and the guidelines therefor be available?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It is difficult to say just when they will be available. This subject was discussed at the last policy meeting yesterday and the question is being very actively considered. As to when the guidelines will be out, I think at this time, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to say.

Mr. MacDonald: Has the special committee produced a report for the minister as yet?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West?

HOUSING COSTS

Mr. Lewis: Just a last question of the Treasurer: Can the Treasurer indicate to the Legislature what changes he intends to make in social policy, perhaps with the Land Speculation Tax Act and other areas, to reverse the position in Toronto, which hasn't been reversed, despite all the protestations from his predecessor about housing, so that for the first time in the history of the Metro Toronto area the average house price in March, 1975, has exceeded \$60,000 for the first two weeks of this month? The average real estate housing transaction in the Metro Toronto area this month is \$60,499. What in God's name can be done to overcome that, which is obviously placing such restrictions on the market that it's hopeless for most middle-income families?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, any substantive changes which may or may not be made will be announced on April 7.

Mr. Renwick: On April 7?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I haven't seen the figures to which the member for Scarborough West referred. What happened last spring is

that house prices in Metropolitan Toronto stabilized, indeed fell, and within the last couple of months have grown by, I think, \$1,700. That's the figure that sticks in my mind but I don't have the figures here in front of me.

Mr. Lewis: Or greater.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Considering the rate of inflation in the last 12 months has been something in the order of 12 per cent, on a \$50,000 house that would be somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$5,000. One could argue, but I'm not arguing, that the price of housing is something less than the rate of inflation during the last 12 months. I'm not making that argument but there it is and that's a fact. One of the encouraging things—

Mr. Lewis: No, the Treasurer has thrown it in just for the hell of it. I thought he would throw it in.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, because I always like to give the member a little economic lecture whenever I can for his edification.

Mr. Lewis: How does one afford a \$60,500 home?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: One of the encouraging things which should be noted is since the first of the year, a turn-up to some extent in the existing housing market—in the last two, three or four weeks particularly. That, obviously, is going to put some upward pressure on prices.

Mr. Lewis: That is lesson No. 2.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That's lesson No. 2. Lesson No. 3 is that—

Mr. MacDonald: Could the Treasurer explain how that takes place?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —once again, we reject putting some sort of price controls on housing which is the NDP's darling over there and by which they would have us living in the most controlled economy.

Mr. Renwick: Does the Treasurer think that the taxpayers' pocket is a bottomless pit?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It would take away every bit of initiative there is and it would have us all living in that socialist Valhalla which, pray God, will never occur in Ontario while we're around running the store and running it so very well.

Mr. Lewis: It would be good for the Treasurer.

Mr. MacDonald: The Treasurer would feel better.

Mr. Lewis: Cutting sugar cane in Cuba. The Treasurer with a machete.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Simcoe East.

FACILITIES ON THE TRENT-SEVERN SYSTEM

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. Is the minister aware that the federal government, through its parks branch, has announced lock charges for boaters using the Trent-Severn and Rideau systems? Will the minister inquire from the federal ministry what the money will be used for?

An hon. member: What about the CORTS agreement?

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): He didn't even know there was a Trent system.

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Mr. Speaker, I'm not too sure there is any relationship between the action taken by the federal government and the CORTS agreement. Actually the CORTS agreement deals with the land on both sides of the corridor and the treatment of that land. There may be some indirect connection; I'm not too sure, off the top of my head. I'll certainly inquire into the question which the member has asked and find out really whether it does have any relationship to that agreement.

Mr. G. E. Smith: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. G. E. Smith: Would the minister give us his assurance that he will refer this to the CORTS committee because it seems to me that a \$3 or \$4 a day locking charge, particularly if the revenues are not going to be funnelled back into upgrading the facilities along the Trent-Severn, is a little much. I would hope, because of the boating traffic and the need for improved facilities, he may use his influence through the committee to get the message to the federal government.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I'll certainly take that in hand—

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Like gasoline tax.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and study any effect it may have with the agreement.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview has been waiting very patiently.

LAW-AND-ORDER LEGISLATION

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General. Could the Attorney General tell us what steps he is taking to implement that fascinating paragraph in Her Honour's speech at the opening of this session relating to law and order? Would he agree that a fair summation of the intent behind that paragraph is that we have nothing to fear but fear itself?

Hon. J. T. Clement (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Mr. Speaker, I think within a matter of days certain announcements will be made in this room which will ease the burden which has been placed on the hon. member for Downsview. I think that I'll say no more, unless he wants some kind of reassurance from me that he will be safe. Even I wouldn't make that assurance here in this House.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

HAMILTON HEALTH CARE FACILITY

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health.

Mrs. Campbell: Where is he?

Mr. Deans: He's here; he just has his back turned. What action has been taken by the health council in Hamilton to meet the criteria that were established by the minister some six months ago to develop a health care facility in the east end of the city?

Hon. Mr. Miller: I can't answer the question in detail. I'll get the answer for the member. As he knows, this was one of the criteria we set up in permitting the redevelopment of one of the hospitals in the core. It had been studied and we met with the health planning council and with the regional government representatives in the city, all of whom wanted the redevelopment of the hospital in that particular spot.

Our ministry hadn't been that keen on a redevelopment downtown. But when we set these other terms of reference, including the requirement that health care be provided in that area and that they were to come up with a plan, it was accepted by both sides. I can't tell the member what that progress has been, but I will find out for him.

Mr. Deans: Just one supplementary question: Can the minister indicate whether there

is a time limit on the council coming up with this plan in order that the people in the east end of the city have their fears allayed with regard to the delays that have taken place for 25 or 30 years and the promises that have been made over that period of time?

Hon. Mr. Miller: I'm not sure, but it's in the letter. It's reasonable that there should be one and I'm quite prepared to see that we discuss a feasible time limit for that answer.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kit-chenery.

CHAIN STORE PRICING

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations with respect to the computer checkout programmes that some grocery stores are now considering introducing. Are staff of the ministry involved with respect to the monitoring of the problems that some of the consumer association groups have suggested can occur in that whole procedure? Is the minister co-operating with the federal authorities who are interested as well in ensuring that the consumer's interest is protected, so that the matters of shelf pricing and price changes at the cash desk itself are going to be worked out so that the consumer's interest is protected?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, of course, we are aware of the growing tendency to experiment in this line. At the present time, there are a few experiments going on in Ontario. I'm not aware of any federal agency which is controlling it or concerned about it, except for the Food Prices Review Board, which of course has no authority to do anything except report on it. Certainly my ministry is aware of it. We have not been contacted by any of the consumer organizations. We are monitoring the situation, which is experimental at the present time.

I must say there are some concerns in the ministry about the possible bad effects of this type of experiment on the consumer. However, I'm quite sure that particularly the supermarket chains that are experimenting will co-operate in any measures that we see might affect the consumer's interest in any retrograde way.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

PRICE OF MILK

Mr. MacDonald: To the same minister: In keeping with the minister's concern for the

consumer, can he give the House any indication as to whether his ministry is going to examine what justification, if any, there is for the dairies' adding one or two cents to the proposed increase in the price of milk, stemming from an application of the milk formula?

Secondly, will his ministry consider establishing some mechanism so that each time there is an increase in the price of milk to meet the needs of the producers in accordance with their formula, there isn't a unilateral right on the part of the dairies without any survey to pyramid their increase on top of that?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, since there is no mechanism, obviously the answer to the first part is no. There is no mechanism to do what the hon. member suggests we do.

Mr. MacDonald: Sure there is. The minister could establish it on an ad hoc basis.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We don't have any mechanism at the present time. As far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, a duplication of the Food Prices Review Board in Ottawa would be absolutely ridiculous. They have the mechanism to review it and report on it. There is no intention in my ministry to duplicate that effort.

Mr. MacDonald: That is a copout.

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of his predecessor's contention that he was going to establish, by what mechanism it would be interesting to know, excess profits in the province and take action whenever it was deemed advisable, couldn't the minister consult with him and establish a mechanism that might do that here in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, before I made any commitment along that line I would have to review my predecessor's statement with him.

Mr. MacDonald: Copout No. 2.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of the Environment.

CANADA METAL CO. PLANT

Hon. W. Newman (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, in response to a question asked on Tuesday by the hon. member for Huron concerning the emission of arsenic from the Canada Metal plant, I am advised that the quantity of arsenic emitted from this plant is estimated to be approxi-

mately 460 lb per year. This plant is operating within the permissible limits for arsenic emission as set out by our regulations.

Mr. J. Riddell (Huron): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister then satisfied with the arsenic standard for ambient air of not more than 25 micrograms per cubic metre over a 24-hour period, which I believe was established by the Ministry of Health?

Hon. W. Newman: Our present requirement is 25 micrograms per cubic metre in the ambient air, and certainly we are always looking at this. There are some that are much lower. Our counterparts below the border are looking at it, and so are we at the same time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: The minister I wanted to question has left.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville then.

LA SALLE RESIDENTS' SUIT AGAINST U.S. COMPANIES

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of the Environment.

Is the minister aware of the precedent-setting \$2.2 million pollution damage suit being instituted by residents in the La Salle area against US corporations? Has the ministry been involved in any fashion, either by the provision of data, or the supplying of personnel, legal assistance or financial assistance, in an attempt to help these residents of Ontario succeed against the US polluters?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I can answer the member's question in part. Any data or information we have regarding pollution, we will make available to the residents in the area. We don't supply legal services, no.

Mr. B. Newman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Has the minister been asked by the Canadian group, the Windsor group that is instituting this suit, for any specific information? And is the minister aware that the amount of pollutants that is spread over the Windsor area is about 12 million tons a year?

Hon. W. Newman: Well, I can't answer the member's question regarding a specific request, but if a request does come through

we certainly will be glad to supply them with information.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

MOOSE POPULATION

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development, in the absence of the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier).

In view of the declining moose population in the Thunder Bay district and northwestern Ontario generally, and the extreme pressure being exerted upon the species, is the policy field giving consideration to measures to protect the species, other than the mere raising of the non-resident hunting fee for moose to \$175?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the question properly should be directed to the Minister of Natural Resources. I'll make sure it is drawn to his attention.

Mr. Foulds: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Has the minister not brought to the policy secretariat for consideration other specific measures to protect the species, such as closing the period for sale of all licences on the opening day of the season, mandatory registration of all moose kills, as well as the selling of licences only through ministry offices?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, these matters have been discussed in the policy field.

Mr. Speaker: The Chairman of Management Board has the answer to a question asked previously.

AWARDS FOR ADVERTISING WORK

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to answer a question on advertising which was raised on March 14 by the Leader of the Opposition.

I would like it noted, Mr. Speaker, that in 1973-1974 it was the policy of the government to make each ministry responsible for contracting its own communications services and for employing its own agency of record to ensure advantageous rates.

On March 26, 1974, Management Board approved a directive on competitive purchasing which was expanded to provide, on

May 28, 1974, a specific directive relating to contracts with non-government suppliers for communication services. This directive was amplified on Sept. 24, 1974, to provide further guidelines and procedures.

These directives have since been formally incorporated in the manual of administration. They cover agreements for the provision of the following services: advertising, public relations, writing, photography, design, graphics, exhibits, audio-visual and film-making services from the planning stages to production.

They apply to all agreements estimated in excess of \$2,000 but not more than \$100,000. Those arrangements estimated in excess of \$100,000 are referred to Management Board for approval prior to commitment. Ministries are required to solicit a minimum of three quotations from suppliers selected in an objective and equitable manner. Tenders must be opened publicly and ministries are required to document their reasons for non-acceptance of the lowest responsible bid.

This brief description of the very comprehensive directives of the government is evidence, Mr. Speaker, of the prompt action taken by the government in March, 1974, to respond to the observations of the Provincial Auditor in his report which was tabled on Nov. 30, 1973. I can say with confidence, Mr. Speaker, that these procedures in a field which has traditionally been difficult to regulate are not exceeded by any jurisdiction in Canada in promoting the cause of fair competition amongst suppliers in optimizing value and service for the public moneys expended. I should add that a single agency of record has since been established by the Ministry of Industry and Tourism. This agency was selected under the procedures of which I have just described.

Mr. Speaker, as I am the minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission, Management Board approved on Nov. 13, 1973, a request to form a contract with the Drake Advertising Agency regarding employment advertisements. The submission to Management Board had requested that the requirements to obtain at least three tenders be waived for the following reasons:

The agency has considerable experience with the unique needs and requirements of the government of Ontario, having provided this service continuously to the commission since the spring of 1967.

The Civil Service Commission is in the process of developing a policy on employment advertising for public servants and it

is felt that it would be expedient to maintain the status quo until existing policy and related systems have been amended or replaced.

I should mention that the advertising carried out by the Civil Service Commission is purely for filling of positions in the public service and costs are charged back to the appropriate ministry. Drake was given three months notice on Jan. 1, 1975, that the existing contract will be cancelled on March 31, 1975. Tenders have been invited and 25 were received. Six of the 25 have been invited to submit further details. Drake is one of those.

Mr. Speaker: I think time will allow one supplementary.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I wonder if the minister could then explain the procedures which led the Provincial Auditor to criticize the actions of the Management Board for allowing more than \$3 million in contracts to be let without even an agreement, let alone a tender. If his intent was to control it, as he has described, then why did he let those \$3 million to companies like Dalton Camp Associates under the previous procedure, which led to the criticism?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I will make brief reply, Mr. Speaker. I think if the Leader of the Opposition will examine more carefully into the question that was raised by the Provincial Auditor, he will find that they have been in accordance with the directives. If the expenditures at that time weren't, they are now subject to the directives.

Mr. Speaker: The question period has now expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS AMENDMENT ACT, 1974

Mr. B. Newman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Employment Standards Act, 1974.

Ⓜotion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to limit the work day to eight hours and the work week to 40 hours.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

NOTICE OF MOTION No. 1

Clerk of the House: Government notice of motion No. 1 by Hon. Mr. Snow.

RESOLUTION: That, as Mr. Donald R. Irvine, member for Grenville-Dundas, holds a 50 per cent interest in Irvine Realities (Prescott) Ltd.; and as Irvine Realities (Prescott) Ltd. has a 50 per cent interest in the lands and premises of which the other 50 per cent is held by Francis Realities (Prescott) Ltd., the lands and premises being described as:—All and singular that certain parcel or tract of land being in the city of Brockville, in the county of Leeds and being composed of lot 78 in Block 30, together with the water lot in front thereof as described in a Crown grant issued to the late Martha Ann Findlay, dated March 17, 1855, registered in Book 29 for the town of Brockville as instrument number 7534; and as Irvine Realities (Prescott) Ltd. and Francis Realities (Prescott) Ltd. have agreed with Pepperidge Properties Ltd. to sell to it the said lands and premises by an agreement for sale, which is dated June 27, 1974, and registered Dec. 19, 1974, as instrument No. 68811 in the land registry office at Brockville; and as Pepperidge Properties Ltd. have offered to lease to the Minister of Government Services approximately 5,100 sq ft of the said premises at approximately \$7 per square foot per year for a term of five years for court purposes, the Minister of Government Services may enter into the proposed said lease agreement and Donald R. Irvine's seat in the assembly shall not thereby be vacated, nor he thereby be rendered ineligible as a member of, or to sit, or vote in the assembly.

Hon. Mr. Snow moves Resolution No. 1.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this resolution be concurred in?

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I think we'll find several things that perhaps could be said with respect to this motion.

I suppose the first thing we should do is go back to Jan. 6, 1960, when the two companies referred to were first incorporated. Later in that year the property in question, the subject of this motion, was purchased.

While the building was leased to M. Loeb for a 20-year term, it so happened that the lease, even though it mentioned no particular consideration, did involve transactions with

four or five other properties in eastern Ontario.

However, Loeb vacated the property before the lease expired, so we have the circumstance where the two particular companies attempting now to sell the property, which in turn is to be leased to the government of Ontario, are in some particular difficulty.

It was rather interesting to see that the property was taken over by this new interest, Pepperidge Properties Ltd., which apparently is operated by Mr. William Watson, who was a real estate agent in the area in the 1960s. He also is involved with Merrickville Estates.

This property was then purchased for \$150,000. Really, what we have to deal with in the question before us at this time is the matter of the mortgage. It was taken back on closing for \$125,000 and, therefore, might under foreclosure be possibly a property owned by the member for Grenville-Dundas through his corporate involvement. This, of course, might put the contract with the Ministry of Government Services into some seeming conflict of interest.

It was rather interesting to read in the Ottawa Citizen an article dealing with this matter, because it seemed almost that the problem of attempting to avoid a conflict of interest brought with it certain rather curious results. Perhaps I might just quote briefly from the article and the involvement in the community once the declaration made by the member for Grenville-Dundas took place:

As a result of the declaration, plans to take over the building were dropped like a hot potato and the word went out that another location would have to be found.

The action was clearly an attempt to avoid any suggestion of hanky-panky, following a series of conflict of interest charges that have plagued the Davis government and last week's disclosures by the Globe and Mail concerning party fund-raising activities.

Unfortunately for the Conservatives, the city hasn't thanked the government for making a clean breast of it.

The decision has touched off a storm of protests from city council, the downtown business association and the legal profession, which are demanding the government reverse itself and locate the court downtown.

Even His Honour Judge John Deacon felt so strongly he took off his robes and

came out swinging against the government.

In an unusual public statement, the provincial court judge accused Mr. Irvine of "demonstrating a conflict of interest position" by using his influence or authority "to block the acquisition of eminently suitable accommodation."

Well, I am sure that the hon. Minister of Housing (Mr. Irvine) was not attempting to set himself up as a straw man in order to be knocked down and have this whole matter cause a problem within his community. However, cause a problem it did, and we are now dealing with this notice of motion in order to resolve the problem.

I suppose two comments could be made with respect to this particular building and to its present owner. The first is that this building no doubt will receive a historic plaque from the government of Ontario rather soon, because it was the campaign headquarters of the present member for Leeds in the federal House, Mr. Tom Cossitt, in the 1974 general election.

The owner of the building, Pepperidge Estates, as I have mentioned, is controlled or operated by William Watson, who also operates a company called Merrickville Estates. Now, just to show the abilities of Mr. Watson, it would appear that he made a proposal for an OHAP project early in January, 1974. And indeed before the end of the year, before 1974, it had received all of the necessary approvals, which surely is amazingly fast even for an OHAP proposal. So, certainly, the parties involved are skillful in dealing with various kinds of projects.

I think the interest within the community is served by the approval of this particular motion, Mr. Speaker.

Certainly, the courthouse requirement in moving out of an already crowded city hall is necessary to be dealt with, and we have no intention of opposing the motion or of making any particular political issue out of the fact of a possible eventual ownership of the building. Surely, the interest of the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas is not going to be increased in any way simply as a person involved with the company, who is a mortgage holder on the building.

Since the minister has indicated that there could be a change of heart and this matter could be proceeded with if the opposition parties went on record in Hansard as supporting the proposed downtown location, I am pleased to go on record in that particular. I suggest that certainly so far as we are con-

cerned, the location seems to be the best suitable for this particular purpose.

I suggest that the motion be approved so that the member in question, the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas, does not stand in any jeopardy in either the vacation of his seat in this circumstance, or in being rendered ineligible as a member of the assembly. Certainly his ineligibility or the vacation of his seat can be taken care of perhaps more easily in a general election.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments? The hon. minister.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the hon. member for Kitchener has fairly well researched this particular event.

I can point out a couple of minor details which perhaps he did not get to the bottom of completely. He refers to Pepperidge Properties Ltd. as the owner of this property. To my knowledge, not being of the legal profession, Pepperidge Properties is not the owner, because they only hold a registered agreement of sale. The deed of the property is still in the name of the two companies, one of which is owned by Mr. Irvine or Mr. Irvine's family.

Mr. Breithaupt: And still subject to the lease.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Of course, the property is still leased to the old company under a 20-year lease that does not expire until 1979. That is the reason for the agreement to purchase, rather than a straight purchase of the property with a mortgage back. I've pointed out there is no mortgage back. Of the \$150,000 agreed purchase price, a \$25,000 payment was made. The other \$125,000 payment, I believe, is to be made on closing, which is on the expiration of the old lease on Sept. 25, or some such date, of 1979.

So, the problem really is that the property, if one searches it at the registry office, is legally in the name of the Irvine Realities and Francis Realities, and that cannot be changed until 1979, when the head lease, which covers this property and four or five other properties, expires with the old company.

Now, I believe Mr. Watson and his firm, Pepperidge Properties Ltd., agreed to purchase this property back in March, 1974. They were negotiating at that time with the Leeds-Grenville board of education to

remodel this property and lease it for an office for the board of education. That deal was never finalized.

However, the purchase of the property or the formalization of the agreement of sale took place and was signed on June 27, 1974, although it was not registered until Dec. 1974, because of the fact that the new proposed owner or holder of the agreement to purchase, in order to make use of the property, had to negotiate a sublease from Loeb. So, really, Loeb is still, as I understand it, paying rent to the former owners, Mr. Irvine and Irvine Realities and Francis Realities, and then in turn subleasing the property to the proposed new owner, who proposes to remodel the property and again, I guess, sublease to my ministry for the accommodation of the court.

So as you can see, Mr. Speaker, it is a somewhat complicated deal. There is a possibility, as the member for Kitchener stated, of the deal not being formalized, or being repossessed or foreclosed on by way of the mortgage. I don't think this is possible because there is no mortgage, but on the other hand if, on the closing date in 1979, Mr. Watson or his company—Pepperidge Properties Ltd.—were not able to come up with the \$125,000 to close the transaction, as it is agreed upon, then presumably the deal would not close, the property would remain in the ownership of Irvine Realities Ltd. and Francis Realities Ltd.

In the meantime, my ministry would be a tenant in the building for presumably a five-year term which would run by that date in 1975. So there is the possibility—remote though it may be—that for a period in late 1979 or early 1980 the Crown could be a tenant of a company partly owned by the member for Grenville-Dundas, and as we are quite confident that he will still be the member for Grenville-Dundas sitting on the government benches at that time, we wanted to clarify this matter. I hope, between the member for Kitchener and myself, we have put the whole story on the record.

Resolution concurred in.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (continued)

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I am going to turn to a very delicate matter now, which I have had the opportunity of discussing with the other doctors in this House, and something which I hope will not be misunderstood when I speak to it. It is a very serious problem which is affecting every medical school in the province, but most particularly the University of Toronto medical school, and that has to do with the admission policy and with the tremendous number of students who are attempting to get into a very limited number of places.

Perhaps I can lay the groundwork best by reading extracts from two letters here which completely confuse the situation. The first one is from one, James A. C. Auld, who presumably is the minister in charge, and he has written a letter here dated Dec. 2, 1974, in which he says:

In Ontario, all policies dealing with admissions fall directly within the jurisdiction of each university. I am sure you would agree that it would not be in the best interests of higher education if I, or any of my officials, were to interfere with the management of these autonomous bodies.

That is clear cut enough. The minister responsible says it is up to the university. Alas and alack, I have a letter dated exactly the same day from the dean of the school of medicine at the University of Toronto, and he writes as follows:

You must understand that the policy is not of our own making. The council of the faculty of medicine is simply following the generally accepted line of our elected representatives, and if you feel that these policies are wrong, I can only suggest to you that you should speak to your member of parliament to try and influence the governments concerned with setting up these policies.

Now we have it clear cut. The university thinks it is up to the government and the government is sure it is not up to it, it is up to the universities. With that kind of situation there is very little question as to why the confusion has developed. The situation is so bad that I have a copy here of the *Varsity* for Oct. 28, and the lead editorial for that day says the situation in the medical

school is quite literally tearing the faculty apart.

This is all the result of the Medicare system that we brought in some years ago. There are side effects coming from that which no one ever dreamed could develop. One of the side effects is that doctors are earning a tremendous amount of money, far more in proportion to the general population than they ever did in the past.

I have a son-in-law who graduated in law last year. He got his first paycheque this past week after completing his articling, and he was very pleased because he's going to be earning \$16,000 this year, which apparently is in the top 10th of the class. It's not an unreasonable salary. But if you graduate in medicine this year and complete your internship, and if you're willing to work hard and hustle, there is no problem in taking home \$40,000, \$50,000 or \$60,000.

An hon. member: Net?

Mr. Shulman: Net. With that kind of a monetary reward, it is very easy to understand what is happening to the schools of medicine. There is tremendous pressure to get in. There is tremendous pressure to get this fantastic job for the rest of your life. I can understand it, but it has led to all sorts of very serious difficulties.

The situation this year at the University of Toronto, which is typical of the other universities, is that there were 2,350 applicants for only 240 places. What is causing a great deal of dismay and upset is that of those 240 places, about 60, or some 25 per cent, were given to landed immigrants—non-citizens of Canada.

The situation has become so bad that in the effort to get into medicine, students are no longer taking the courses which would best prepare them. Instead, they are taking the courses which will best get them in, and that has nothing to do with the practice of medicine.

At the University of Toronto there are absolutely no interviews. The choices are made by computer, and the computer measures only one thing. It measures the marks you get, and it doesn't care what courses you get them in. So now the smart student, and I use that word parenthetically, will take the bird-dog courses, the courses in which he can get the highest marks possible.

Let me quote Jim Prentice, a professor of physics at the University of Toronto, who says that the emphasis on marks "completely screws up the learning process." He goes on:

In order to get the highest marks possible, students take courses which they figure are the easiest. Unfortunately, the easiest courses are usually those which do not lead to any future work in that subject area.

This is not a secret. This is well known among every student who is hoping to get into medicine. The result is that we had about 2,300 students this past year who took courses that lead nowhere. About 2,100 of those students are not getting into medicine, and they are now in the position of having wasted two years of their time, two years of the school's time and having fouled up the school system to boot.

Let me quote Mr. Tony Key, who is an associate professor in the physics department at the University of Toronto. Last week Key's 9 a.m. class was filled to overflowing. There was literally not an empty seat in the lecture hall. Key has said he will not teach the course next year. I quote him:

The problem is, how can I teach students when 65 per cent of them don't really want to take the course? It would save me a hell of a lot of trouble if pre-med students came to my class wanting to learn physics instead of getting As.

The emphasis on grading leads to antagonism between students and teachers, which is inimical to the teaching process. Key cited the case of students in one tutorial who now have a hostile relationship with their tutor because the latter didn't raise their grades by four per cent or five per cent on a recent quiz.

I quote him again:

How can we teach effectively in these circumstances? I get very frustrated. More and more of my time is taken up with this. The whole atmosphere is one of competition with one's neighbour. The whole system, as we have to live with it, is very frustrating.

I go on with the quotation:

There are horror stories. Students now hoard library books so nobody else can use them. There is quite a bit of cheating. Students won't tell other students what happened at a class that they missed, because the competition has become so severe that they want the other students to fail. Students refuse to lend lecture notes to fellow students or refuse to discuss problems set. The system of admission to medical school is the biggest incentive to this bad competition.

This numbers game has a disastrous effect on the future careers of nine out of 10 of the students who apply and who are not accepted into medical school. Because if they really want to get into medical school, they must take courses in which they think they can get the highest marks. That means that a student with a 91 average will be accepted before a student with a 90 average. A difference of one great point can be the difference between being accepted and being rejected.

This means that if you wish to take the more difficult courses, which might lead to a future specialization or a future value in something other than medicine, you are likely to get lower marks and thus you are not likely to get into medicine at all. And if you want to get higher marks you have to take the useless courses.

This means that those who want to get into medical school can't afford to take the best things for medicine. They have to proceed on the assumption they are going to get into medicine, even though nine out of 10 of them are going to fail.

That means that last year 2,100 bright, hardworking students who didn't get accepted had effectively wasted two or three years of education. They wasted their own time. They wasted their own money. They wasted the province's money. They wasted the time of the university and the time of the teachers. And their talents have been wasted. This, surely, is an outrageous price to pay for admission policy based only on an academic standard. It would be an outrageous price to pay even if the medical school was satisfied it is the best possible system, but even they don't think it is.

Edward Llewellyn-Thomas, dean of the faculty of medicine, says, and I quote him:

There is no correlation between marks and the ability to be a good physician. When you get people with a B average or better, a few marks one way or the other won't make any difference.

It's an unfortunate situation, and what are we going to do about it?

I wonder if all the members are aware there is only one group that is discriminated against. If you happen to come from a province other than Ontario—if you happen to have done your studying in Manitoba—then you are not allowed in. The system at the University of Toronto is to give first priority to Canadian citizens who are Ontario residents and landed immigrants; they are lumped together. Way below them, kept down in the small 2½ per cent group, and

others—and that includes foreigners; that is, people applying from outside the country. But foreigners also means people coming from other provinces.

It just doesn't make any sense. The landed immigrants who have been here two or three years, who are not Canadian citizens, are allowed in in huge numbers; we have 25 per cent of them. Canadian citizens born in Manitoba or Quebec or other provinces are not allowed in. It is senseless.

The letter here from the dean is dated Nov. 8, 1974, and says what we have done is to "create a pattern of discrimination against our own sons and daughters." I agree with him completely.

Nobody likes the system and perhaps we should go back a bit and I should explain how this system came about. Up until some eight years ago the university had a quota system. There was a quota for women. There was a quota for Jews. There was a quota for children of doctors. There was a quota for children of alumni. Once all the quotas were filled, then the balance was filled from WASPs. It was wrong; there is no question the system was wrong.

A new dean came in and when he learned of this quota system he was very upset and he threatened to make it public if it wasn't changed. The response of the university was: "If you can work out a better system, do so."

This man, with the best will in the world, brought in the only system he thought was fair. He said: "The only thing we are going to consider is marks. We are not going to interview people, because if you interview them the bias of the interviewers come into it. We are going to have a computer do the whole thing. We are going to feed it all into a machine, and then we'll let the computer decide who gets into medicine."

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Must have been from Hong Kong.

Mr. Shulman: No he wasn't from Hong Kong, actually, he was from another area.

The intriguing thing is what happened the first year the quota went out. The dean was happy. It turned out there was some 28 per cent of the class, or perhaps there was 30 per cent that year, who were landed immigrants, largely from Asia. They were brilliant, they did fantastically well on the exams—everything went well. This was three years ago. Everything went well until this year, when they started taking clinical classes. The professors discovered to their horror that a very significant proportion of these people,

something like a third of them, could not communicate with the patients. They couldn't understand what the patients were saying and the patients couldn't understand what they were saying because they had learned English from books; they could read it and write it but they couldn't understand it. They couldn't communicate.

Suddenly we have this terrible problem where we are going to be graduating a tremendous number of doctors who quite literally will not understand what their patients are complaining about. And quite literally their patients will not understand what they are telling them to do. Obviously this system won't work. We have to change it. We have to at least ensure that the students we are letting into medicine can communicate with the public and can understand their patients' problems.

The Medical Alumni Association was terribly upset about the whole thing. They wrote a letter to the university faculty council, saying the system was wrong, in effect that we were discriminating against our own Canadian students and it should be changed. They asked for permission to be represented on the selection committee. They wrote this letter to the dean of medicine; alas, their request to be represented on the selection committee was ignored, and no one from the Medical Alumni Association is on that committee.

What is the situation now if you want to apply for medicine? Let's suppose you are a brilliant student and you have got an A average. Well, I have a statement here from the dean of the medical school, saying if you have a straight-A average—nothing below an A—you've got a 50-50 chance of getting into medicine—50-50 with a straight-A average!

Obviously the solution is not a simple one. Dean Llewellyn-Thomas has come up with a suggestion that instead of using a computer, instead of using a quota system, we should have a lottery. This is the most incredible thing I have ever heard. In other words, you put the names of everybody who applies in a hat and pull those names out of the hat, and from that you decide who is going to get into medicine. Well, that is just—to me that is just so far out that I find it absolutely unacceptable.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Maybe there would be as good a selection.

Mr. Shulman: Well, I don't know. Obviously the systems we've been using don't work. How in the world are we going to take all those people and say we are going to choose you, not by merit, not by how hard

you work, not by your citizenship, but purely and simply by lot! So I reject that out of hand.

The feeling among the profession—and I am glad the member for Oshawa (Mr. McIlveen) is here to support me on this—is a very bitter one. I am sure there is not a doctor in this province who has not had a colleague come to him and say, "My son applied for medicine and couldn't get in, even though he had top marks." I am sure there are very few MPPs in this House who have not had constituents come to them and say, "I cannot understand it. My son applied to medicine. He has struggled hard all his life. He wants to be a doctor. He can't get in. What can we do about it?" I'm sure all of you have heard this.

It doesn't seem right, and it doesn't seem fair to me, that about 60 places this year should go to people who have come to this country purely and simply to go to medical school. I don't want to be called a racist. I am not a racist. I personally was one of those who fought through the other system and thought it was wrong and had to be changed. But surely we must give preference to our own in something like this.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Do we graduate enough doctors?

Mr. Shulman: Well, that is the other problem—whether we have too many doctors or not enough doctors; I don't want to get into a battle with the Minister of Health (Mr. Miller).

Mr. J. R. Smith: Canadians first.

Mr. Shulman: There is no question that Parkinson's Law applies. As many doctors as you graduate will be busy because the way OHIP is now set up—and looking back now, I realize it was wrong. I was one of those who fought for it, and I confess fully that I was wrong and so was everybody else here. It is set up so as to encourage the public to see doctors, whether they need them or not. It is set up to encourage doctors to bring people back, whether they need to or not. It is set up to encourage waste. This system is leading to bankruptcy.

Somewhere within the Ministry of Health we have to have a change. Actually, this is the first Minister of Health who might be brave enough to do it. He's like a bull in a china shop. He goes places where I would never dare to go. He makes mistakes, but sometimes he does the right thing. And he may bring in the changes that are necessary.

Something has to be done to discourage people from coming to doctors offices who don't have to go there. And if we don't do that, it doesn't matter if you graduate 10,000 doctors this year, they are all going to be busy. They'll see their own families if they have to, because there is a great incentive. The government is paying them for every person who walks into that office. When little Johnny comes in with a cold and the mother has him by the hand, Dr. X says: "And how are you, mother?" And mother says "Oh, I'm feeling better. I had a little cold last week but I feel fine." He writes down mother for another \$6.70. That is human nature. It is not even crooked, it is a part of human nature and it is taking place right across Ontario in every city and town.

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): He usually gets her shirt off first.

Mr. Shulman: Well, perhaps.

Mr. Bounsall: That is what the member requests, is that it?

Mr. Shulman: It depends on her age.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): It also depends on the predilections of the medical doctor concerned.

Mr. Shulman: I personally like boys!

Mr. Bounsall: The member's practice is in Ottawa, is it?

Mr. Shulman: I am moving to Ottawa, yes.

We have here an editorial from the *Medical Post* of Nov. 12, 1974, and this, like it or not, represents a growing antagonistic feeling among the medical profession to the situation as it now obtains at the University of Toronto medical school and elsewhere. I quote:

This year there were 241 seats available to first-year students in the faculty of medicine at the University of Toronto. Of these seats, 33 are occupied by Chinese and 28 other seats are held by students from . . . the US, Lebanon, Egypt, Venezuela, the UK, Jamaica, Yugoslavia, Italy, Korea, Israel, India, Argentina, Guyana and Trinidad.

These 61 foreign-born students represent 25 per cent of the entire first-year class.

There was no method of selection except that of marks. There were no personal interviews. . . .

The admissions committee for the [Toronto] faculty of medicine has literally

given up on all methods of screening for medical students. The stock answer is that there are no "reproducible" tests available which can determine whether one applicant will make a better doctor than another. Even if an applicant did have all the desirable traits, such as motivation, idealism and empathy for people when he started, he stands a good chance of having those traits pounded out of him during his tenure in medical school. So why bother testing him or even interviewing him?

They go on at some length and I don't want to read it all, but I want to read the conclusion, because this is of some merit:

We are not advocating that the seats in the faculty of medicine be reserved entirely for WASP students. That would be racism. But we do feel that surely it is not beyond the capacities of the university and government to devise a system whereby the medical students more nearly represent the cultural and sociological mix of the taxpayers in the province. As the system now stands . . . it is just as discriminatory against the majority in Ontario as the super-intellectuals will charge that our ethnic mix idea is.

I want to say before I go ahead that the leader of the Liberal Party agrees with me. I got some pounding from the Tory side, but before I get any flak from the Liberals I had better read a letter I have here from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon), because he too agrees with this. This letter is dated Oct. 25, 1974:

I feel very strongly that these facilities ought to be available to our own Canadian students and our responsibility to offer the training to citizens of other countries is somewhat less than the fact that I read recently, that 25 per cent of the places at the medical schools were occupied by students from outside Canada.

Mr. Foulds: That is what he believed in October of 1974, I guess.

Mr. Shulman: I have here a more recent editorial from the *Medical Post* which I do not agree with entirely, but I want to put it on the record because it is what an increasing number of people are believing. This is dated Feb. 4, 1975:

We are simply going to have to face up to the fact that here in Canada

we have too many applicants for the available number of seats in the most popular and lucrative professions. A quota system based on the public's needs and preferences must be set up. We have ducked the issue long enough. We might draw comfort from the knowledge that other countries are in the same dilemma, but it will not solve our problem.

It was encouraging to read that the Ontario government's Task Force on Physician Manpower touched on the problem when it recommended that allotment to a reasonable number of places in medical schools be made to "qualified applicants from smaller communities."

Obviously some type of quota system must be set up. It cannot be done by the universities for fear that they will be branded discriminatory. It has to become government policy, and soon.

That surely is true. Universities, when we approach them, duck it. They are frightened stiff of this and they pass it right back to the two governments involved, the federal and the provincial governments. It is the provincial government which must make the move. The federal government can't; all it can do is supply moneys.

I look at other countries. I have a book here from the United States—it is called "Medical School Admission Requirements"—and it is fascinating to see what is done there. In every publicly-funded university across the United States they do not admit people from out of state, and that is the situation. If one compares those universities to our universities, which are publicly funded, they say their taxpayers are paying for those universities, therefore their taxpayers' children must be given first crack at it. In the private universities in the United States, one like Yale where one pays fees of \$5,000 and \$6,000 a year, they let anyone in, depending on marks. This is proper too because they are teaching the world. They are not being subsidized by the American taxpayer. It is an entirely different situation. Surely in our publicly-funded universities our public should get first crack.

I want to talk about the unthinkable for a moment. I want to talk about the students who are coming from Hong Kong and Korea and Singapore and are getting in. There is a great deal of tragedy in their cases, and I have the greatest sympathy for what they have suffered in those other countries. They come over here with their entire family's

future depending on what they do. They do nothing but study and they get incredible marks. They get marks that our students can't consider—98, 99. One lad got 100 per cent. The computer couldn't handle it. It came out at 99 per cent.

The way they do that is they don't socialize. They don't go out with girls. They don't play sports. They don't do anything but work.

I can understand their motivation, because when they succeed and get into medicine they get a lucrative position which represents everything—a veritable fortune. They will then be able to bring in their families from these other countries and support them.

I can sympathize, but their problems must come secondary to ours; and ours are to educate our own students first.

I don't say we should cut these people out completely. We have an obligation to the rest of the world and we have to decide how big that obligation is. I think it is not unreasonable to say we have 240 places in our class this year and we will set aside 10 per cent of those places, 25 places, for students from other countries. Perhaps we should set aside another 10 or 15 places for students from other provinces. But the way this can be handled is not by lottery or not by quota system; though perhaps there should be a quota for areas like northern Ontario, where the basic teaching is not as good and we have to have doctors up there. I can't quarrel with that.

I think there should be preference for people from the disadvantaged areas of the province who can't get the hot-shot teachers that we have. Perhaps we should set aside a certain number for areas in eastern Ontario that don't have enough doctors. This I can go along with, but surely we have to give first preference to the Canadian students who have grown up here and who are residents and citizens of Ontario.

I have one suggestion here—and I see there is a discussion in Medical Post—my suggestion is that after the government sets aside this limited number of places for foreign-born or foreign students, it should offer the remainder of the places to those students who are children of Ontario citizens.

The minister says no. He says we mustn't do that. He says this is against the Human Rights Code. Well I say—and I am agreed with by the leader of the Liberal Party, by many backbenchers in the Conservative Party and I know by at least some people over here; I know that I am supported by the Medical Alumni Association and I know that

I am supported by the many doctors that I have had an opportunity to talk to in the last few weeks—I say that the majority of the seats in the faculty of medicine at the University of Toronto and everywhere else in this province must be kept for the students who have graduated from our high schools, who have gone through our courses of study. If their marks are lower, there are other factors that must be considered.

What do I say to the doctor who practises with me on Roncesvalles Ave., two blocks down, who came to my office three days ago, whose son has planned all his life to take over his father's practice. Two years ago he came to the point where he could apply for medicine and was rejected. He took another year at university to perk up his marks, got them up to an A average and was rejected again last year. He is taking a fourth year at university now, getting another degree and pushing his marks up again.

He will be rejected again, because he can't match up against these other students who have taken their grade 13 in another country. They come over here and repeat it again and they know it backwards, forwards and upside down. When their 99 is better than the computer, how can any lad here compete with that? They can't.

It is only chance the way the system is working that it is 25 per cent foreign-born. It could be 100 per cent foreign-born in the class or 100 per cent landed immigrants in the class. It could be that next year. It's simply chance.

Mr. Bounsall: It's not against the letter of the code, either.

Mr. Shulman: No, it's not against the letter of the code. It's the way the minister is interpreting it and it's not what his colleagues want him to do.

I've talked about the unthinkable and the unspeakable and I've had people come up to me and say, "You can't do it. You can't say it. You'll be called a racist." But racist or not, this is something we have to face; and we must face it now, because an increasing number of people are becoming extremely upset about it. This is what produces racism, this type of reverse racism. We must come to terms with this problem and we have to handle it one way or another; and it has to be handled soon, before the next admission class.

There's another thing. What they're doing is they're feeding student marks from high school and from the two university years into

a computer, and the computer sees only the marks. Can this university not devise an admitting exam to consist of two parts, written and oral? Let the written be 80 per cent or 90 per cent of it; let the oral be 10 per cent or 20 per cent of it. This is not to determine how big are the marks they earn; because now, if he's a smart kid, the student takes the simplest classes, he doesn't take the advanced physics class which will lead him to something, he takes physics 100 which leads to nothing. It's a bird-dog course and he can get 100 in it easily.

Let us have everybody on an equal footing so that when the exams are to be taken we're not comparing one fellow who took a tough class with another fellow who took the easy class. And we're not comparing someone who graduated from a high school where the principal says, "Give them high marks;" with one from another high school where the principal says, "Mark them tough." It's not a fair comparison and the wrong people may be getting in for that very reason. Everyone should take the same examination in the same subject.

There is one examination they all take in the same subject, that's true enough. There is only one exam the university gives and it's called the MCAT—which amounts, I think, to 15 per cent of the mark, a minor thing.

What is the MCAT? This is the most infuriating thing of all; the MCAT is an American exam, administered by Americans and paid for by Canadians to Americans.

Anybody who wants to get into medicine in this province must send \$20 to New York and apply to take a test which is written down there, which is marked down there, which is developed on American standards and which no one in this room could pass.

Last year I determined to take this test and I challenge any of the doctors or anybody else in this room to take the test. I will guarantee members that no one will pass. This test is supposed to determine whether one is fit to go into medicine. No one is fit to go into medicine according to that test.

I took the test. I got a copy of the test—I didn't want to take it officially because certain members of my family were afraid they would be disgraced by my marks—but I managed to get a copy of the test and went over it. I couldn't answer any of the questions. None of them!

Hon. J. P. MacBeth (Minister of Labour): That doesn't surprise us.

Mr. Shulman: I would like to challenge anyone on that side. I'll pay the \$20 to the

USA if one of them will dare take the MCAT test.

Mr. Bounsall: The Minister of Labour.

Mr. Shulman: I would like the minister to take it and I will guarantee him anything he'll fail; because these are tests which have been developed by American professors to determine not what your ability to learn is or your agility of mind but how much you know of certain things which have been taught in American schools. That's it, pure and simple.

One of the tests is current knowledge. One of the questions, believe it or not, was in what year did the Americans drive the British out of Yorktown? All right, I suppose it's of great interest to the United States but it's of very little interest to me. I didn't know it.

When I went to the university to complain about this they said: "Not to worry. There are five parts to that test and we disregard the part about current knowledge because we know that's American. We disregard all of them except the part, the one section, that bears directly." But that one section is the one where I couldn't answer a single question. Okay; I'm incompetent to get into medicine; I would make a very bad doctor, agreed. But I challenge the members for Oshawa, Parkdale (Mr. Duszta) or Ontario (Mr. Dymond) or the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Potter), or anybody else to take that test. And I will guarantee them that no one will pass it.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): The member for Oshawa had better take it.

Mr. McIlveen: I might do that.

Mr. Bounsall: Join the club, the failed-MCAT club.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: Is it beyond the ability of our universities, of our professors, to develop a Canadian test paid for in Canada? Why do we have to send all this money down to the United States every year? From the University of Toronto alone \$40,000 went last year to New York. Why do we send this money to the Americans? With that \$40,000 they could have dealt with 100 tests. And that is from one university in one series of tests.

From what I can calculate in going through this, last year from Canada alone we sent approximately \$1.3 million to the United States for them to inform us who should become our doctors and lawyers. Why? All right, that is the only test that everyone is given, and it amounts to 10 or

15 per cent of the marks. The whole system is screwed up. I don't want to belabour this, but I want to come back to what I was saying.

The system has to be changed. Everyone should be given an examination which they can compete in equally. A lottery system surely is wrong, and this is what the university is thinking of doing now. If they bring that in, I abandon all hope for them entirely. That is wrong. The present system is wrong. Obviously the old quota system was wrong.

I am suggesting to the minister—I hope someone will talk to the minister, he is not here—that he has to step into the university at the present time and set up a new quota system, not based on race, not based on colour, not based on religion, but based on where did you come from? If you came from northern Ontario or eastern Ontario, where there are no universities, you have to be given preference. Preference one is that we have to get a certain proportion of doctors back there where we need them.

Preference two has to be Canadian citizens who have taken their schooling here, and they must all be examined so that the best of them get in. If the competition is going to continue, it shouldn't be comparing apples and oranges; everybody should be taking the same examinations.

Thirdly, these examinations should be Canadian examinations, not American examinations.

Finally, I don't want to be too parochial, but we have an obligation to the outside and we have to decide how much this is. I am suggesting that obligation is 10 per cent of the places in our classes, and that 10 per cent should be reserved for those who are coming here to learn skills which they are going to take back to their own nations or those who wish to come here and immigrate—but they must come third, after the other considerations.

Mr. McIlveen: What about the interview system?

Mr. Shulman: The interview system has some merit. It is a problem. In all fairness to the interview system, some tests were done which showed that if you had different groups of interviewers interviewing different people you got exactly opposite results, so that isn't the perfect answer.

But the one thing the interview system does it weed out those who cannot talk English and surely cannot communicate with the patients; for that reason only, obviously

an English test should be required. An interview system would do that, yes.

I think you have to have an interview system for that reason and for that reason alone; not to decide the merits or the prejudices as seen by the interviewer, but just to determine one thing only: Can this person, if he becomes a doctor, communicate with patients in Ontario? Yes, that's important.

Mr. Bounsall: They could give them an oral test on tape.

Mr. Shulman: Sure.

Mr. Foulds: Of course, the member for Oshawa would fail such a test.

Mr. Shulman: Actually, I must tell you in all fairness that after I had graduated from Ontario, I thought for one ridiculous moment that I might go down to the United States. I wrote my written exams and passed them with As, straight through, but I failed my oral down there. So I have some doubt about the oral test; there was a certain personality conflict between the lady interviewer and myself.

Mr. Bounsall: Ah!

Mr. McIlveen: The member is a chauvinist, that's why.

Mr. Shulman: I don't want to belabour this. This has been a hot potato that everyone has been afraid to touch. Quite frankly, I wanted to make this speech last year and did not make this speech last year because I had a son who was applying to medicine and I didn't want to be accused of sour grapes by saying that he couldn't get in. He is now in medicine, he got in via this computer, so I can speak out, without fear of any conflict of interest.

Mr. Kennedy: Did he pass the test?

Mr. Shulman: Someone has to tackle this. I know that everyone here is going to be afraid to speak up on it, but I am directing this comment to the Minister of Colleges and Universities. It is a very important issue. It is going to become an increasingly important issue, and it is going to cause tremendous racial tension unless the minister steps in and does something about it. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Perth.

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join in this debate, and now I can say that this is the second time I have followed the member for High Park.

He surprised me this time. I recall that on a previous occasion it seemed to me I sat here for three days waiting to follow him. So I thank him very much for being so considerate.

First of all, I would like to join with the other members in offering my congratulations to Mr. Speaker for the way in which he has been carrying out his duties in the House and I certainly wish him well as he continues in that position.

Mr. Speaker, in looking over the Throne Speech, I feel in the same position as many other members and many newspaper writers, that it is somewhat difficult to really find any substance on which to speak or reply, because as has been said, the Throne Speech seemed to only contain many platitudes.

I noted, particularly in my area, many of the editorials seemed to be entitled with such comments as "A Throne Speech Without Clues." Another paper said the Throne Speech was a "nebulous affair."

I would like to place this one editorial on the record. I think it shows the concern and the manner in which most of the people accepted the Throne Speech, which I guess was the shortest one in the history of this Premier (Mr. Davis). The editorial went like this:

Premier William Davis is not playing his cards close to his vest. He is carrying them behind his back concealed from everyone. Given the expectation of a provincial election sometime this year, the Throne Speech delivered in the Ontario Legislature was a startling short story that offered not an inkling of what is to come in the months ahead.

Throne Speeches are supposed to be a declaration of a government's intent. If this one is to be taken as that, we can expect the spring and summer to pass free of election fever and fervour. Politicians, if they open their mouths at all, will probably only do so to yawn.

An unspectacular statement of philosophy, the speech at the opening of the Fifth Session of Ontario's 29th Parliament called on residents to exercise moderation and restraint, rather than disclosing what the government intends to do about inflation and escalating strikes in the public sector.

That's just a very brief portion of what was written in our area of the province, and I think it is very similar to many other comments by other newspapers and individuals.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thought during my comments in reply to the Throne Speech and in this Throne debate, I would try to bring a few matters before the government which are of concern to my riding, and I think to many people in the province as a whole.

I would just like to very briefly refer once again to Hydro transmission lines. I've done this on previous occasions, as have many other members, and particularly the member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt). On previous occasions I have added my objections to the destruction of class 1 and class 2 farmland, particularly when Hydro suggests that this type of land is not effected to any great extent by transmission lines.

However, I noted in the north end of my riding that Ontario Hydro decided to draw a proposed route across this land. As I understand it, they made the decision to plot this power line across the map without updated information on the type of land they were planning on crossing.

Since this was done, there is a group which calls itself "The Concerned Farmers of the United Townships." They've been working diligently with many interested people in the area. Really, all they are trying to do is to get the government to see that this particular line is unnecessary and to show the government and Ontario Hydro that they want this land to remain strictly for agricultural purposes.

In fact, very recently a petition was taken to county council. It is a small township. I think there are 318 people who own agricultural property in the township, and 316 of those signed a petition saying they wanted the council to pay the interested citizens to continue actively in the work in opposing this transmission line. This was taken to the local council; the council agreed with those who brought in the petition. The group of involved citizens was at the meeting. After some discussion they decided they would decline the offer of the council and in turn wrote the following letter to the council. I thought this should be on the record and I hope the Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell) and the Minister of the Environment (Mr. W. Newman) would take note of this. The letter was as follows:

We, the concerned farmers of the united townships, greatly appreciate the trust shown us when a petition was presented on March 3 to our council, signed by nearly every resident in the township. This petition asked the council to fully support the work we are doing both morally and financially. Contrary to what

Ontario Hydro has been saying, that there were no complaints until property owners found the proposed Hydro transmission lines were on their property, this petition indicates that people are deeply concerned about the unnecessary destruction of prime agricultural land.

We humbly reject the general offer of receiving remuneration for our time and travelling expenses and would like to thank again the many, many people who are giving so generously of their time and effort towards this great cause.

I thought this was worth placing on the record, Mr. Speaker, because this to me shows that people generally are concerned about what Ontario Hydro is doing to agricultural land. Again I would ask that the Minister of Energy particularly does his best to see that before the line which is proposed goes through the north end of my riding we would have a public hearing.

I think that's enough on that subject, Mr. Speaker, it's been mentioned by many members in the past. But I thought it was important to show how some of these agriculturalists were working to maintain their land for farming purposes only.

The next item I would like to take a moment or two to discuss is the matter of nursing homes and nursing home beds. Recently I received many requests from the nursing home operators in my area for permission to extend their facilities because of demand. Also I've received many complaints from people trying to find accommodation who have had to go out of the county to try to find such accommodation.

Just yesterday I received a letter from the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health (Mr. Walker) on this matter. I see the ministry is still very concerned about percentages and they get right down to the fine point and say that there must only be 3.5 beds per 1,000 population in any area.

The area I represent, of course, has a larger percentage of senior citizens than in some other areas, and in that case we at the present time now have approximately 5.6 beds per 1,000 population. This still is not adequate. I notice again in the letter which I just received from the parliamentary assistant that we just could not expect anything more in approvals to nursing homes in our area until all the other areas of the province are as good as or better than Perth county. I believe it is now 4.5 beds per 1,000 population.

It so happens, Mr. Speaker, that just two days ago an item in the local press mentioned the frustration of one of our citizens who was trying to find accommodation for his elderly sister, who was recovering from a broken hip and was in the rehabilitation unit of the Stratford General Hospital. I'm sure many of the members are aware of what takes place when citizens are in the chronic care wing of a hospital. It's usually up to the physician and the ministry here in Toronto to decide when that patient is able to be moved or should find other accommodation.

I would just like to put this on record, because it really gives the details of the frustrations that are created and frustrations which people must put up with in the area of nursing home care. In this item, this gentleman is referring to an elderly sister who was in the rehabilitation unit in the that on a certain date she must be moved and, of course, could only be moved to nursing home accommodation because of her condition. I quote:

If I hadn't been through the mill I just couldn't have believed the frustrations and heartaches to which patient and family are subjected once the countdown notice is received from the Ontario Health Ministry in Toronto.

My dilemma began on Nov. 7 last, when I learned that my sister's stay in recuperating from a fractured hip, would terminate on Nov. 15 as far as OHIP was concerned. The daily rate charged against the patient would be \$29.50 thereafter. In January the rate was increased to \$32.55. How long can the individual or family meet such a tariff?

On Nov. 8 I consulted R. J. Cameron, executive director at Stratford General Hospital, and learned that decisions concerning discharge of patients under the health plan are not made by local hospitals, rather they are based on reports made by the patient's physician, which are sent to Toronto for assessment. If it is determined that the patient is not eligible for OHIP benefits, the local hospital is advised.

I learned in the case of my sister that the medical report was made not by her own physician but by the surgeon who set the fracture. Her physician was unaware of the situation until he received a copy of the letter sent to the hospital. In his judgement, the patient was not ready for discharge. When I talked to the patient's

surgeon he acknowledged that the situation was due to an unfortunate misunderstanding and added that he never realized when he signed the report that it would lead to her discharge at that time. He assured me that steps were being taken to have the matter rectified.

I was never so naive as to think my sister's stay in the rehabilitation unit would be limitless. I am aware of the tight bed situation in our hospitals and of the desire of the officials to make room for more urgent cases, but not at the peril of the patients still under their care. It was the brevity of the notice and the uncertainty of the future that were the real shockers.

On the advice of Mr. Cameron, I immediately visited Murray Bishop, social service director of the hospital staff. It is part of Mr. Bishop's duties to try to find accommodation for patients about to be discharged but who have no definite place to go for further recuperation.

We started proceedings for my sister's admission to a nursing home and for extended-care benefits through OHIP. At that time, Mr. Bishop had knowledge of only one nursing home in the area that had a vacancy. At all the others there were waiting lists.

I visited the home mentioned by Mr. Bishop and was impressed by its cleanliness and air of efficiency, but the percentage of patients with mental illnesses convinced me that it was not a suitable environment for my sister.

The search became a family project. While I visited or telephoned virtually every nursing home in this area, a brother in London was doing likewise there. A sister-in-law in St. Catharines thought she could find accommodation in a retirement home in that city. The application was rejected because the patient at that time was not sufficiently ambulatory to meet the home's admission standards. A London retirement home rejected an application for the same reason. I visited Spruce Lodge, our city-county home for senior citizens, but was advised that if the move was imminent, there would be little use in making application as there would be no vacancies in the women's quarters in the foreseeable future.

In every direction we turned, the answer was the same: There was simply no room in the inn. So on Nov. 13, two days before V (for Vacate) Day [from the chronic wing of the hospital] I contacted Mr. Cameron.

He had received no word from Toronto on the application for an extension of the patient's stay in the rehabilitation unit. On V-Day itself, the situation was unchanged. Mr. Cameron had a telephone call made to the health people in Toronto, who promised to look into the matter and call back. I heard nothing.

On No. 18, I called Mr. Bishop who advised me that my sister's application for extended benefits in a nursing home had been rejected. He said that he could not understand the situation and would re-apply.

On Nov. 28, I learned through J. H. King, the accountant at Stratford General Hospital, that the patient had been given a reprieve at the unit to Dec. 1 and that a further stay was under review.

On Dec. 2, I learned through Mr. Bishop the stay had been extended to Jan. 1 but that he had no word on extended care in a nursing home.

On the morning of Dec. 24, I called Mr. Bishop again. He said he had no further word, but promised to call Toronto. He did so and informed me that my sister's case would go before a review board in Toronto on Jan. 2, 1975.

Later the same day, I was unexpectedly on my way to University Hospital in London for emergency surgery. Before leaving home, I called the brother in London to tell him the bad news. He expressed sympathy but added: "It's not all bad news. I just learned that our sister's stay in the rehabilitation unit has been extended to Jan. 31 and that extended care in a nursing home has been approved." This despite the fact that Mr. Bishop had been told that the case would be reviewed Jan. 2. Can it be that the left hand of the mandarins in Toronto doesn't know what the right hand is doing? The information received by my brother on Dec. 24 was confirmed in a letter received at Stratford General Hospital and dated Jan. 7.

On Dec. 28, while still in hospital in London, I was advised that there was a vacancy in a nursing home near Delaware. It was one of the contacts made by my London brother. Before making a decision, I telephoned a nursing home near Stratford where I knew my sister's name was near the top of the list. I felt it would be to the patient's advantage to be closer to relatives and friends who could visit her. The situation was unchanged. Put bluntly,

someone had to die to make a bed available.

My sister was taken to Delaware by ambulance on Dec. 31, now more ambulatory. The London retirement home agreed to reassess her application. She became a resident there Feb. 5. In retrospect, it seems like a bad dream.

He went on to wonder what the problem really was. But I wanted to put his letter on record because of the letter I just received from the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Health saying that we were well served by nursing home beds in our area. I thought this should go on record to show the frustration of just one family. I can assure the Minister of Health particularly that this is far from the only case, and I hope the ministry will do something in the near future to relieve the situation.

I seem to be on the subject of health today, Mr. Speaker, because I have another topic which is on the subject of community health centres. I would like to go through as briefly as I can some of the facts pertaining to a proposal by a community in my riding which is very desirous of having a community health centre. This goes back, I believe, to earlier than 1971. It's most interesting that it started to come to a head in September, 1971, when the then Minister of Health put out a press release stating that in the town of Mitchell, Ont., there would be a unit operated as a satellite of the Stratford General Hospital which would provide services for diagnostic and treatment purposes on an ambulatory basis. This press release was issued Sept. 20, 1971. It seemed to come out just prior to the October, 1971, election.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): A strange coincidence.

Hon. F. S. Miller (Minister of Health): It got the member elected.

Mr. Edighoffer: That's right, it did. Since that time, I believe the people in the community have been actively pursuing this matter without much idea of when the community health centre will be completed in the community.

I could also say that one of the reasons it has been actively pursued is that a local resident passed away a few years ago and left a bequest for further health facilities. He left approximately \$125,000 to go for such a project. I just like to put this on record, because it has been a long process

since Sept. 20, 1971, when that press release was issued. I believe that was issued because there had been a study suggested by the government prior to that time. I believe the local board also paid about \$900 towards that study, hoping that it would assist in seeing that this community would have some of these services.

Just to keep things in order; from that date, Sept. 20, 1971, much contact was made with the Ministry of Health and the local community health centre board. On April 7, 1972, they received a letter from the then Ontario Hospital Services Commission suggesting—or actually saying—that the commission would give approval to the board to purchase land for this project. However, it went on carefully to state that this wouldn't mean that there would be any support grants on the land purchased, but it intimated they could go ahead with the development of this centre.

Then on July 5, 1972, another letter was received. A letter was also received on June 27, 1973, outlining what would be contained in this facility. I won't go into details because I think many people are aware of what a community health centre must contain.

In July, 1972, and June, 1973, letters were received stating what facilities could be used in the community health centre. Of course, again it was believed by the board that there would be grants available for such a building.

On July 4, 1973, the board received a letter from the University of Western Ontario, from the faculty of family medicine, saying it would like to use the centre as a teaching facility as well. The interesting part, Mr. Speaker, is that in April, 1973, a regulation numbered 381/73 was placed on the record—I have a copy here—which states that grants will be available for health resources which are defined as follows: "Health resources means a community health facility, including health practitioners and personnel through which health services can be provided to persons in a community."

We were then advised by members in the ministry that we could go ahead and plan this facility because grants would be available; and the board, of course, did this, they went ahead. As a matter of fact, they have working drawings completed now and hope to go forward with this project. Following the time when we learned of this regulation which supposedly gave grants, particularly capital grants, to community centres, we had a delegation come to the

town and this delegation informed us there would be no grants available.

I very recently checked to see if this regulation was still in effect and I understand from the Clerk's office and from the minister that it is still in effect. I hope from the comments I've made, showing the determination of the local board, that the minister will look at this matter very carefully and possibly make some type of grant available. I don't think the board expects a 100 per cent grant, although the regulation does state that the government can make 100 per cent grants. I think they do have some funds available but they would like some assistance because they're most interested in seeing that this centre is completed in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I read over the Throne Speech several times; it didn't take very long to read, really. I noticed on page 1 it stated: "From the people we must have moderation and restraint in the pricing of goods and services," and so on. I recently received a communication from the Minister of Government Services and I wonder, if the government is suggesting there must be moderation and restraint in the pricing of goods and services to try to stem the inflationary pressures, what the Ministry of Government Services is trying to do.

I refer to an instance when the government purchased 9.2 acres in the city of Stratford in 1966. I referred earlier to the 1971 election; this happened to be just before the 1967 election. The Ministry of Government Services purchased this 9.2 acres of property for, I believe, \$24,500 appraisers were in the vicinity and, according minister on April 5, 1974, they asked the city to pay \$192,000 for that property. I believe it was in the first part of January, 1975, that the appraisers were back and they said they would be glad to sell the property to the city for a total of \$270,000.

Mr. Ruston: That is a profit of \$250,000.

Mr. Edighoffer: Mr. Speaker, I think this isn't at all reasonable, especially when the government has stated very clearly that—

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): How many appraisals were received?

Mr. Edighoffer: To my knowledge the appraisal was done by the Ministry of Government Services.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: How many others, for comparison's sake?

Mr. Edighoffer: To my knowledge no other appraisals have been done.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Better have a look.

Mr. Edighoffer: I am referring to the information I asked to receive from the Minister of Government Services. I would think that they, with the number on their staff, should be able to go out and have some idea of what values are throughout the province.

I did write to the minister asking if he would consider selling that property to the city of Stratford at cost, plus a reasonable \$50,000. But I didn't get a reply to that.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that if this is the practice and the policy of this particular minister, it is no wonder that we are faced with such inflationary pressures because this government is doing all possible to maintain it at its present levels.

Mr. Speaker, there are a few other things I could say. I think I will just leave them probably for the estimates, which will be coming up in the near future. But because the riding of Perth is so well known for the Stratford Festival, I thought I might just place on the record an article I picked out of the paper last fall. It is written in similar language to what we listen to on the stage in Stratford where the international theatre is located, but it refers really, basically to some members in this government. I thought, if you could bear with me Mr. Speaker, it will just take me a few moments, and I would like to place this on the record.

This was an article in the paper and it is entitled "Is Foul Fair?"

[The scene: A blasted heath beneath a Florida condominium. Enter MacDavis and Darcy.]

MacDavis: So foul and fair a day I have not seen.

Darcy: Nor I, but what are these, so withered and so wild in their attire?

First Witch: All hail MacDavis, thane of Robarts.

Second Witch: All hail MacDavis, thane of Frost.

Third Witch: All hail MacDavis, thane of Drew.

MacDavis: How know they I am of the Tory line, thanes of Queen's Park since forgotten times? Speak, you secret black and midnight hags.

First Witch: Thrice the brindled cat hath mewed.

Second Witch: Thrice and once the hedge pig whined.

Third Witch: An elector cries 'tis time, 'tis time.

Darcy: Good sir, why do you start and seem to fear?

MacDavis: They say it is election year.

First Witch: Round about the cauldron go, and into it we witches throw: Fidinam memos for old times' sake and lunch with Moog beside the lake;

Scandals old and scandals new, sweeten the election brew.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Why doesn't he get the member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) in that little poem?

Mr. Edighoffer: I am getting some others in here.

All: Double, double, election trouble, fire burn and cauldron bubble.

Second Witch: Tooth of a bat, a dragon's hair

Regional government and Canada Square
Stephen's tongue and Morty's sting
Into the cauldron do we fling
A mess of minor Tory gaffs,
We toss in just for laughs.

All: Double, double, Tory trouble; fire burn and cauldron bubble.

Third Witch: Airplanes that to Cuba go, conflicts of interest in a row;

Eye of newt and tail of skate, plus a dash of Hydrogate,

All go into the election pot, hissing, bubbling, boiling hot.

Escarpment and deals thicken the brew and colour it a Tory blue.

All: Double, double, boil and bubble; Benoit bombed, Big Blue's in trouble.

MacDavis: Enough, begone wretched apparitions. Begone, I say!

Witches: (joining hands and dancing about the cauldron): Double, double, boil and bubble, Darcy sweats and Bill's in trouble.

MacDavis (desperately): Darcy, the song. The song, Darcy.

Darcy (in a rather shaky baritone): We keep on growing the way we've been growing;

Keep on growing the way we've been growing.

MacDavis: Louder, Darcy. Louder. They're fading; they're fading away.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I thought the member was above that sort of thing, but I guess he is in the same class as the rest of them over there.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): What's the matter? Can't the minister take it?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member didn't say one word about Donald Macdonald—

Mr. Ruston: It was very well done.

Mr. Edighoffer: I thought that was very well done.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I thought the only member over there with poor taste was the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent). But there was an additive. The member doesn't have to stop at that kind of drivel.

Mr. Edighoffer: I appreciate the comments of the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet; however, I was just referring to this very fine piece of literary work.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member has just put his stamp of approval on it. That's fine.

Mr. Edighoffer: I'm glad the minister was so keenly interested.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I'm always interested when the member indulges in that kind of muck-raking. He loves it. They all love it over there.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): He's a connoisseur.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister couldn't tell the difference between Shakespeare and the author.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member would be surprised.

Mr. Ruston: He just doesn't understand good poetry.

Mr. Edighoffer: I appreciate the comments of the minister, and I appreciate him staying in his seat today to listen to the few comments I've made. I believe that's all I'll say regarding the Throne Speech today.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Oxford.

Mr. H. C. Parrott (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, the member is probably making a good judgement—

Mr. Bounsall: We're going to hear about dental admissions.

Mr. Parrott: No, they're not. May I just make one or two brief comments first? I don't think I've formally done this since you took the chair, Mr. Speaker, and my comments are going to be very brief. I'm sorry, first of all, that my desk mate is in such bad health that he is not here in the House more frequently, but I'm sure that all in the House wish him well. Secondly, I do want to extend to you our best wishes from the people of Oxford. We very sincerely believe that you are fulfilling that role in the great tradition that it's come to know. Because those remarks are brief they are not insincere.

It is rather fitting that I should have the opportunity to follow the member for Perth. He and I have shared many occasions in the past, but let me assure you, sir, that I do not share with him the rather poor, if I may say, conclusion to his remarks. Quite frankly, I'm not going to go to that kind of speech this morning.

There is no one I like better than the member for Perth, and we have had a very kind and firm relationship over many years. But I was disappointed by that kind of poem, which seems to be so much a part of the thinking of that party; and when it gets to the finest member of that party, it disturbs me a great deal.

I'm going to come to that point because I'm in a very irritated mood this morning. Just once I would like to see some fairness in the situation. My good wife continually reminds me it's stupid to ask for a fair approach in politics, the game itself is not fair. That disturbs me. I think we've got to come to that kind of understanding in politics in this country, and in this province, and soon, because if we don't we are going to pay an extremely high price in our democratic process.

Turning just briefly to some of the remarks in the Throne Speech, I'm going to direct my remarks more to members of this House than I am obviously to the government or to the Lieutenant Governor in preparing that address. There was one particular comment that concerned me, and I'll be quite frank about it, it was the ombudsman. I'm going to talk about that at greater lengths, if, and when, that bill is presented.

Unless we in this House consider that particular role along with the duties of the House and the members of this House, we are going to see a system go out of whack. I'm concerned about that. But maybe we should talk about that at that time; it might be more fitting then. I'm going to come back to it a little bit, but I do want to serve notice that at that time we are going to have to very seriously consider the role of the member. By failing to do so, we are going to have an unbalanced view of that particular role that might be—and I say might be—very necessary in this province.

I'm reminded of the remarks that the great John Diefenbaker made on an occasion when he was talking about the federal House, and maybe the Chairman of the Management Board could remember that time. I don't know whether it was before or after his day there. He talked about it being the only institution of a mental type where the inmates ran it. I rather think he was speaking with tongue in cheek but with a great deal of logic at the same time.

I've come to believe the same thing about our parliamentary system here in the Legislature of Ontario. I'm totally frustrated by the impossibility of the role. Unless any of my friends to my right might think, "That's good news; we won't see him here next time," I want to put those fears to rest. I'm going to attempt to the very best of my ability to return.

Mr. Lawlor: The member is a bear for punishment.

An hon. member: He will.

Mr. Parrott: That's true, and so is the member for Lakeshore. I couldn't agree with him more. We are foolish to do so. Let's look at some of the things that should, in my mind, be corrected. First of all, it's an absolute impossibility to begin to do the job of representing one's people and sit in this House the number of hours that it demands and it warrants. Let's look at the attendance right now. It is pitiful. We see those headlines in the paper consistently. What we don't see in those same headlines, or in the body of the story that follows it, is the reason for the poor attendance in this House.

Mr. Lawlor: The member means apart from indifference.

Mr. Foulds: And the quality of debate.

Mr. Parrott: It may be the quality of debate.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): There is a lot of indifference over there this morning. There are just two Liberals.

Mr. Parrott: I am going to answer that in one minute. I have made it my business to go to the members' library frequently and I have yet to see a member in it. When I was in graduate school, if I found none of my confrères or peers in the library on many occasions, I knew that the quality of research of that work was going to be very poor. My friend from Nickel Belt says—

Mr. Foulds: Port Arthur.

Mr. Parrott: —excuse me, Port Arthur—says the quality of debate is poor. I couldn't agree with him more. Mr. Speaker, you don't give a well-reasoned, well-thought-out and well-prepared address under the terms in which we, the members, must serve. It's an impossibility.

I think we must come to realize and accept that and all of us as members must come to grips with that problem if we are going to have in this Legislature the kind of debate and the kind of attendance it deserves and the people of Ontario deserve.

The first thing I think we've got to do is to look at the time schedule that is foisted upon the members as they try to serve. I would very much like to be standing by this seat this morning with the kind of remarks to which I had given an amount of time and effort to prepare. I am going to be very frank about the situation.

This morning I had the opportunity to have visiting from my riding a young chap who is very interested in this process. He came into my office at 9:45 and I said, "Come over to the question period." He saw me as not a young man any more, and a totally frustrated man. There are letters not answered and people expecting phone calls which are not returned. I think it is necessary on occasion to explain to the people of one's riding, to the people of Ontario, the system as it works. He came here for question period; ran away; 14 other things on one's mind, work unattended back in the office.

Tell me for one minute how any of us can cope with the responsibilities of the House and the responsibilities of a riding. Perhaps my remarks are not as well reasoned, as well thought out as I would like them and I apologize for that but under the circumstances they are the very best I can do.

I would like to draw comparison with my federal member who was elected last July

and who, by agreement with me, would have a joint riding office in the city of Woodstock. First of all we thought we might be able to work some rather interesting arrangements re personnel and joint facilities and we made an agreement. About three weeks after that agreement was made I went to my federal member and said, "I think we had better cancel it. It's not going to work." The reason it wasn't going to work was the lopsided arrangement between that House and his one.

Let me put on the record very briefly his comparison with mine. I'm not interested in the pay he is receiving; it's more than mine but that's fair. That's their business. I was elected to this House and I've had a raise since I was here. I have no complaints on the remuneration I have received from this House. I don't think it's even logical to say this man who represents Oxford could be at home making more money. If I had chosen that life I would be there. I chose to be here and I am satisfied with the pay but I am totally unsatisfied with the other conditions associated with this office. The federal member has a riding office provided.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): For \$8,400.

Mr. Parrott: For \$8,400. Now what is my alternative? I am in comparison with this man and rightly so.

The member who represented our federal riding before that did a fantastic job; I think the record has spoken so many times on his behalf. He represented that riding for 20 years but unfortunately died at a very early age—he was 55 years of age. He was a man of great wealth who dedicated that wealth to serving his riding. We should all give him honour for having done so but following in his footsteps some of us were naturally to be compared. I accept that comparison as a challenge but let me tell the House that I feel very few members of this House have, out of private income, \$8,400 with which to compete with their federal members. If they don't, they are looking poor by comparison. I can suffer the poor comparison but for the people of Oxford county I cannot suffer doing a poor job because we in this House refuse to fund the necessary amenities that should be associated with this job. That's a job all of us share.

There are no greater responsibilities at the federal level than here; nor as a parliamentary assistant rather than as a private member. In fact, I think if anything my role has been enhanced since I became a parliamentary assistant, not worsened. I'm speaking

more of the days when I was a private member rather than a parliamentary assistant.

All right, if it was bad enough that he had a riding office, let's take one more comparison. He has two, and if he chooses, three, assistants in Ottawa, and one—out of that \$8,400, granted—in Woodstock, his riding office. As you well know, Mr. Speaker, even in this term we've changed from sharing a secretary to where we now have the luxury of one—one—for all of that work that's required.

The logic of the situation says it must be that the load the federal member carries is three times as heavy as that of the provincial member. If that should be the case, then I ask members to come to the riding and open the mailbox day in and day out. We share a common mailbox, interestingly enough, and the mail by count is two and three times as much for the provincial member as it is for the federal member, and I suspect that is not because this provincial member does the job any better than the federal member—not at all—or that he's more popular. It is none of that. It is simply because the workload that's foisted upon the members who represent their communities in this House is greater than the load carried by their counterparts in the federal seat.

Mr. Bounsall: They get UIC cases.

Mr. Parrott: They get UIC cases and a couple of others. But what else can we look at in this regard?

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): How about my riding?

Mr. Parrott: Maybe we'll use the municipal relationship with government. If, in this House, we expect a relationship—I think the member from Simcoe East (Mr. G. E. Smith) asked the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman) this morning—to carry to the federal government some concerns that affected his riding; that was the normal process. But what happens in the municipalities that I represent, and there are many of them, is that they deal with these members of our government and they receive many deserving and well-reasoned answers. I might be a little biased in that, but I'm saying that the responsibility of the province to the many municipalities is far greater than the federal government's responsibility to those municipalities, and I use that only as an illustration.

How many letters do the federal members receive from the municipalities; forgetting

their constituents, just like the municipalities?

That workload in itself is very large. I use that only as an example, and maybe a poor one, but nevertheless I think when we get right down to it, we look into that mailbox that I share with my federal member and we see that it's two and three times the workload.

There are only one or two alternatives for this, but that's the thing that worries me. One of the alternatives is to ask only rich men to serve and that's wrong. The other alternative is for a man of means, or one who has the opportunity to make a dollar in what should be spare time, to use those hours, and that I've done. Somebody had to pay that office rent up there and that was a responsibility that I chose to take on and I am prepared to do so, but I say it puts that much more extra load on the member who must either dig into his pocket or find a way of financing that particular riding office if he chooses to serve the people of his riding. That's what it is all about.

I'm quite happy if we redefine the roles of the members of this House and if they bring us back in the next session of this parliament and say, "You are now going to be legislators." I could accept that if we as a total House said, "The role of the ombudsman no longer is a part of serving your riding. You are not welcome to call the civil service of this province. You are to make the laws, consider the laws, and that's it." Let us be the legislators. I don't covet that role for myself, but if those have got to be the terms of reference then I think there is no doubt we're sufficiently paid and we have sufficient staff. But if we are going to be ombudsmen, and most of us have chosen to play that role, then I'm saying, as I've said before, we are terribly understaffed and we must do something about it.

Before we come to the role of ombudsman—this is sort of a notice of motion this morning—surely we will attempt to take that kind of perspective view of whether or not one ombudsman with some staff makes logical sense, particularly if he should be centralized in the city of Toronto. I say to members that I cannot accept that if that's the role. I haven't seen the bill obviously, maybe I wouldn't be making these remarks if I had. It may be quite different from what I fear but I do not want one ombuds-

man with a staff for the Province of Ontario. Unless there can be an ombudsman eyeball to eyeball with the people of every riding of Ontario, I think we should not have one.

Mr. Lawlor: He has a different role.

Mr. Parrott: He has a different role. That's right and I am prepared to allow the ombudsman to have a different role. I see the logic.

Mr. Lawlor: He is not a substitute for the individual member.

Mr. Parrott: I accept that. I could accept that, but I say it would be far better if we had the right, the privileges and the staff and hopefully, the ability to play that role best because I think we can. I think we can do it better than the ombudsman for this reason. The ombudsman would not be expected to go periodically to the people he was serving and say, "I want your support again." I think that puts a real check, a real value into the system that we can't get if we hire an ombudsman. My worry is that he becomes a bureaucratic extension—bureaucracy fighting bureaucracy—and that would be a very serious concern on my part. I am willing to listen to the debate of this House on that bill as I am sure there is a lot of merit to it. I haven't just rejected it out of hand but I think we must address ourselves to that total role.

I could go on at some length on this particular subject. I won't choose to do so now but I would like at this time to adjourn the debate. The other things I might like to get into will take a little longer than the remaining time, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Parrott moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I think today I will endeavour to outline what the next few days will be so that members can make their own arrangements or plans or judgements.

On Monday, we will proceed with this debate and on Tuesday we will deal with some second readings, Nos. 4, 5 and 6—standing on the order paper with the possibility of one other item that I will not allude to at this time. I have reasonable agreement that the House will sit on Wednesday the equivalent hours we might have sat on Thursday—that is, to 6 o'clock on Wednesday of next week—at which time we will adjourn for the Easter recess.

When we return on Monday, April 7, we will conclude the Throne Speech debate and I will call for the vote on that issue at 5 o'clock in the afternoon of that Monday. The Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) will proceed with his budget at 8:30 p.m., Monday, April 7.

Mr. Breithaupt: Before the adjournment of the House, Mr. Speaker, I presume the government leader does intend to sit both Monday and Tuesday evenings?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, that was previously announced. That's correct, Monday and Tuesday of next week in the evenings.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12:55 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, March 21, 1975

Toronto building height bylaw, statement by Mr. McKeough	281
Credit unions, statement by Mr. Handleman	282
Toronto building height bylaw, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mrs. Campbell	283
Credit unions, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. R. F. Nixon	285
Federal-provincial conference on energy, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Shulman	285
Bed situation at London hospital, questions of Mr. Miller: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Shulman	286
Timiskaming area hospital, questions of Mr. Miller: Mr. Lewis	287
Multi-service centres, questions of Mrs. Birch and Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Lewis, Mr. MacDonald	289
Housing costs, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis	290
Facilities on the Trent-Severn system, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. G. E. Smith	291
Law-and-order legislation, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Singer	291
Hamilton health care facility, questions of Mr. Miller: Mr. Deans	291
Chain store pricing, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Breithaupt	292
Price of milk, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. MacDonald	292
Canada Metal Co. plant, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Riddell	292
La Salle residents' suit against US companies, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. B. Newman	293
Moose population, questions of Mr. Grossman and Mr. Bernier: Mr. Foulds	293
Awards for advertising work, questions of Mr. Winkler: Mr. R. F. Nixon	293
Employment Standards Amendment Act, Mr. B. Newman, first reading	294
On notice of motion No. 1, re Mr. Irvine's land interests, Mr. Snow, concurred in	295
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Edighoffer, Mr. Parrott	297
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Parrott, agreed to	314
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	315



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, March 24, 1975

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MARCH 24, 1975

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, through you, sir, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome to the House and introduce to the hon. members a delegation from Hamilton and District Council of Women led by Mrs. Muriel Beatty, their president. They are sitting in the west gallery of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

SALES TAX ON REUSABLE CONTAINERS

Hon. A. K. Meen (Minister of Revenue): Prior to today, an exemption from retail sales tax applied to the deposit paid to encourage the return of reusable containers and applied most commonly to glass containers for beer and soft drinks.

Amendments to the regulations made under the Retail Sales Tax Act, which take effect today, extend this exemption to the deposit made on any container to encourage its return, including beer cans, which are recycled rather than refilled. The exemption goes beyond the deposit on beer cans and applies as well to the deposit on all containers used for soft drinks or other products.

As the House is aware, the Ministry of the Environment has recently made a determined effort to encourage the development of a system of refunds for all containers used by the soft drink industry. I hope our new regulation will substantially help the Ministry of the Environment's efforts to eradicate litter of this kind.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Hon. W. Newman (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, continuing the government's action programme outlined in the Speech from the Throne, later today I will introduce for first reading legislation entitled, the Environmental Assessment Act, which will provide for a comprehensive

system of anticipation and prevention of environmental damage which can result—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): That's the third time that has been announced.

Hon. W. Newman:—from future development projects in the Province of Ontario.

This bill clearly reflects this government's commitment to environmental protection as an objective and as a guiding philosophy. We intend to continue to lead the way in the introduction of programmes and policies which will protect our natural environment. In this respect, I am certain that this legislation will stand as an example for other jurisdictions throughout the world, which are as concerned as we are here in Ontario with the protection of the environment.

Environmental assessment is a relatively new term. It is really preventive medicine—action before the fact, as opposed to reaction after the illness has developed and damage to the environment has occurred. The process of environmental assessment is a means of ensuring that a project can be achieved with a minimum of undesirable effect on the environment. In many ways, Mr. Speaker, we have been doing this kind of planning in Ontario for many years. Certainly, in the private sector, the approvals required for development must meet the high standards of my ministry with respect to pollution control and abatement.

The Environmental Assessment Act refines and defines this policy. The requirements of the legislation are clear and reflect the determination of this government to protect the natural environment today and tomorrow for the generations of the future. Without doubt, this bill is one of the most important pieces of legislation ever introduced in this province.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): That's three times he has said that.

Hon. W. Newman: We are breaking new ground. We are proposing and providing for public participation in major projects. We will be asking more of the sponsors of projects. This bill will place a great responsibility on

all concerned, and wisdom and caution will be required in its administration.

Slightly more than a year ago, the green paper on environmental assessment was released. This indicated the government's intention to establish a formal procedure for environmental assessment, and it set forth the respective advantages and disadvantages of the various optional approaches for a comprehensive programme. These options were presented to the public for critical examination and recommendations.

The response was good, and this valuable input has enabled the government to develop positive legislation to establish an efficient and workable system for environmental protection through the advanced assessment of proposed major projects. It will ensure environmental protection at the critical part of any proposed project—at the very beginning of the decision-making process.

(We have set these objectives: First, to ensure that the responsibility of government is maintained and that final decisions will be made by those people responsible to the electorate. There is no other responsible way;

Second, to ensure that the assessment is carried out early in the project's planning stage so that a proposal can be changed if necessary without imposing major inconvenience or expense;

Third, to ensure that the proponent of the project and the appropriate government agencies properly and thoroughly evaluate the proposal so that adverse environmental effects will be avoided;

Fourth, to provide access to documents relative to a project under review and to provide for complementary public reaction and input. This will be achieved by both direct presentation and at times by public hearings. Both approaches are provided for in this Act;

And finally, to provide for the conduct of the entire process efficiently, to avoid unnecessary delays and to eliminate confusion and red tape.

Specifically, the bill provides that the initiator of a project will prepare an assessment document to meet specifications set out by the Ministry of the Environment and the ministry will co-ordinate review of this document. The project and its assessment and review may be further examined at public hearings conducted by an independent Environmental Assessment Board. This board will then make its recommendations to the Minister of the Environment.

The final decision on the project and the recommendations from all sources pertaining to it will be made by the minister and the cabinet. Cabinet's decision will be binding so that a project assessed and reviewed will not proceed without meeting the required environmental considerations.

This legislation and the procedural process have been prepared only after an immense amount of study which required dedication and time of those concerned. This Act has been studied and refined again and again in order to ensure that we have, in this province, an efficient and practical process for environmental assessment. As I have said, this is far-reaching legislation and we are breaking new ground. I am confident that we have produced a strong, realistic and workable system.

I would like to highlight three aspects of the legislation: timing, participation and the role of the assessment board.

The legislation encompasses an area of environmental protection which has not been fully developed elsewhere in the world. As you appreciate, Mr. Speaker, a form of environmental impact legislation has been introduced previously in the United States but with limited success.

In Ontario we have anticipated that in this virtually new legislative field, as with similar pioneer legislative programmes, it may be necessary to refine and to develop improved administrative procedures as we go along. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to implement this legislation in stages.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Like the ban on non-returnables, eh?

Hon. W. Newman: The Environmental Assessment Act will apply first to projects and programmes initiated by the government of Ontario and its Crown agencies. The second stage would apply to major public and private projects.

We believe that an immediate headlong rush into wholesale application of the legislation to all development projects would be foolish, possibly dangerous and even irresponsible.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why didn't the minister announce this two years ago?

Hon. W. Newman: It is far more practical, in our view—

Mr. Cassidy: He was doing well until he got to this stage.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. W. Newman: It is far more practical in our view to implement the features of this legislation in stages in order to develop satisfactory procedures which will be non-disruptive.

Mr. Cassidy: Does the minister have a 10-year plan or a 20-year plan?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. W. Newman: It is not my intention, however, to delay unnecessarily the overall application of this bill and, in fact, the principle of this bill already has been adopted in our province.

On the recommendation of my ministry, environmental assessment is currently under way in the private sector. Several assessments are now proceeding in co-operation with my ministry. Beyond this, a number of principal industries and companies already have indicated their intention to undertake environmental impact assessments of their planned future developments. We welcome this spirit of co-operation and the acceptance of the principle of acting to protect the environment rather than reacting to repair it.

I have emphasized that we plan to provide for public participation in the assessment process. The legislation encourages constructive submissions by the public or environmental assessments and reflects this government's policy in this respect.

Thirdly, I wish to make clear that the Environmental Assessment Board will serve as an independent body which will be appointed by order-in-council and which will then report to cabinet through the Ministry of the Environment.

Since this will be an appointed board it will not have the authority to make final decisions. This will be the duty of the Ontario cabinet as its obligation to the public under our responsible system of government. The board and its members will represent a broad spectrum of the people of Ontario and will bring the widest possible range of opinion and perspective to its forums.

I must advise you also, Mr. Speaker, that it will be necessary to introduce suitable amendments to both the Ontario Water Resources Act and to the Environmental Protection Act to conform to the requirements of this new assessment legislation. These amendments will be introduced at a later time.

In summary, I wish to emphasize once more that this legislation has been prepared

only after extensive study of assessment programmes in other jurisdictions of the world. We have studied and questioned and considered all suggestions presented to us before determining legislation which will serve the people of this province efficiently.

We believe without doubt that environmental assessment—

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): And pragmatically. The minister left out something.

Hon. W. Newman: And pragmatically. I am sorry; thank you.

Mr. Renwick: What does that mean?

Mr. Cassidy: It means no headlong rush.

Hon. W. Newman: We believe without doubt that environmental assessment, as defined in this bill, will enable all of us in Ontario to achieve a universal goal — to provide and to ensure an environment which is satisfying and rewarding in our time and which will be enriched for the generations of the future by the actions which we take today.

LIVER DISORDERS

Hon. M. Birch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to draw attention to a major development in the field of medical research which, while still experimental, has a high probability of finding applications for developing specific new treatments for liver disorders.

One of the major priorities of the Ontario Ministry of Health and, indeed, health systems throughout the world, is the search for new ways and means of decreasing mortality and morbidity rates. The achievement I am speaking of represents a new discovery which may prevent alcoholic liver cirrhosis.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The government had better pay attention.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The technique, now undergoing clinical trials, involves using an anti-thyroid drug to reduce the speeded-up metabolism of liver exposed to heavy amounts of alcohol. This increased oxygen demand cannot always be met by the liver's blood supply. The result of such oxygen deficiency is cellular damage leading to alcoholic hepatitis, which in a high proportion of cases develops into cirrhosis.

Prof. Yedy Israel, principal investigator, has indicated that if the clinical trials at the Addiction Research Foundation Clinical In-

sstitute are as successful as the animal trials, it should be possible to halt the cellular damage associated with alcoholic hepatitis in humans. This should facilitate quicker and easier treatment of this disease and sharply reduce the number of hepatitis and cirrhosis deaths.

The implications of the work are significant. In 1973, more than 2,500 Canadians died of liver cirrhosis.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Why doesn't the government restrict the sales?

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): The member for High Park is the guy who wants to open it up.

Mr. Shulman: Decrease the advertising.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That was 1,500 more than in 1972.

Mr. Shulman: The member for Scarborough Centre has a vested interest in this.

Mr. Drea: I don't buy any liquor stocks.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Scientists estimate that about 60 per cent of liver cirrhosis deaths in Ontario are attributable to heavy alcohol consumption. Apart from the humane aspects of the research, the work has significant implications in terms of health costs. As we are all aware, liver disease is a heavy contributor to health costs, particularly public health costs.

Details of this research will be unveiled today at the Addiction Research Foundation. I considered it of such significance as to draw this matter to the attention of members of the Legislature and thus acknowledge the contribution made by the scientists at the foundation and at the University of Toronto.

Mr. Cassidy: That's very good news for the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

The Leader of the Opposition.

HOPE TOWNSHIP GARBAGE SITE

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Minister of the Environment if his announcement means that the proposal by Canadian Pacific Rail to dump Toronto garbage in Hope township will be reviewed under the procedure that will be coming forward administratively under this Act? Or, failing that, is he prepared to announce his decision, because the decision has been his and it's been pending for some months.

Perhaps it might be helpful if I were to ask a supplementary question associated with it. Is he aware that Marathon Realty, the realty arm of CP Rail, is negotiating to buy more property adjacent to the Hope township site on the Howard Payne property? Should he not make some announcement about this matter before it goes any further?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, as you know, the site in Hope township was examined by the Environmental Hearing Board. They made recommendations to our executive director within the ministry. They have been evaluating the circumstances surrounding that and they are doing a lot of hydraulic testing, as I said. I might say that at this point in time that our people have been doing a final assessment on the situation and I would anticipate that I will have some answers in the fairly near future.

Yes, I was aware that someone was buying more land in that area. Certainly, this wasn't a result of anything that I had to say to CP or Marathon, or whoever the hon. member for Brant was mentioning. I just knew that somebody was buying more land down there. Certainly, as far as I am concerned, there was no indication that anybody should buy or even look at any more land.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Would the minister agree that his statement that the decision on Hope is pending and that his ministry is going through further evaluation, is patently ridiculous, since he has been giving precisely the same answer for over a year?

Wouldn't he further agree that this is a prime type of decision—where the garbage of the city of Toronto is to be dumped into Hope township on contract by Canadian Pacific Rail—and that this new board established by the legislation he intends to introduce in a few minutes should accept, as one of its first responsibilities, a total review of this situation?

Surely, if there is any thought that the government would permit it, it is going to cause a substantial furore, not only in Hope township but in the other areas of the province.

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, at this point in time, as I've said, the Environmental Hearing Board did hear the case in question.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister is replacing that whole procedure.

Hon. W. Newman: I assume that the Environmental Assessment Board will replace part of the procedure. They still will be hearing the same sort of applications as the Environmental Hearing Board has been hearing on sanitary landfill sites. I do go forward

here now and say that we are going to have a review with the Environmental Assessment Board process, which is not retroactive as far as I'm concerned.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No decision has been made.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is not retroactive.

Hon. W. Newman: Calm down. Mr. Speaker, I've said before that we will be having—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The government has been delaying for ages.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. W. Newman: Does the Leader of the Opposition want an answer?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister is not giving us an answer.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): He doesn't want an answer.

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I said before we would be having an announcement on Hope in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth, a supplementary.

Mr. Deans: Thank you. Supplementary question: Am I to understand that projects which have not yet received final approval are not going to be referred to the board to be set up under the new Act?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is going to be phased in. The announcement for the election and the—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, when this legislation is brought forward—it's quite lengthy legislation—and when it has had final reading, we'll look at any particular project, but this will not be retroactive, no.

Mr. Deans: Nobody's asking if it will be retroactive. What I am asking is, in the case of projects that have not yet received final approval, will the new criteria that are now being established by the Act that the minister will introduce today be applied to those projects; and will the persons applying for the implementation of those projects be required to abide by the criteria of the new Act?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, until the Act is passed, they will not have to, of

course, and we'll look at it on an individual basis.

Mr. Deans: Is it likely then that approval will be given to the Hope township project or anywhere else before this Act is passed?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Carleton East.

Mr. P. Taylor (Carleton East): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a supplementary. On page 5 of the minister's statement he refers to two phases. The first phase would affect projects and programmes initiated by the government of Ontario and its Crown agencies, while the second stage would apply to major public and private projects. Could the minister advise this House as to what his thinking is as to the time span between the implementation of the first and second stages of this bill?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, that is a very difficult question because we want to get the legislation in place, get it operating, see how efficiently it works and get any bugs that may be in it out of it before we get into the private or public sector. But we are going to start dealing with government projects first.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister's answer is, it will be as long as possible.

Mr. P. Taylor: Would it be more than a year or two?

Hon. W. Newman: I can't give the member a time frame on that at this point in time. I would hope if it works efficiently and well we can move it in reasonably quickly but there may be some problems in getting it worked out in detail.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: May I ask of the minister if both the Canadian National and Canadian Pacific railways would come under the ambit of this legislation?

Hon. W. Newman: Canadian National Railways would come under the ambit of the federal Ministry of the Environment. It comes under the federal government, so it would come under their ambit at this point in time. As for a CP proposal, it would depend upon what kind of proposal it was, whether it would come under our jurisdiction. I would assume in many cases it would be, depending on the specific instance one is dealing with.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

ONTARIO NORTHLAND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask the Premier, Mr. Speaker, if his appointment of the member for Timiskaming (Mr. Havrot) as chairman of the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission means his outright rejection of the recommendation of the commission on the Legislature that this practice of appointing sitting members to positions of extra responsibility and emolument be abolished.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I recall those recommendations relatively well. I think the main context of the recommendations was that as these appointments came up, it could be worked out that they would be appointed as parliamentary assistants. If they have responsibilities, which the member for Timiskaming will have with respect to the Ontario Northland, that is, in conjunction with his responsibilities as a parliamentary assistant, then I think this is totally consistent with the report.

While I'm on my feet, I'd also congratulate the member for Timiskaming. I'm sure all members on all sides of the House wish him well in his very onerous responsibilities.

Mr. Cassidy: We are not so sure.

Mr. Deans: I wouldn't bet on that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'm sure the members on the other side of the House share with me the great confidence I have in his capacity to look after this particular area of responsibility.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): There is nobody left.

Mr. Cassidy: It is one of the worst appointments the Premier has made in four years.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The Premier is joking.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, since the Premier has taken the opportunity to express his congratulations, I regret I have to express to you, sir, my deep concern that once again the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission is headed by a political hack who knows nothing about running a railroad.

Mr. Deans: How about the member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes)? There is a man who knows how to run a railroad.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Wouldn't the Premier consider that it's about time we put in some-

one from northeastern Ontario who knows something about the running of a railroad? Wouldn't the Premier consider that his experiences in the past in this regard have been enough of a lesson so that he is not going to repeat them?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have found that appointments of members to various boards and commissions have been very excellent appointments. I'm not going to go through them all here, chapter and verse, this afternoon.

Mr. Breithaupt: It would take too long.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Not very many that haven't had a taste of the gravy. Just about everybody. Just about all of them had some of it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would only say to the Leader of the Opposition, in that this is a sort of pre-Easter week I will not become provoked, but his observation about the appointment of a political hack to a particular position is one that I think the Leader of the Opposition ought to consider very carefully.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Tell us about the guy the Premier fired.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

GO-URBAN SYSTEM

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask the Premier further, in the absence of the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Rhodes), if he can clarify the status of the work that is evidently going forward on GO-Urban since his minister, who is absent still, and the other employees of the transportation commission have indicated they still have confidence in the feasibility of magnetic levitation and there is a further expenditure going on? Can the Premier tell us of the status of the \$3.4 million lien brought by Canada Systems Group against the project for payment of its commitments, and the \$100,000 owing to Spar Aerospace for work carried out on the project as well?

Are these commitments going to be made? What is the status of it? What happened to the three-month report the minister was supposed to present to the House following the withdrawal by the West German government of its support?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can't comment in detail. I'm sure the Minister of

Transportation and Communications will be delighted to do so. I would only observe that the Soberman report—which I know the members opposite have read with great care, and of course they have reached a consensus as to its recommendations—states, I think without any hesitation, the absolute necessity of an intermediate capacity system for Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I think he is talking about light rail.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If memory serves me correctly there were some five probable alignments suggested in that report. However, Mr. Speaker, I cannot comment exactly on the status of the two or three contracts related to the GO-Urban system. As I said in this House, and I've said publicly, it is my hope this province and the people in it will be the developers of some form of intermediate capacity system, both as it relates to the needs of Metropolitan Toronto and some of the other urban centres. In view of the economic benefits to be derived therefrom, and the technological advances that are of course part of it, I would like to think we have the capacity here in Ontario to do it rather than have it developed elsewhere. As I have said, Mr. Speaker, some jurisdiction somewhere is going to do it; I would like to see Ontario be the one.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: We are concerned, however, about the financial commitment. Can the Premier tell us what this is costing us on a continuing basis?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Minister of Transportation and Communications will be delighted to give the hon. member that information.

MERCURY POLLUTION

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Finally Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of the Environment if he has consulted with the professor from the University of Tokyo, whose name I guess is Dr. Jun Ui, an expert on the effects of mercury pollution, on human ingestion of mercury, who has made, I thought, some very strong statements regarding the problems we have in this province associated with mercury pollution? Has the minister undertaken to meet with this gentleman and the people who are with him for consultation purposes?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, these gentlemen, I believe, were supposed to come to Toronto originally, but their plans were changed. I have not met with him personally, but I certainly have had my technical people made available to talk to him at any time. I believe our people are going down or have been in Ottawa discussing the matter with him, providing all the technical data available within the Ministry of the Environment.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Is there any thought within this ministry or the Ministry of Health, concerning any further assessment of the problem in Grassy Narrows, and the Wabigoon and English River systems, which the minister has indicated to the House he feels is largely a receding problem, in light of the fact this external and independent expert claims from experience in Japan the levels of mercury ingestion here are very serious and will lead to substantial medical problems for the Indians concerned.

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, as far as the jurisdiction of the Minister of the Environment is concerned, we have been monitoring the fish. We will continue to monitor the fish and check the mercury levels. We have certainly made the information public and will continue to keep the public informed. We will also be giving those results, of course, to the Minister of Health (Mr. Miller) and the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier).

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): No alternatives, though.

Mr. Speaker: No more questions? The member for Wentworth.

TORONTO DEVELOPMENT CONTROLS

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer indicate if in his discussions with the Metro council and the city of Toronto council regarding the Toronto development controls, there was mention made of the 12—perhaps more than 12—projects which had applications before them for building permits, and if in fact those projects will now automatically receive approval as a result of the act or whether the controls that have been set in place by the cabinet will allow the council to disallow the applications?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I did not have discussions with city

of Toronto officials or with city of Toronto elected persons.

Mr. Deans: I then ask whether the Treasurer is aware, from the discussions that were held with people in his ministry, from feedback from them to him, of whether in fact there are 12 or more projects which were awaiting a final decision of cabinet before automatic granting of building permits would be required, since they complied in all other aspects, presumably? If that is the case, then do the development controls put in place by the cabinet allow the council to disallow the granting of those permits?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I have no idea whether there are 12, or how many there are, but it seems—

Mr. Deans: Well, a number.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —to me that undoubtedly there were applications which came forward to the city, how many I don't know, during the period from the time that the original bylaw was passed until the time of its disallowance—if I can use that term—by the Ontario Municipal Board subsequently confirmed by the cabinet. I don't know what their status is. Whether in fact that was the only reason that they were not granted, I have no idea. That is something which would be between the applicant and the city.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Since the cabinet, in making its decision, has apparently endorsed the principle of what the city of Toronto has intended to do although it disagreed with the manner in which it was done because of the lack of objective criteria, will the government take action with the municipality of Toronto in order to ensure that those 12 applications which came in after the bylaw was initially passed and which the city therefore could not deal with by any other means than the means which it undertook, now come under the objective criteria when they are released at the end of the month?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I think, as I have said, that is something which is going to have to be determined between the applicants for building permits—if there were applications, and undoubtedly there were during that time, and the city of Toronto. If there are disputes as to the position of those applications for building permits, then that's something that the courts will have to settle and which we are not able to settle any further.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Rather than deliver a non-answer like that, is the minister not aware that the city is powerless to stop those 12 projects or apply criteria to them because the original bylaw is the only bylaw which applies to them since this cabinet has struck down the 45-ft holding bylaw?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I'm sure that there are a number of things which may or may not have prevented the issuing of those permits—demolition legislation and a whole host of other things. What the status is of each of those applications, however many there may be—the hon. member seems to know and thinks that there are 12; I don't know how many there are—again I can only say that that is something which will have to be sorted out between the applicants and the municipality and, failing a resolution at that level, that's what the courts are there for.

Mr. Cassidy: The Treasurer is lining up with the developers on that one.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If I might ask a further supplementary. The matter was raised following the minister's announcement a few days ago. Since the action of the Municipal Board, on emanation of this government, and the action of the government itself has in fact left a hole in the protective bylaw structure through which some of these applications may very well be approved, would he not agree that, since it is the stated policy of the government that the city of Toronto should have these powers, the government could act through private legislation to prevent an approval of the building permits simply by mistake or in fact by the intrusion of the power of this government in the first place?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is the minister for or against—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the member for or against?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Entirely for.

Mr. Deans: Now we know.

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): That was a non-answer.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Retroactively.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Wentworth has the opportunity to ask questions.

HOUSING POLICY

Mr. Deans: I would like to ask the Premier a question with regard to his overall housing policy: Between November, 1974, and March, 1975, the income levels of families eligible for housing under the Home Ownership programme in the city of Hamilton and surrounding area went from a minimum of \$8,700 to a minimum of \$11,806. How does that coincide with the government's stated intention to continue to provide housing for low and middle income groups, given that there is over a \$3,000 difference in the qualification requirements in the matter of five months?

Hon. Mr. Davis: That question should properly be directed to the Minister of Housing (Mr. Irvine). I would say as a matter of general policy, we are developing programmes and are committed to providing housing for middle and lower income groups.

Mr. Deans: If the government is developing programmes for middle and low income groups, could the Premier perhaps make known to the public what those programmes are so that they might be able to make some kind of determination about the likelihood of their ever being able to find accommodation?

Let me ask a question with regard to rentals. In a statement made by the Minister on March 20, he set out some criteria for the establishment of rents in projects which were being undertaken between private developers and the Ontario Housing Corp.—the criteria will be found on page 3. Can I ask the Premier whether—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Page 3 of what?

Mr. Deans: Page 3 of the document that he read in the Legislature.

Can I ask the Premier whether he doesn't feel, given the rapid rate of rental increases, that criteria not unlike those set out on this page could be applied to the overall rental industry in order to try to make available to people, housing or accommodation at a cost they can afford? Does the Premier think it particularly funny that people aren't able to get housing within their ability to pay?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't have a copy of that statement with me.

Mr. Deans: Does he know what his government is doing?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I regret that I didn't bring it with me. Perhaps if the member had advised me he was going to ask this, I would have brought it with me. I am sure the

Minister of Housing will be delighted to answer this for him.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, on a supplementary question: I want to put this to the Premier. It is said in the statement of the Minister of Housing on behalf of the Premier's government—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Our government.

Mr. Deans: The Premier's government.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is all our government.

Mr. Deans: It is the Premier's government.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is the member's government. He lives here and pays taxes.

Mr. Deans: On behalf of the Premier's government—I don't take any credit nor do I accept any blame for his blundering—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: —it is stated in that particular document—on his behalf this was made—that there could be an agreement reached between developers and the government with regard to the rate of rent which would be charged. Why doesn't he move to do likewise across the board to protect people in rental accommodation against unwarranted rent increases?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, we have discussed this matter of rent controls before. I know the members opposite are totally committed to a policy of controls on all things—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Control, control, control.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —prices, rents, wages and so on. It has just never been as clearly enunciated as it has been this afternoon. I am delighted to hear it.

Mr. Stokes: Who was talking about wages and price controls?

Hon. Mr. Davis: He was.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Why doesn't the Premier practice a little self control?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Provincial Secretary for Resources Development has the answer to a question asked previously.

PROVINCIAL PARK FEES

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, on March 20, the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr.

Laughren) asked the following question, in the absence of the Minister of Natural Resources, of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development:

In view of the statements made by senior officials of the Ministry of Natural Resources that there is going to be an increase in the provincial park fees, would the Provincial Secretary assure this chamber there will be no such increase before the next provincial election?

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to assure the members of the Legislature that we do not intend to increase fees for provincial parks. I am advised that the speculation in the press was probably prompted by the recent announcement of the federal government concerning a significant increase in national park fees.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Shame.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I'm not saying anything nasty about the federal government—just the facts.

Mr. MacDonald: Dastardly.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Isn't that part of the plot?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The officials of the Ministry of Natural Resources who were questioned by the press did not, I am told, say that there would be a fee increase in provincial parks.

Mr. Stokes: They said it was customary to raise them every three years.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Like University tuitions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They simply reiterated the policy of the government to maintain a reasonable balance between operating costs and revenues through periodic adjustments on the scale of park fees.

Mr. Stokes: They were just kite flying, and it wouldn't fly.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the member still in favour of free admission?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

TRAINING SCHOOL GRANTS

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): A question of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, relating to the amendments to the Municipal Act which now permit municipalities, in which there is a training school

or an institution under the Developmental Services Act, to assess \$50 per person or per bed as a grant in lieu of taxes: Is there anything in legislation or regulations requiring such a municipality to provide or maintain any certain level of service in that municipality?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Good: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Why then is the municipality of Montague township being pressured into paying the water and service bill of the Ontario Hospital school in Montague township, which I believe is about \$50,000, to the city of Smiths Falls, now that it is about to receive this grant of \$50 per bed?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I have no idea, Mr. Speaker. I'll be glad to look into it and give the hon. member the answer.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

ALGONQUIN COLLEGE

Mr. Cassidy: A question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. Auld), who has been absent for several days:

Is the Premier aware that the Minister of Colleges and Universities waltzed into Ottawa a week ago Wednesday to meet with the board of Algonquin College, that he told them to spend all of their reserve funds in order to eliminate the 1974-1975 deficit, and that he's left them facing a \$1.4 million deficit for 1975-1976, with absolutely no concrete suggestions as to how to meet it?

If he is aware of that, can the Premier tell the House how the government intends to help Algonquin out of this financial difficulty, having cut its spending to the bone?

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): This is happening all over the province.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to hear that a minister of the Crown is still able to waltz in and out of any situation. I find that encouraging, very encouraging. I wish I had that same ability myself.

No, I don't know of any discussions the minister had with Algonquin College. The minister at this moment is, I believe, engaged in dialogue at the University of Toronto. He may even be here before the question period is over, at which time I'm sure he'd be

delighted to answer the hon. member's question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Carleton East.

OTTAWA AREA AMALGAMATION STUDY

Mr. P. Taylor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Premier:

In response to a question from the hon. member for Ottawa Centre on Oct. 29 last, nearly five months ago, the hon. Premier told this House—and I refer to page 4515 of Hansard—that there was a study under way at that time to determine whether or not the urbanized portions of Gloucester township and the village of Rockcliffe Park should be amalgamated by the city of Ottawa. Could the Premier say when that study will be completed and reported to this House?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I'm very surprised that the hon. member—and I know he's a new member—isn't aware of the study going on by Dr. Mayo in the Ottawa-Carleton region, which is of course a total study of the community.

Mr. Stokes: The Premier was just lucky enough to have the Treasurer on his left there. That's how he was made aware of it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Perhaps if the hon. member would consult with Dr. Mayo, he might tell him when he expects to have his study completed.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

HEALTH AND SAFETY HAZARDS AT ELLIOT LAKE

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker: Inasmuch as the joint report prepared by his ministry and the Ministry of Health has now been completed and copies have been delivered both to the Minister of Health, who alas has departed the scene, and to the Minister of Labour himself, or at least to his deputy, is the minister prepared to release that report?

Hon. J. P. MacBeth (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I hope that we'll be prepared to make a statement on that in the near future.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kit-chen.

GRAND RIVER FLOOD INQUIRY

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development with respect to the Grand River flooding of last spring and the inquiry that has taken place: Can the minister advise us when we might expect to receive the report of the inquiry commission, as some substantial time has now passed and there is great interest within the Waterloo region and the communities along the Grand River valley to come to grips with the conclusions that the commissioner may bring forward?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The water is rising again.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to advise the hon. member of that at this particular time.

Mr. Lawlor: Will the minister get himself into such a position?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

INSULATION MATERIALS

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier: What is the government doing to encourage the use of insulation materials that are safer than asbestos, both in its mining and in its processing?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that question for the hon. member, but I will be delighted to try to find out for him from the appropriate ministers.

Mr. Burr: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware that Ontario Hydro has virtually eliminated the use of asbestos as the result of a programme that began several years ago?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of it; but obviously the member feels that is a very positive thing. I will communicate his views to Ontario Hydro just to tell them how well he thinks they are doing.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River.

MANPOWER TRAINING

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I suppose this question should be directed to the Provincial Secretary for Social Development in regard to manpower training in the Province of Ontario.

Have there been any meetings going on under the umbrella of this ministry to plan for manpower training, apprenticeship programmes and so on, especially as they relate to the study of the Ministry of Colleges and Universities called "Training for Ontario's Future"?

Has the minister had any discussions with the Minister of Labour and the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. McNie), I believe, who is looking after this?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, the Minister without Portfolio is the minister responsible for the manpower secretariat.

Mr. Reid: He is not here.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I understand there has been discussion between his secretariat and with the Department of Labour, but he will be in a position to speak to that when he is in the House.

Mr. Reid: Supplementary: By "the Department of Labour" does the minister mean the provincial Ministry of Labour?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The Ministry of Labour.

Mr. Reid: Could I then redirect my question to the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker? What talks have gone on, and has the minister come up with any programmes? Is the ministry, for example, going to follow the recommendations in the task force report and become industry-centred with apprenticeship programmes and remove some of these programmes from the secondary schools and community colleges?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, that is quite a way removed from my ministry, but I have had discussions with the Minister without Portfolio in connection with manpower problems—not in connection with those training problems which would ordinarily be the responsibility of the Ministry of Colleges and Universities. I can't tell the member what he may be planning in that way. I know he has plans afoot in connection with manpower, but they are still in the formative stages. Our discussions in that regard are continuing.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor West?

AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. Bounsall: A question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker: Since the minister last month removed agricultural workers from

some of the exemptions in the Employment Standards Act, will he now consider removing those agricultural workers from the exemption under the Labour Relations Act so that their association of migrant farm workers can, in fact, receive the protection of the Ontario Labour Relations Act?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, there is no thought of doing that at the present time.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre.

NIGHT TRAFFIC COURT IN YORK REGION

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): A question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker: Why has there been such a delay—it has been a period of nearly two years since the region of York asked the minister's predecessor, twice removed—to establish a night traffic court in York? Has he yet replied to the region about establishing such a court?

Hon. J. T. Clement (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Mr. Speaker, it is my information it has been operating since February, 1974, in that particular area of Toronto.

Mr. Deacon: I was referring to the region of York in Newmarket, the one operated in Newmarket. That is a different region. Maybe the minister doesn't understand. Metropolitan Toronto is different from the region of York.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Has the minister got that figured out?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, I think if the hon. member would refer back to the statements of two of my predecessors, twice removed, a statement was made at that time by the then Attorney General that they would embark upon this study as a pilot project in, I believe, North York. Before they decide to expand it, in other areas of the province or other areas of this particular region, they would see if it was operating successfully.

Mr. Reid: Predecessor three times removed.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Accordingly, it is operating up there. Is the member trying to tell me something? Has he been caught up there or something?

Mr. Deacon: No. Doesn't the minister have a copy of the letter written March 7? They are asking for an answer, and attempting to get one from the minister.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Don't look at me. Perhaps if they wrote to me they would get an answer more accurately and more quickly.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They did write to the minister and they didn't get an answer.

Mr. Deacon: I think the minister should have a copy of the letter sent to him on March 7 asking for an answer for them.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Maybe the minister needs a special arrangement to get it through.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay.

COMPLEMENT FREEZE

Mr. Stokes: I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development.

Is the minister aware that the complement freeze imposed several months ago on all ministries within his government is working undue hardship on a lot of the regional offices, particularly the district offices of the Ministry of Natural Resources? Is he aware that, as a result of this freeze in complement, the Ministry of Natural Resources is forced to take people on on a contract basis by which they are denied the rights and working conditions which generally apply to civil servants across the province—particularly female workers? In district offices they may have one permanent employee and six others on contract who are forced—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Ministry of Culture and Recreation is growing.

Mr. Stokes: —to take two weeks off a year so they won't be considered permanent personnel. Doesn't he think this is discriminatory against female employees and will he do something about it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's quite a question.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes and yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, it was a long speech ending with a rising inflection.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Just say yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I'll try to remember everything the hon. member has asked.

Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, we can't have it both ways. The hon. member and all members agree the government should keep down the complement of the civil service; that we shouldn't allow it to increase and that we should, in fact, try to reduce it. We're holding the line now.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What about the Ministry of Culture and Recreation?

Mr. Ferrier: They are circumventing it. The Ministry of Culture is advertising some excellent jobs.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member for Thunder Bay certainly, I'm sure, gives public credit to the government, particularly under the responsibility of the Chairman of the Management Board (Mr. Winkler), for keeping from increasing the complement of the government. This is probably the only government in North America which has succeeded in doing it.

Mr. Stokes: The ministries still have them but they have them on a contract basis, that's all. The minister is just playing games.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member for Thunder Bay asked me whether I know if there are any hardships down the line in doing this. I would be surprised if there weren't. Of course, in some areas there is going to be some weeping and gnashing of teeth in getting adjusted to this particular situation but I'm sure the ministries and the civil service will manage to cope with it as they have with other difficult situations in the past.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is deceiving himself as well as the other people now.

Mr. Stokes: Will the minister look into it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would be pleased if the hon. member would get up and give his blessing and his encouragement to the continued policy of the government to keep down the increase in the size of government generally.

Mr. Stokes: That's not what I asked.

Mr. MacDonald: And it's not what the minister is doing.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre has a supplementary.

Mr. Deacon: Would the minister tell us if this is the way the government is covering up the larger increase in the civil service than is apparent from the figures?

An hon. member: Certainly he is.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member is referring to the fact that we are hiring some people under contract, that has no relation to it at all. As a matter of fact, if the hon.

member doesn't appreciate the difference between not taking on, say, 10 people and adding them to the civil service and, perhaps, getting three or four people on contract then he had better do a little greater study in depth on government generally.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is a great difference first in numbers—

Mr. Lawlor: We have had six new boards in the last three days.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and one has greater control over the period of time in which they are needed insofar as the work is concerned.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Essex-Kent.

CATALYTIC CONVERTERS

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. Is the Minister of the Environment aware that catalytic converters on new cars could be dangerous by causing fires in forest areas where there is dry grass? Has he had any information on that?

Hon. W. Newman: No, but we have certainly looked at the catalytic mufflers on the 1975 models. The member might be aware of the fact that the catalytic mufflers were not a pre-requisite here in Canada. It was just in the US that the American-made cars—a lot of them in the GM line—had the catalytic mufflers. Certainly we have no reason to suspect them of causing fires but we certainly do check the emissions from them.

Mr. Ruston: Would the minister consider investigating their use in park areas where there is a possibility of fires?

Hon. Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, we certainly would be glad to look at any flames being shot out of the catalytic mufflers but we have made a great deal of tests on them.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury.

TORONTO AREA TRANSIT OPERATING AUTHORITY

Mr. Germa: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier in relation to the Toronto Area Transit Operating Authority. A statement by the Minister of Transport of March 13, 1975, wherein he said that the Toronto Area Transit Operating Authority, an arm of the ministry, was created by the Ontario

government to regulate and co-ordinate inter-regional transit services, is in conflict with the statement the Premier made on Aug. 23, 1973, when he was speaking to this and said that the government would not be infringing upon the autonomy of the local areas concerned. Has there been a change in government policy in relationship to the minister's recent statement?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I must confess that maybe because it is Monday I'm a little slow today. I really don't understand the question or see any conflict or contradiction in the two observations that were made. If the hon. member might like to rephrase it, I'd be delighted to try to answer it for him.

I'll tell him that I think the problem may be in his understanding of it. What I indicated initially, when the Toronto Area Transit Operating Authority was being proposed and developed, and the legislation passed, was that when it came to the planning mechanisms we were most interested in having the planning responsibilities still those of the regions which were participating within the authority. I don't think anything the minister has said has contradicted that. We are talking now about inter-regional transportation. I don't really see any conflict in those two observations.

Perhaps if the member could drop me a note and spell it out more specifically, I'll try to answer it in a better fashion for him. As I say, it still hasn't registered, but I don't see what the problem is.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

COURT BACKLOG IN WINDSOR AREA

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Attorney General. Is the Attorney General aware of the serious backlog of criminal cases taking place in the city of Windsor and the county of Essex? If the minister is aware, will he look into the situation in an attempt to resolve it? Is he also aware of the fact that the jury panels being selected sometimes number as many as 86, at a cost to the province of approximately \$1,000 for them, and that they are called in and then sent home because the criminal case cannot be conducted?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of it, having read about it as recently as today, as reported in the Windsor Star, I believe. As I read the article, from the com-

ments of the judge reported in the article the problem seemed to be that there were only seven or eight lawyers in that area during the bulk of the criminal work. As I read the article, it would appear that the lawyers weren't ready to go or were involved in another court.

Insofar as this pertains to legal aid, if it turns out that legal aid applicants are trying to secure the services of a small number of criminal lawyers in that area, I would hesitate to tell them they must take other people on the legal aid panel. I think that the choice should be available to those who have been issued a certificate.

That's what I read in the article. Perhaps I didn't understand it correctly. If there is a large number of criminal cases on the list and a small number of defence counsel handling the bulk of those cases, if they have to be involved in another court and are not ready to go, then it is just one of the situations which we run into, not only in the Windsor area but in other areas of the province that are served by a fairly small number of members of the criminal bar.

Until the public goes to other lawyers—and I'm not suggesting that they should—the problem will continue. It is just the same as 20 people wanting their cars fixed by one mechanic. It all can't be done at the same time. I'll welcome any observations the member might offer as to how this congestion can be alleviated. But until such time as the situation changes, I think it will continue to be with us.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. B. Newman: Is the minister aware that the jury panels are called down to the various criminal cases, but they are sent right home simply because the cases cannot be proceeded with? Could not the cases be programmed in such a fashion, or the lawyers involved inform the officials, so that the jury panel wouldn't lose a day's pay and receive only \$10 for its services in putting in an appearance at the court?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, jury panels are directed by the sheriff to appear on a certain day at the opening of the sessions or the assizes. There may be two or three cases slated for that particular day, or perhaps one case, wherein counsel have indicated to the officers of the court, the sheriff and perhaps even to the judge himself, that they anticipate the case may last for three or four days.

Lawyers coming next on the list with case No. 2, No. 3 or No. 4 are usually advised by the court, because they call and ask how long the first case is going to take, that it is estimated the first case will take perhaps as long as three days, and so they are not ready to go until later on in the week.

It may be that on the day in question, or almost on the eve of the day in question, a very critical witness for one side of the case or other is ill, or counsel is ill; and in the interests of their respective clients, be it either the Crown attorney representing the Crown or the defence lawyer representing the accused, they communicate that to the court. The next morning, when the panel turns up, there are no lawyers ready to go for cases Nos. 2, 3, and 4 because of the reasons I've outlined and, in order to minimize the inconvenience to the jury, the judge will send them home, and quite properly so.

This is what happens when you have people involved in a system dealing with people. It's only as good as the health and the ability of the people involved. Sometimes the same thing will happen where an accused actually absconds and, without the accused, they won't proceed with the trial.

I just don't know what the answer is, but it's something we can't just ignore; it's there. Anybody who has practised any law in the courts will tell the member the same thing happens with civil cases too.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS FOR MEDICAL TRAINING

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker: Inasmuch as the Minister of Colleges and Universities has stated that the problem of admission to students into first-year medical school is strictly within the realm of the university, and the dean of the medical school has written a letter stating that they are only carrying out the policies as set down by this government, can the Premier step into this vacuum and straighten out one or the other and let us find out who has the responsibility?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I'm always prepared to step into a vacuum if one exists. I really don't know of any vacuum. I haven't had a copy of the correspondence. This government has always been prepared, I think, to recognize the relative autonomy of our post-secondary institutions in terms of standards, admission and otherwise. However, I'd be delighted to discuss it with the minister

and see if the member for High Park is right as to whether there is a vacuum. I question that there is, but I'll certainly have a look.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker: Will the Premier agree that there is a serious problem there which is causing more than serious inconvenience and heartbreak to many Ontario students? And can he do something to assist in this problem?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I recognize that there are a number of students every year, whether it be in medicine, law or elsewhere, who are disappointed in not gaining admission; of course, this is sometimes more pronounced in the faculties of medicine, although it has happened in other faculties as well.

I have always been concerned, Mr. Speaker—and I think there has to be some degree of reason, some degree of balance here—that we don't become totally restrictive as far as admissions to our post-secondary institutions are concerned. This doesn't mean that it can't be looked at and discussed with the universities, but I'm sure the member for High Park doesn't feel that we should restrict enrolment at our universities entirely to Ontario or Canadian citizens—

Mr. Shulman: They should have priority.

Hon. Mr. Davis:—since there are a number of Ontarians who attend universities outside our own country, certainly outside our own province. I recognize there is a certain amount of political appeal in it at the moment. I don't deny that for a moment. But I think we have to look at it very carefully and do whatever we do with some degree of reason and logic. I am quite prepared to discuss it with the minister, but I am not prepared to give any commitment today.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kent.

AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Labour. Is the minister aware that over the past few years a number of those in the agricultural industry have been bringing in experienced Mexican farm labourers and that they could bring their families with them, but this year they are informed by Manpower that the only members of their families they can bring with them are those who are 16 years of age and older, so the experienced Mexican farm labourers refuse to come to assist those in agriculture in the Province of Ontario? Has there been a change in the manpower Act, or

does the minister have anything to do that would correct this situation?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): The member should ask his friends up in Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, the provisions for bringing in people from Mexico and the Caribbean are governed by the federal government. In making those regulations, I believe they do consult with our Ministry of Agriculture and Food, but they are the ones who are responsible and I think the member would have to ask them. However, I'm sure the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) will have some information if the member will save his question for him on Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that, notwithstanding the previous order, the House will sit on Wednesday, March 26, and when it adjourns on that day it will stand adjourned until Monday, April 7.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT ACT, 1975

Hon. W. Newman moves first reading of bill intituled, the Environmental Assessment Act, 1975.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AMENDMENT ACT, 1975

Hon. W. Newman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act, 1971.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

ONTARIO WATER RESOURCES AMENDMENT ACT, 1975

Hon. W. Newman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Ontario Water Resources Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, in explanation, this bill actually dissolves the Environmental Hearing Board and, when the new bill comes in, replaces it with the Environmental Assessment Board.

LABOUR OMBUDSMAN ACT, 1975

Mr. Reid moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the appointment of a Labour Ombudsman.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to establish a labour ombudsman to hear and investigate employee complaints with respect to employers and trade unions. It would apply to both union and non-union workers.

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day, I'll recognize the member for Algoma.

An hon. member: Keep it short and sweet.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, it's the usual tradition at this time of the year to bring some of the sweetness from Algoma to the members of the Legislature. So I would say that these little envelopes that have been distributed by the page boys and girls are with the compliments of the Algoma maple syrup producers.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, assuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(continued)

Mr. Speaker: The member for Oxford had the floor when we rose last week.

Mr. H. C. Parrott (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, appreciating the urgency and the short time left to this House to debate the Speech from the Throne, I think the rest of my remarks could sensibly be done when we debate the budget. I am prepared, therefore, with those very few words to conclude my remarks and yield to the next hon. member who chooses to speak to the Throne Speech.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron.

Mr. J. Riddell (Huron): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope I can make myself heard

despite the rather raspy voice I have at the present time.

As appears to be the custom, Mr. Speaker, I would like to join other members of this House in commending you on achieving and capably fulfilling your responsibilities in the high office as Speaker of the House.

I am going to be honest with you though, Mr. Speaker, and tell you that some of the members of this House, including myself, considered your appointment to be very short-lived, as your past attempts, as Deputy Speaker, to conduct the procedures of the House in an orderly fashion, left something to be desired. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, you have surprised us. You have done a reasonably good job of maintaining order and you seem to exercise fairness in carrying out your responsibilities, which other members of the House appreciate I am sure.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): He may be blind at times.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Members don't have to be like the weather outside today.

Mr. Riddell: You seem to be somewhat reluctant, however, Mr. Speaker, to cast a glance at the back benches on your extreme left during the question period, and I would hazard a guess that you purposely ignore us here in the fear that my colleague, the member for Carleton East (Mr. P. Taylor), will jump up and pose a question which might be embarrassing to you and your colleagues in the conduct of the House proceedings.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): What about the member for Essex South (Mr. Paterson)?

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, the member for Perth (Mr. Edighoffer) and I will try to restrain the member for Carleton East as much as possible in the hope you will make every effort to acknowledge our attempts to ask questions periodically.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Do you hear that, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, having given some considerable thought to what I might say in reply to the Throne Speech, I am reminded of a teacher who would begin his chemistry lecture by asking the students to name the properties of a vacuum. There was so little substance in the Throne Speech that it is practically impossible to comment on the policies of the government in this time of uncertainty, due to inflation here and abroad

and world recession. Therefore I will comment on matters of concern as they pertain to the people of Ontario.

We received a copy of the final report of the electoral boundaries commission on Tuesday last, and I would like to express my sincere regrets that the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) has lost his riding.

Not only did he lose his riding, but the rural people of Ontario have lost what little remains of representation on their behalf in the Ontario Legislature, inasmuch as another rural riding has been lost in favour of an additional riding in the city of London.

Now I fail to understand, Mr. Speaker, why the Minister of Agriculture and Food and his parliamentary assistant, the member for Middlesex South, (Mr. Eaton), would support the views of the two members for London in doing away with one of the rural Middlesex ridings in an attempt to establish three ridings in London and only one Middlesex riding. The news media has given wide publicity to the fact that the member for Middlesex North (Mr. Stewart) lost his riding, but the reports fail to indicate that the four members from Middlesex and London requested these changes, and assuming that the commission gave some consideration to the request, then I can only say that the Minister of Agriculture and Food helped feather his nest and now he is going to have to lie in it.

It has been suggested that the minister has three alternatives; to retire after 18 years of service, contest the London North riding, or run against the Liberal member for Huron.

Mr. Gaunt: He would be defeated.

Mr. Riddell: I say, Mr. Speaker, the minister really has only two alternatives; to retire or to run in the new Huron-Middlesex riding, for I firmly believe the minister's roots to be too deeply anchored in the rural community for him to even consider contesting the election in an urban riding.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the minister would seriously consider contesting the election in the Huron-Middlesex riding, for I firmly believe it could be one of the most interesting campaigns in the entire election.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Hear, hear. It would be another cabinet minister down the drain.

Mr. Riddell: I am fully cognizant of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that one such as I, who lacks experience in the political arena, should not be giving advice to a member who has

had 18 years of experience in politics. But should the Minister of Agriculture and Food decide to contest the election in Huron-Middlesex, then I would like to suggest that the tone of this election be conducted in a much more moral fashion than was the by-election in Huron in 1973.

Mr. G. W. Walker (London North): The member has to speak for himself.

Mr. Riddell: During the by-election in Huron at that time, I can't help recall that there was an attempt on someone's part to muddy the waters, and it didn't take a genius to assess the origin of such erroneous information. The press reported that an unidentified person said that he certainly wouldn't hire the Liberal candidate to work for him as he couldn't content himself with any one particular line of profession and, as a result, was always on the move.

What was not reported, Mr. Speaker, was that the same Liberal candidate worked for the extension branch of the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food, commencing his duties in Hastings county, and later being moved to Essex county with the same department, and then to a position as an assistant general manager of the Ontario stockyards in Toronto—all of which are departments and facilities of the Ontario government.

This, I presume, was what was implied as the Liberal candidate not being able to settle down to any one particular job. But, unfortunately, this wasn't the only dirt that was hurled during that by-election.

During the campaign, Mr. Speaker, I was allegedly divorced, bankrupt, and a one-time prisoner in a penitentiary in western Canada. I was amused, however, at my constituents' response to these allegations, particularly in connection with my so-called prison term in western Canada.

Mr. P. Taylor (Carleton East): That one was true, eh?

Mr. Riddell: Some of my constituents responded to the delegation by saying: "Well, if he was in jail it shows that he has got some gumption, and we want a man with aggressiveness to represent us in the Ontario Legislature."

Mr. Speaker, you well know, as do many of the members in the House, I hope, that people will no longer buy this kind of political garbage. Unfortunately, there are some members who have not yet grasped this concept. The type of political nonsense which

the hon. member for St. David (Mrs. Scrivener) was reported to have stated in a speech to some group in Toronto recently can do nothing more than lead to her defeat, along with that of the government, in the upcoming election.

Mr. P. Taylor: That's right. That's right.

Mr. Riddell: And, Mr. Speaker, I can say without fear of contradiction that the hon. member for St. David will be defeated unless she has something more positive to say about the Ontario government's housing programme. Surely the people of Ontario are entitled to something better than that.

To get back to the Minister of Agriculture and Food, I would very much regret to see him throw in the towel. I have seen the minister perform both in the Legislature and outside the Legislature, and although it is questionable whether he has rendered a great deal of assistance to the farmers in Ontario, he does have the ability to lead them to believe that he has and is doing something for them. He speaks well at agricultural meetings and conventions, and certainly has a very pleasing personality wherever he goes.

I commend him for his dedication in the House for I don't believe that all other cabinet ministers put together spend as many hours in the House listening to the debates as does the Minister of Agriculture and Food. But his shortcoming is definitely his reluctance to implement policies for the betterment of the agricultural industry in Ontario.

Our beef producers are in trouble. Our pork producers will likely suffer the effects of low beef prices. Our chicken producers have to operate at a loss, particularly when the Ontario Farm Products Marketing Board negates the effectiveness of the Chicken Producers Marketing Board in setting prices.

Our sheep producers are practically giving the wool away, and paying a levy on that wool to promote sheep and sheep products.

Our beef producers will be expected to pay a 45 cent levy on each head of livestock sold—which, I might say, is 10 cents more than that requested by the Beef Improvement Association. Why the minister chose to increase this levy to 45 cents on his own volition remains a mystery, not only to me, but to the beef producers in general.

The minister does not want to take part in the preservation of class 1 and 2 land. And when it did appear that he was trying to preserve good farm land by taking a stand against the pipeline being installed in the good agricultural land in southern Ontario,

he succumbed to the decision made by the present Treasurer, the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough), that the pipeline was going to be constructed in southern Ontario and that was it. It was just not going to go anywhere else other than in southern Ontario.

The minister seemed to show very little interest in preventing Ontario Hydro from constructing power line towers on class 1 and 2 land; and I don't recall him voicing any objections to the gobbling up of land by the government to construct new cities.

There has been a request to the minister on the part of opposition members to establish some type of price stabilization for farmers to eliminate the high risk and financial difficulties that farmers continually face. But the minister has always passed this off by saying that price stabilization programmes are matters for the federal government. Every other province seems to assist the farmers, while the Ontario Minister of Agriculture and Food introduces legislation to permit farmers to borrow money in order to get themselves out of debt.

Now I could go on and talk about the plight of the farmer in Ontario but I don't believe anything will change in that respect until the government changes, and this is a matter for the people of Ontario to decide in the next election.

Mr. Speaker, I was amused at the report of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Grossman) announcing the government's decision to establish an independent commission of inquiry into the long-range planning of Ontario power needs. The commission will emphasize public participation in planning the expansion of Ontario Hydro from 1983 to 1993. In the meantime Hydro will continue to increase its expenditures by establishing more generating stations and power corridors all over Ontario with no public involvement in the decision-making process for any project undertaken before 1983.

I would like to pose a question. Is hydro a lifeline or a killer? Electricity is a marvellous source of power, we will all admit that; without it modern society would be lost. Ontario Hydro needs new sources of power for the years ahead, there is no question about that; and these sources are limited because of technical knowledge and certain physical attributes which must be present.

While the farmers of rural Huron county may see no reason that all hydro development could not be located in the northern part of the province, Hydro may have some very

valid and understandable arguments why this is impossible. Nevertheless, Hydro should certainly listen to those at the grassroots in the province, listen to their concerns and listen to their suggestions, which Hydro has generally tended to ignore up to the present time.

Farmers are the backbone of the nation and there are few people who will dispute this. Much is being said these days about the rate at which farmland is being taken out of production because of urban-like development. In western Ontario, Hydro is being dubbed a culprit because power corridors, to carry the heavy lines from the power plant to the power distribution station, in some cases crossed crop-growing lands, reducing productivity there.

One of the most valid arguments put forward in opposition to the proposal that a Hydro plant be located in the southern half of Huron county has been supplied by the white bean growers of Huron county. The white bean industry in Huron county could be threatened by the introduction of a Hydro plant; and it wouldn't really matter whether the proposed Hydro plant would be a nuclear type or a fossil fuel type, both could result in dire problems for white bean consumers across the world. A fossil fuel plant would produce air pollution and a condition known as ozone bronzing in white beans. A nuclear plant would have no direct effect on beans, but the industry would be indirectly stymied by the fear of foreign buyers that the beans carried fallout from the Hydro development. This could be a very real concern for foreign buyers who would simply shun Huron county beans for those grown in other areas.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): That is one of the most original ideas introduced in this Legislature. I congratulate the member.

Mr. Riddell: I thank the member for his support.

Mr. Cassidy: Radioactive beans for all; is that right?

Mr. Riddell: Environmentalists have great influence—

Mr. Cassidy: The chairman of the ONTC has been giving the member the raspberry.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): No, that was directed at the member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): He is a raspberry.

Mr. Cassidy: That's his first official act.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Cassidy: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: What is your point of order?

Mr. Cassidy: Perhaps you should bring the member for Timiskaming to order for making rude noises in the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker: You have no point of order.

Mr. Riddell: Environmentalists have great influence on everyone these days. Everyone wants clean air, clean water, clean countryside. These are worthwhile aims and objectives. With modern technology and plenty of money, one could almost believe that some day it could be possible to live in the style to which most people want to become accustomed without fear of pollutants of any sort. Yet common sense dictates that unless there are some changes in the pattern of modern living, there will be little left of what is now familiar and enjoyable. I believe it is time people became concerned about pollutants in our environment.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend a little time to speak on certain environmental matters which have been and are of great concern to the people of Ontario but which have been, if not completely ignored by the government then inadequately and irresponsibly handled.

I refer to the number of environmental issues on which this government has promised action in previous Throne Speeches as far back as 1971. I point to the complete lack of any concrete legislation for any of these issues thus far. It is not surprising that this year's Speech from the Throne should be completely void of any promises dealing with environmental legislation, or any type of legislation as far as that goes.

Mr. Haggerty: He's right on.

Mr. Riddell: Perhaps it is the feeling of this present government that if no promises are made none will have to be broken, as has been the custom in the past.

To begin with, I would like to talk about noise pollution and the complete lack of any worthwhile controls on this most serious problem. We are aware, I am sure, of the problems of noise pollution today and of the problems which it can cause to our health and overall well-being. It was as far back as 1971, when the Premier (Mr. Davis) announced that there was to be a bill of

rights for the protection of the environment, that the whole question of noise pollution came under discussion. At that time the Ministry of the Environment was promising that noise pollution would be dealt with at another date. This legislation was to have dealt with provincial noise regulations which would be enforced throughout Ontario.

We recall the Speech from the Throne in March, 1973, when the Premier stated that it was the intention of his government to institute a provincial noise abatement programme. Now, after 3½ years, all this present government has been able to bring forward has been a model bylaw, which can be adopted by municipalities if they wish but which has not even been defined yet.

Mr. Good: And it hasn't even been introduced.

Mr. Riddell: In other words, while this situation has been growing steadily more disturbing and more complex since 1971, and while the government has been conducting expensive studies in various municipalities, we are back to 1971 in terms of dealing with this situation.

Many municipalities which have been concerned about this question of noise pollution had wanted to do something about it two or three years ago. However, the municipalities got letters from the Ministry of the Environment stating they should not do work on this question because the province was going to do it. We now find ourselves in 1975. And what do we have in terms of provincial noise legislation? Nothing. We are to have a model bylaw which can be accepted or rejected by the municipalities.

Mr. Good: They haven't even got it ready.

Mr. Riddell: Not only do we not have any regulations, but what about the question of vehicle noise regulations which were to be aimed at curbing operational noise from motor vehicles; or the stationary noise source regulations; or the nuisance noise, such as noisy neighbours?

Mr. Haggerty: The member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea) says, "I'll put 'em in jail."

Mr. Riddell: All has been forgotten. This government has proved to be inefficient in dealing with this question, saying that it is not the government's responsibility but that of the municipalities. The municipalities, however, have shown they have not been able, or willing, to convict on infractions of noise bylaws.

Moreover, this province will become a mosaic of municipal regulations. Some will enforce the government model standards while others will not. What will happen is that this government will encourage industry to locate in municipalities with less stringent regulations or ideally no noise bylaws.

I would sincerely request, Mr. Speaker, that the Ministry of the Environment take immediate steps to introduce legislation for noise regulations for the province as a whole.

There is another question I wish to deal with that has received an almost total lack of action from the government. This is the whole question of solid waste handling and disposable containers. I would like to know how this government can face the people of Ontario today and say they are acting responsibly on environmental problems in this province, when surely they are not doing so.

It was as far back as 1971 when the former Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr) promised legislation to reduce the use of non-returnable pop containers. And in March, 1973 the minister of the Ministry of the Environment of that day (Mr. Auld), stated that the province had a very definite commitment to hold the line on the increase in the amount of garbage. He said strong leadership would be taken in this field so that "we can cut down as much as possible on one-way disposable cartons that will include cans, bottles and plastic containers."

An hon. member: Non-leadership.

Mr. Riddell: In the Throne Speech of March 1974 we heard the Premier state, and I quote: "My government will also propose other measures for the control and reduction of litter and solid waste." These measures, however, have merely resulted in a ban on the flip-top of non-returnable cans. This is by far inadequate.

Solid waste in Ontario now exceeds six million tons per year. Garbage disposal costs the taxpayers of this province \$100 million per year. In 1972 the composite beverage industry generated an estimated 241,846 tons of waste at a cost to the taxpayer of \$3.9 million. The estimated waste amounted to 6.76 per cent of the estimated 3,575,000 tons of solid waste collected by municipalities in that year.

In 1972 the total energy consumption connected with the manufacture and disposal of primary containers amounted to 3.3 billion kw hours. This energy is sufficient to heat 25,500 average size Ontario homes for a year,

and this degree of energy consumption would be valued at \$32.3 million.

All the facts in the Ministry of Environment's solid waste task force report made clear the need for a ban on non-refillable containers, bottles and cans. Yet no adequate action has been taken by this government. It can only be concluded that the environment has again been sacrificed on the altar of corporate profits, with the taxpayers left to pay the ever-increasing costs of cleaning up and disposing of this problem.

My dissatisfaction with the provincial programmes in the area of solid wastes stems from a difference in philosophy. The ideal environmental solution is to eliminate waste at its source. That is to replace things that are discarded after one use with things that can be reused many times over. A switch from the throw-away can and bottle to the returnable container would provide an excellent example of the philosophy which urges fundamental changes in our society.

What is happening in the matter of disposable containers is similar to what will happen to the noise regulations. Many municipalities are themselves planning to ban non-returnable bottles. An article in the London Free Press this past week stated that the city of London is preparing a draft bylaw to ban non-returnable bottles. This matter, however, is a provincial responsibility which it will be impossible, and undesirable, to handle on a municipal level.

I would again request, Mr. Speaker, that immediate steps be taken by the government for the elimination of non-returnable bottles and cans through a gradual ban in favour of reusable containers.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a short reference in my speech to the matter of environmental impact assessment. We did get a report on it today; a bill has now been introduced and we are thankful the minister is finally seeing fit to bring a bill into this House.

Mr. Good: Inadequate though it is.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): The member hasn't read it.

Mr. Good: Yes, I have; every bit of it. I know what's in it.

Mr. Drea: Oh, sure he does.

Mr. Riddell: The inadequacies of existing procedures for government approval of major projects in this province are alarming. In 1971 the Environmental Protection Act was

passed and provision was made for a similar agency called the environmental council.

Again, in 1973, in the Speech from the Throne, the government said it would place before us legislation to establish a permanent agency for environmental protection having the responsibility for a comprehensive system of assessment and evaluation of the environmental significance of activities of ministries of the government, utilities, projects funded in part by the government and related activities in the private sector which had comparable environmental implications.

Again, in the 1974 Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, the government said we would be asked to approve legislation which will require an environmental assessment of major new development projects. But once again, the government only talks about protecting the environment and has done nothing on this question up to the present time.

Mr. Cassidy: They are pragmatic.

Mr. Riddell: What I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, is what this government has been doing since 1971 in regard to environmental problems in this province. The answer must surely be very little. It would seem that the ministry of this government responsible for the environment is much more a public relations agency than a responsive government ministry.

It is completely beyond belief how this government can come before the people year after year with promises of this nature which are still to be fulfilled. We are all aware, Mr. Speaker, that Ontario Hydro is in the midst of planning a new transmission system across southern Ontario which will eventually connect to northern Ontario.

This system will have a tremendous environmental impact on the areas through which it will pass. Already this government has approved a 500 kv transmission corridor from the Middleport transformer station near Nanticoke to the Cherrywood transformer station near Pickering; a corridor between the Pickering and Lennox generating stations in the eastern part of the province; and a corridor to join the Bruce complex to the Toronto area. While the Nanticoke-to-Pickering transmission corridor was extensively studied by Bruce Howlett Inc., an independent organization, whose findings were reviewed by the Solandt commission; and the Pickering-to-Lennox line has been studied by Commonwealth Associates Inc. and is being reviewed by the Solandt commission, this was not the case with the Bradley-to-Georgetown transmission route. In the last case, Ontario Hydro

has been permitted to do its own study without the benefit on an independent group and without public hearings.

Mr. Speaker, the need for a permanent environmental impact assessment body is most apparent when one considers the enormous effects these huge corridors will have on our environment and on the lives of the people affected. Moreover, the Bradley-to-Georgetown route must be immediately reviewed by an independent environmental group and through public hearings.

I would again request, Mr. Speaker, that the Ministry of the Environment take immediate steps to review all the questions to which I have referred and to act responsibly on these problems rather than mask them. In the last four years very little has been done by this government on environmental issues. Perhaps this present government does not feel that environmental questions are important enough to be dealt with by effective legislation or perhaps the industries would not approve.

The result is the same: A series of broken promises one after the other culminating in the present Throne Speech with no promises at all. The people, however, are aware of the lack of action of this government; and this lack of ideas in the present Throne Speech is a clear representation of the non-action of this government on the questions which I have outlined.

I want to complete my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by talking about the latest educational grants. I might say that both Huron and Bruce county boards of education were denied any grant whatsoever and the unfortunate part of the whole thing was that neither board was consulted. They simply received a letter from the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) saying they would not receive one penny of a grant. It would appear that Perth county as well was not going to receive a grant; and I became somewhat alarmed at this, because all three counties happened to be represented by Liberal members and I began to think the government was playing politics.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Sounds like dirty tricks.

Mr. Riddell: However, I must admit that Perth county did receive a slight grant—certainly not nearly as adequate as it might have been, but it did receive a slight grant. Huron county board of education did not receive a grant of any kind and this led to an interruption in a five-year programme on the part of the Huron County Board of Education to

have industrial arts and home economics courses throughout the county.

They are also endeavouring to establish a minicomputer at the high school in Exeter for instructional purposes; this was to be a pilot project. Again, they didn't receive a grant for this purpose. One of the heating systems has completely packed up at one of the schools in Huron county, and again they didn't receive a grant in order to rectify this situation.

I might just say at this time that the fact that Huron County Board of Education did not receive a grant will not disrupt the programmes in Huron as much as it will in Bruce county. I would just like to quote from an editorial in one of the weeklies, which I think hit the nail right on the head. I quote:

INEXCUSABLE CUTBACKS

The provincial Ministry of Education's decision to cut off the entire capital budget of the Huron County Board of Education is hard to understand. Its decision to cut off capital funds to the Bruce county board, however, is downright outrageous.

There can perhaps be some question as to whether or not Huron needs the extra classrooms it has budgeted for. Perhaps we can get along without these new facilities. There is no question, however, that new facilities are needed north of the county border in Bruce.

The population of the south Bruce area continues to grow strongly. There is only one reason for that growth—Ontario Hydro's nuclear generating station and the accompanying heavy water plant. It is completely inexcusable that one branch of the provincial government can cause growth problems while another branch refuses to help cope with the problems; one more reason for Huron to continue to fight against a generating station in our county.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) will have more to say about the grant structure in the educational system in Bruce and the fact that the Minister of Education refused a grant to Bruce. I won't elaborate any further on this matter, other than to say that the trustees of the Huron County Board of Education know full well that grants were made to certain county school boards which did not even request the extent of the grant that they received; and yet for some reason the Minister of Education turns around and refuses to give a grant to those counties which certainly do need them for one purpose or another.

So with these few remarks, Mr. Speaker—and I say again I can make many more but I'll leave them for the budget debate—I will now end my remarks and relinquish the rest of the time to some other member who wishes to speak. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. Cassidy: One of the best private members in the House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, although you are not the Mr. Speaker whom I have in mind, I should like to congratulate you upon your election to your high office and commend you on the way in which you have been handling the assembly. Incidentally, inasmuch as you, as the Deputy Speaker, are now in the chair, the same applies to you.

Last Thursday, the United Auto Workers presented a brief to some members of the cabinet. It was predictable that many of the auto workers' requests and suggestions would fall on deaf ears, but there was one so logical and reasonable that it should have been accepted without hesitation or reservation.

I refer to the request that compulsory overtime in auto plants be eliminated. Some men have run up as many as 1,600 hours of overtime in a single year.

There are several reasons for discontinuing overtime. If the work were spread around, there would be fewer unemployed. It is as simple as that. It is true that many workers need the extra income that overtime work provides, but most of them would rather see a share-the-work policy adopted by the auto companies. As it is now, refusal to work overtime can lead to serious difficulties and even penalties for those who do not acquiesce.

The work week should be legislated as one of 40 hours. Work beyond that should be considered overtime and should be voluntary. In order to share the work, a low limit of overtime should be set and, more important, enforced; and the minister should not grant permits beyond the present 100-hour-a-year limit that is supposed to be observed now.

Another complaint to which the cabinet should have responded favourably was that affecting safety in the plants. At Chrysler, large numbers of maintenance men who help to maintain safety conditions have been laid off. Consequently, there are increasing complaints from the safety reps. When government inspectors issue directives to the company on safety improvements, in some auto

plants the safety reps receive a copy but in others they do not, or at least only with great trouble. These directives should be disclosed to employees as a matter of right.

Another complaint easily remedied concerned Workmen's Compensation Board payments. In one auto plant, injured workmen are penalized about \$20 a week because their cost-of-living allowance, amounting to over 60 cents an hour, is not considered by the Workmen's Compensation Board as part of their wages. This should be rectified by the board.

Another matter with which the government should concern itself is pension plan termination insurance. American subsidiaries can close their Canadian plants and leave our factory pensioners in financial difficulties. At Auto Specialties in Windsor, for example, some pensioners lost as much as \$100 a month when that American company terminated operations in Ontario.

It is not only in bankrupt companies that pension plans are lost. There is at least one instance in which employees have had to give up their pension plan when the company maintained that it would have to close down unless the workers gave up their insistence on planning for their retirement.

There are too many Ontario workers, Mr. Speaker, losing their pension plans, often on the eve of retirement. The provincial government should devise some plan to insure workers against loss of pensions if their company goes bankrupt. A pension reinsurance programme is needed now, and for many people it is needed urgently.

Of course, Ontario and Canada need to build homes for low-income families. A public corporation, using publicly land-banked property, should go into action, first to keep the economy from slowing down; and second, to restore to young married couples any hopes that they ever had of home ownership.

These are some of the issues raised by the auto workers that should have elicited a favourable response from the cabinet.

On another topic, Mr. Speaker, as every entrepreneur knows, investment of money is required to establish a successful enterprise. It takes money to make money. The same is true of energy. It takes energy to produce energy. Back in 1961, little more than seven per cent of Canada's energy consumption went to produce energy. By 1971, over 10 per cent of Canada's energy was being used to produce energy. This increase reflects the large amounts of energy now required in producing nuclear power.

In the United States it took many years before nuclear power plants, as an industry, produced their first lot of energy above the amount of energy invested. If I recall correctly, the first nuclear plant was put into operation in 1956, and it was 1971 before the nuclear industry produced any net contribution of energy to the people of that country. In Great Britain, Peter Chapman, an energy accountant, who has gained international recognition lately, has made a study of the energy costs of fuels. The energy industries in Britain consume 30 per cent of the energy they produce. I quote: "Coal mining, oil refining, coke, gas and electricity production jointly consume more than 30 per cent of the total energy input to the United Kingdom." Walter C. Patterson, editor of "Your Environment", a British magazine, predicts that the cost accounting now being done by Chapman and his associates may, I quote, "present the nuclear industry with an indigestible mouthful."

In the United States it is only because of billions of dollars of government money that nuclear power plants are producing electricity at prices the public have so far tolerated. In Ontario it would be interesting to discover how much electricity from nuclear plants would be costing us today if all the money spent by the federal government on Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd., as well as the investment by Ontario Hydro, had to be taken into account.

The office of energy conservation in the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources at Ottawa has been talking recently in realistic fashion about conservation.

In the August, 1974 issue of ASHRAE Journal, the research director and economist present some interesting views and statistics. Among other things, they show how impossible it is to forecast Canada's energy needs for the year 2000. If we have a high growth rate, high population—that is 38 millions—high consumption, and I take it a lack of interest in conservation methods, we shall require 26 quadrillion Btu's in the year 2000 AD. If, on the other hand, we have slow growth, low population—29 million—low consumption and, if we take conservation seriously and practise it, only seven quadrillion Btu's will be required. There is a great margin for error between seven quadrillion and 26 quadrillion Btu's.

Between 1961 and 1971, Canada's total energy consumption went from three to over five quadrillion Btu's. If we Canadians are reasonable and make an effort, we can hold

our increased energy requirements over the next 25 years to less than the increase experienced during the Sixties. If we are unreasonable and selfishly refuse to conserve our energy resources for future generations, then we may easily quadruple present-day consumption of energy.

Whose is the choice? It is really a collective choice. It will be of no use if one per cent or two per cent of Canadians conscientiously conserve energy by reducing use of their automobiles, by insulating their homes to better advantage, by turning down their thermostats, by turning off their unnecessary lights and by enduring summer heat instead of turning on the air conditioner. The efforts of one of two per cent of the people will make no significant difference. All Canadians must participate.

No great sacrifice is necessary, just the suffering of a little inconvenience from time to time. But 98 per cent of the people will not follow unless there is a leader to follow. The government of Canada would be the ideal leader. For us in Ontario the provincial government is an acceptable alternative. Serious leadership must be given without further delay.

We are told that the Canadian government has applied more efficient maintenance procedures in its Ottawa heating plants, achieving a 10 per cent or 12 per cent more efficient performance. Well that's fine, but how did they do it? What can you or I, Mr. Speaker, do to achieve a similar reduction in energy requirements? Have you been told? I haven't as yet.

Why are so many skyscrapers in Toronto still lit up all night? We are told that the lighting helps to heat the building. Even if we accepted this as a valid excuse in winter, how could we possibly accept it in summertime? What we need is leadership to solve our energy problems.

About the only answer we hear from the Ontario government is that Hydro will squander almost \$24 billion in the next eight years—mostly on nuclear power—for power plants, most of which would not be required if our government showed genuine leadership, not only in conserving the unrenewable energy resources now being used extravagantly, but also in developing alternative sources of energy.

One American company in Columbus, Ohio, with branches in such cities as Detroit, is already planning homes with solar heating systems that will pay for themselves in from six to eight years, even at present fuel prices. As we know, the present fuel prices will escalate. This means that the solar energy

systems will pay for themselves in less than eight years, and from then on will deliver free fuel—free in money terms and free in energy terms.

The Pittsburgh Plate Glass people are already preparing to turn out solar panels on an assembly line system, the inevitable result of which will mean a slashing of capital costs. One of the engineers doing a study for Honolulu on the feasibility of using wind turbines to produce electricity for that energy-impooverished island, estimates that a \$50,000 wind turbine will last 50 years and pay for itself in about seven years.

As I said earlier, it takes energy to produce energy, but for solar and wind energy systems the energy and the money are for the capital costs only. The fuel forever will be free.

For nuclear power plants, and for plants powered by fossil fuels, the capital costs are only the beginning. Fuel must be fed into the power plant day after day, month after month, year after year. The cost of the fuel is subject to inflation. In the case of oil and gas, the fuel is becoming increasingly inaccessible and therefore more expensive, even if there were no inflation with which to contend.

The research director of the office of energy conservation at Ottawa, to whom I referred earlier, says:

As for forecasts in the energy field, I am afraid that the record has been one of self-fulfilling prophecy. Time and again we have made forecasts, then installed capacity to meet those forecasts and finally induced the development of energy-consuming residential and industrial practices to match the capacity.

This is a serious ecological indictment, Mr. Speaker, of our materialistic society. It is also a fine description of Ontario Hydro's game plan: Make a forecast for expansion; advertise like mad to make sure it comes true; encourage people to live better electrically, to heat their homes with electricity, a method that uses up almost twice as much energy as other methods; then make more forecasts and scream that now we must go nuclear to meet the so-called demands of the public, which of course Hydro has encouraged.

Hydro says innocently, "We are simply trying to meet the demands of the public for electricity. Hydro officials apparently give no thought to the change in society that will take place in the plutonium economy into which they are guiding us. Do they realize that the Atomic Energy Commission in the United States has finally become alarmed at the dangers inherent in the theft of plutonium by organized terrorists of one kind or an-

other? Do they realize that the Atomic Energy Commission, a few months ago, gave "shoot to kill" orders to at least one private power company in order to prevent the possible theft of plutonium? Do they realize that the Association of American Railroads is refusing to transport radioactive wastes, claiming that they are too hazardous? Do they realize that the Atomic Energy Commission now proposes that shipments of radioactive materials be accompanied by armed guards?

By the year 2000, when the United States has its 1,000 projected nuclear plants and Canada has its proposed 100 plants, do you realize, Mr. Speaker, the small private armies that will be needed on this continent, apart from the regular military and police forces? These guards, incidentally, are part of the financial cost of having nuclear power plants. Do Hydro officials or Ministry of Energy officials realize how this unavoidable necessity of taking every conceivable precaution against the theft of plutonium will drive us inexorably towards a police state?

In April, 1974 the Atomic Energy Commission revealed its special safeguard study. One of its recommendations reads as follows:

The first and one of the most important lines of defence against groups which might attempt to illegally acquire special nuclear materials to make a weapon is timely and in-depth intelligence.

There it is, Mr. Speaker, "in-depth intelligence." And what is that? I quote further:

Such intelligence may involve electronic and other means of surveillance, but its most important aspect is infiltration of the groups themselves.

Shades of Richard Nixon.

Most people agree, of course, that infiltration of anti-war demonstration groups and civil rights marchers was as destructive of democracy as it was unnecessary. But in preventing a fanatical group from making a bomb from plutonium stolen from the nuclear power industry, we must ask ourselves how else the United States government or our own government could possibly cope with the problem and frustrate the plotters without using every form of electronic surveillance and infiltration.

Nuclear power, the so-called peaceful exploitation of the atom, is bringing us relentlessly and inexorably into the police state, or the garrison state, as someone has termed it. Nuclear power plants bring us into a plutonium economy. Neutralizing the dan-

gers inherent in the plutonium economy requires intolerable infringements on the personal freedoms of all of us in order to frustrate the subversive activities of a few who will be unable to resist the lure of political and/or financial power that possession of a few pounds of plutonium would put in the hands of unscrupulous men.

In an October, 1974, statement, the Atomic Energy Commission admitted that current procedures for safeguarding plutonium were quite inadequate. The proposed remedies are tantamount to turning the nuclear fuel system, processing plants and all, into armed camps with military security, federal police, security checks, and all conceivable means of violating individual privacy. In other words, a garrison state.

In case it has escaped your notice, Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to your attention the fact that the Canada-US Environmental Council-CANUSEC-meeting in Toronto late last fall, called for a moratorium on further nuclear power development.

On another environmental topic, is the Ministry of the Environment checking into the possibility that fibreglass is now presenting society with the same problem as asbestos? The British Journal of Industrial Medicine in 1973 reported animal experiments showing mesothelioma could be caused not only by asbestos but also by fibreglass.

Use of fibreglass in tires is likely to increase, presenting us with a possibility that small respirable particles of glass fibres are becoming airborne as tires suffer wear on our streets. Are the asbestos particles now released when brakes are applied, mostly near street corners, going to be joined by fibreglass particles as motorists lay rubber, mostly near street corners?

Studies have shown that at street corners in the downtown canyons of big cities, carbon monoxide concentrations often exceed levels that are presumed safe. Do street corners of our large cities now present those who live and work nearby with a triple threat to the health of their lungs—fibreglass, carbon monoxide and asbestos?

Has the ministry checked a single office or home to find out whether the fibreglass filters used in so many heating and cooling systems are emitting small glass fibres while filtering out larger particles of other substances?

If, for administration purposes, the inside of buildings is not considered part of the environment by the Minister of the Environment (Mr. W. Newman), who is the appropriate minister to do a study on this matter?

Auto body repair shops that make use of fibreglass may, through their buffing procedures, be contaminating their own air and perhaps that of the neighbourhood. As Barry Commoner has pointed out, technological substitutions cause most of our environmental problems. Fibreglass may not be doing much harm but it certainly has the potential. There will never be a better time to investigate this suspect than the present.

It is natural for us to assume, because we hope, that fibreglass is no threat to our health. That is exactly what virtually everyone thought about asbestos some years ago. Asbestos workers found the dust annoying, but who suspected that it was actually harmful?

Today we know better. According to the University of Toronto study by Shettigara and Morgan, in one patient cancer of the larynx developed 23 years after a four-day exposure in an asbestos insulation works. Another victim had only about one month's total exposure over a 15-year period. Another contracted cancer of the larynx 31 years after spending a few days in an asbestos insulation works. The latent period amongst the patients ranged from five years to 55 years after the first exposure. One of the two patients whose latent periods were only five years had a six-month exposure in an asbestos insulation works and the other had eight months in an asbestos spraying shop.

There is a report also concerning an asbestos mining area in Germany—blue asbestos or crocidolite, that is. People who had had one or two years of residence as children, and no further known exposure to asbestos, developed mesothelioma 35 years or so later.

Because asbestos takes such a relatively long time to produce its harmful effects, it has taken our best medical investigators a long time to indict it. Fibreglass may be just as ruthless a killer, but at least it is now a suspect, and we should be able to carry out investigations much more expeditiously. Incidentally, the Shettigara-Morgan study seems to show that intense exposure to asbestos leads to asbestosis; that moderate exposure leads to lung cancer for smokers and to mesothelioma for non-smokers; and a short exposure leads to cancer of the larynx. These categories are somewhat blurred, of course, but there seems to be such a general probability pattern for those unfortunate enough to come into close contact with asbestos itself or with asbestos workers.

A few words about crocidolite—blue asbestos. Irving J. Selikoff, E. Cuyler Hammond

and Herbert Seidman in their Oct. 4, 1972, presentation to the International Agency for Research on Cancer meeting in France had this to say:

Crocidolite was not used for insulation work in the United States during the period covered by the experiences of insulation workers we have studied. Exposure to this fibre therefore cannot explain the cancer risk involved. [Later they said:] We were not able to detect evidence suggesting that chrysotile was associated with greater risks than amosite in insulation work or vice versa. We have no knowledge of the comparative effect of crocidolite because it was not used in United States' insulation work.

It may be that crocidolite fibres are even more harmful than other kinds but the claim that crocidolite is a sole villain responsible for mesothelioma, as made by a Ministry of Health spokesman not so long ago, is not supported by the research of Selikoff and his associates.

We shall be whistling past the graveyard, Mr. Speaker, if we hope that elimination of blue asbestos at Johns-Manville will end the dangers of asbestos to the workers. Blue asbestos is just a red herring.

I should like to refer briefly, in closing, Mr. Speaker, to the excellent brief presented by representatives of five of the leading churches in Ontario to the cabinet on Jan. 22 of this year.

Their basic request was that the Ontario government match dollar for dollar those amounts now being voluntarily donated by Ontario citizens through their churches and through international agencies for the purpose of promoting or furthering self-help development programmes in the third world. Since the federal government, through the Canadian International Development Agency, would apparently match this combined amount again, the capabilities of the various non-government agencies would be quadrupled.

Inasmuch as the Ontario government would undoubtedly like to increase its assistance to the third world, this method of doing so seems to offer us the advantage of participation without the obligation to concern ourselves with all the petty details of administration. It seems likely, too, that from the recipients' point of view aid offered by voluntary organizations is not suspect as is sometimes the case when aid is government-sponsored and administered. There have been disturbing rumours that food sent through

government bodies has ended up on the black market in the countries to which it has been sent. With churches and other volunteer agencies working on a person-to-person basis this could hardly happen.

The brief presented by the churches to the cabinet closed with a reminder that hundreds of millions are suffering. I quote:

This is a time and opportunity for Ontario to stand together with the global village in banishing from the earth all those ills which debase man's dignity, starve his body and crush his spirit.

We in Ontario, cannot alone banish these ills but we cannot refuse this call for help.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I would like to congratulate you and also the people who s't in your stead on the fact that, despite the newspaper pundits and what have you, I don't really believe we have the most disorderly House in Canada. I think because of your very firm—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Some of the most disorderly people though.

Mr. Germa: He is at it again.

Mr. Drea: —sometimes benevolent, and very often understanding hand, I think we have the one House in Canada that truly expresses the indications, the aspirations and, indeed, the hopes of the people.

It is all very well to run the kind of a House that perhaps would have brought great commentaries 100 years ago, but I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the deputy Speaker, and to the chairman of the House as a whole that in the year 1975 institutions have to justify themselves to the public. I suggest to you with the greatest respect, Mr. Speaker, that by the way this House is conducted we do justify ourselves to the public, for matters can be brought before you without all of the red tape, the hocus-pocus and all of the nonsense about precedents of 100 years ago or 50 years ago or 25 years ago, and they are heard.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the way this House is conducted is really much more relevant to the times we live in than to the times that were written about in some book that was published with a black cover and now languishes somewhere in a library with loads of dust upon it.

Mr. Lawlor: Even the times are chaotic. Keep your patience.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend someone else also from this institution and that is our Sergeant-at-Arms. I have sat in the chair on a very infrequent occasion and for very, very limited periods of time. I can think of no one who has to sit here, who despite his personal feelings, who despite the lack of alacrity in the debate, must nonetheless sit there straight forward, without a nod, without any indication of boredom, without any indication of excitement, other than our distinguished Sergeant-at-Arms. I am very proud to serve in a House that has been able to have such a distinguished practitioner of the art of absolute impartiality as our Sergeant-at-Arms.

Mr. Speaker, it has always been my custom when replying to the Speech from the Throne to talk about something in Scarborough. I realize that for one political party, because they never attend anything in Scarborough, that that type of thing is a little blasé. I understand for another political party, because they don't have representation in it, that it may be a bit incomprehensible. Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House bear with me for a few moments because once again this afternoon I want to pay some tribute to some people who are very unsung in the borough of Scarborough, and those are the public health nurses.

Mr. Speaker, I am possessed this afternoon of a very large document which is the 1974 year-end report of the borough of Scarborough. I could probably read in a lot of things that give great credit to the borough, and that give great credit to the people there, but I just want to talk about something on pages 5 and 6 of the yellow section, which is devoted to the health department and the nursing services.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the objective of the nursing services in Scarborough was to give more support to the family by enabling parents to cope with problems in bringing up children. In other words, to help them to be better parents. Mr. Speaker, that may be the motto of the public health nurses in Scarborough, but I would say to you that this country would be a lot better served if that were the motto of every municipal government, of every provincial government and of every federal government. Quite often the women who serve in that department find themselves serving above and beyond the call of duty; they are dealing with many problems which are outside the pure and distinctive health disciplines.

Mr. Speaker, when is the last time that you can recall a public health nurse from the borough of Scarborough or, indeed, from any municipality across this province, who first didn't try to cope with the problem, even if it wasn't health, and only after having tried to cope with the problem and having failed, then came to us? I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the public of this province who seem to have the idea that any time they get into a problem they can come to us or the federal government, or their municipality—might very well follow the example of the very distinguished women who serve in the nursing services branch of the health department of Scarborough, in first trying to cope with the problem. And if you can succeed, well then, Mr. Speaker, you have solved the problem.

I would very much like to see the example of these women—who receive very little publicity, who receive very little fanfare, and yet who do a tremendous job, not only for the people they serve but for the entire community—brought to the attention of those who say they want to serve the community. Because I think if they would follow the example of the nurses in trying first to cope with and solve the problem, and only going to a governmental body as a last resort, that perhaps the province might be better served.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, I would like to turn to a much more distressing thing. Last week my colleague, the member for St. David, put forward some very accurate, some very descriptive—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Inflammatory!

Mr. Drea: If inflammatory is the truth, then the member had better get used to flame in his mouth.

Mr. Lawlor: Oh, my Lord, he sounds like a magician. Blue smoke. Poof!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, the hon. member for Scarborough Centre has the floor.

Mr. Lawlor: The member should not raise his voice. Just stay calm.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say today that I am going to be entirely accurate; I am going to be entirely calm—

Mr. Lawlor: Impossible.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): That's unusual, isn't it?

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, my colleague, the member for St. David, put forward some very accurate, some very truthful and some very disturbing accusations against those in the federal government. It is with the greatest of reluctance that I am going to add to that today, Mr. Speaker, because I am going to give you the record of how the federal government deliberately sabotaged, deliberately stopped, deliberately made sure—and I use the word deliberately, because they did it deliberately—they stopped the people of this province who were going to buy a house between now and the end of the year from having a warranty and having insurance protection upon it. Mr. Speaker, I say to you, the fault for that lies with one federal cabinet minister, Mr. Danson, because he deliberately did it. And that's the fourth time I've used "deliberate."

I'm going to go into the history of the housing warranties and how Ontario has been deliberately—and that's the fifth time—thwarted by him and by his staff.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to go back to August of 1974—

Mr. Lawlor: He won't even talk to them any more. He doesn't want to talk to those people opposite any more.

Mr. Drea: He doesn't want to talk to me? I'll tell the member something, I don't want to talk to that four-flusher any more.

Mr. Haggerty: Put him in jail.

Mr. Lawlor: That shows the utmost courtesy and rapport between governments.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Scarborough Centre will continue.

Mr. Lawlor: We're going to get a lot done that way.

Mr. Drea: Then the member had better talk to the Ministry of Consumer Affairs and Ministry of Housing in Saskatchewan, because they know what I'm going to say and they echo it.

Mr. Lawlor: Echo? Stay calm.

Mr. Drea: My friend had better talk to his NDP government, because they are heartsick. The only difference between them and me is they don't have the guts to say it.

Mr. Stokes: Did the member never hear of the carrot rather than the stick?

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, let us return to last August—

Mr. Lawlor: Did he ever hear of the gloved hand rather than the gunned gut?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will continue.

Mr. Drea: In August of last year, Mr. Speaker, the federal minister responsible for housing warranties was Mr. Basford. That was prior to the election. Mr. Basford had told the house builders of this province and of every other province that the federal government was not interested in an overall housing warranty programme. Because of that, Mr. Speaker, the house builders came to the Province of Ontario and asked us if we would be interested in bringing in a housing warranty programme that would cover new houses and cover, in separate areas, a protection for the new home buyer against the bankruptcy or the vanishing of the builder prior to the closing of sale—if the builder just took the deposit and vanished into bankruptcy or the vanishing of the builder after the date of closing and sale, or the date of occupancy, a protection plan for the new home buyer that would provide a warranty against the things that showed up in the first few months—

Mr. Lawlor: Oh, the law reform commission recommended that six years ago, and this government has done nothing about it.

Mr. Drea: The reason we didn't is because we went to the federal government and said that if we did, we'd very seriously jeopardize the ability of other provinces. And I can document that one.

Mr. Lawlor: Nonsense. We're perfectly within our competence.

Mr. Drea: The member had better go out and talk to his friends in Saskatchewan before he opens his mouth again.

Mr. Haggerty: Tell us about consumer protection.

Mr. Lawlor: Is that a warning, my friend?

Mr. Ruston: Got a warrant?

Mr. Lawlor: I'll leave now.

Mr. Haggerty: Tell us about consumer protection in Ontario.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, the second part of that was that subsequent to the date of transfer of deed and occupancy the particular house would be covered for a specific

period of time against immediate faults, and after that against very serious structural defects. The particular thing about structural defects was that it would extend for a rather prolonged period of time, because it dealt with walls, it dealt with soil conditions, it dealt with drainage and a great number of other things.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to you that in August of 1974 this government was on record that, yes, we were fully prepared to enter into a programme that would guarantee this to the new home buyer. And, once again, because it was a rather new area on two grounds: If a programme could be developed where the house builders policed, administered and did a lot of the free inspections—in short, cut the bureaucracy and the cost—then, yes, we would provide them with umbrella legislation that would enable them to do this. But if they could not produce a plan that was satisfactory to this government, we would bring in a plan by the end of 1974 which would do this under governmental control.

Mr. Speaker, in October, 1974, because the federal government, the government in Ottawa—and I am not talking about Central Mortgage and Housing Corp.; I am talking about the government—said they had absolutely no interest in this programme. Despite the fact that the Throne Speech said they were bringing in a housing warranty programme, they really had no interest in this.

At that time, the 10 provinces of this country called meetings to see if there could be a co-ordinated national plan, administered by the 10 provinces in lieu of the fact that the federal government did not choose to participate. There were meetings in Toronto, in Winnipeg and in Quebec City, on an interprovincial basis, because the federal government did not choose to participate.

Subsequent to the time of those three interprovincial meetings, there was a further meeting called in January, 1975, and at that time the federal government again announced that it did not intend to participate. Mr. Speaker, it wasn't our announcement that appeared in the newspapers, but at that time I think you will recall there was some talk about six provinces: Saskatchewan (Mrs. Hind is a very remarkable woman), Ontario, and the four Maritime provinces.

We were asked by the HUDAC organization, which represents builders across the country: Would we accept a plan in principle and agree to provide some seed money for two or three years, which would be repaid, because there is a cost to setting up an

insurance programme like this? And would we introduce provincial legislation in as co-ordinated a manner as was possible to achieve such a plan? And, Mr. Speaker, we said we would. The provinces were Saskatchewan, Ontario, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Newfoundland. That great consumer province of British Columbia said they neither had the resources nor anything else and they bowed out.

Mr. Speaker, we did that, and they said that in view of the fact that the federal government would not participate, would we be agreeable to putting in seed money to get this off the ground? The amount of seed money from Ontario was high, but it certainly wasn't as high in per capita terms as was being assessed upon the four Maritime provinces. It may have been higher in per capita terms for Saskatchewan, but they felt a social duty to the rest of the country. We went along with it.

We were hardly out of that meeting when the federal government said it was going to bring in a national housing warranty programme, it was going to have a meeting in April and that's when it is going to be done. Mr. Speaker, there is going to be a meeting in April, but not with the minister. The minister is going off to Europe. He is going to see Paris, Stockholm and a few other places. People in the press gallery tell me it is the most avidly sought junket of the year by those in the parliamentary press gallery. After all, Mr. Speaker, they're going to look at low-cost, co-operative housing, all of those things that touch everybody's heart.

They're going to do Paris in April. I can just see them all trudging along to the low-income houses to "April in Paris." Wow! I can see them going up to Stockholm to see the socialist enterprise. It won't be in early April, it will be in the middle of April when the weather gets warmer.

Mr. Lawlor: That's great. This is the socialist prejudice the members over there have.

Mr. Germa: Let him tell us about his summer holidays in Inuvik.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: But Mr. Speaker, the minister who is supposed to be in charge of this—

Mr. Lawlor: What is poor old Barney going to do?

Mr. Drea: I guess Barney is going to play "April in Paris." That's about the limit of his intellectual ability.

Mr. Speaker, this is what April in Paris means to the people in this province this year. We have accepted our constitutional responsibility and we really believe in a housing warranty programme that will for the first time protect the people who buy new houses, not only in this province but across the country, that will protect them against bankruptcy, the vanishing with their deposit by the builder, and against the house being no good when they go to move in and it's caving in a year afterward. The price this province has paid is April in Paris because it is betrayal, it is sabotage and it is a deliberate programme to make sure that when we try to introduce a programme in this province that that programme will be subverted before it can be brought to being.

I'll tell you why, Mr. Speaker. We sat down in those meetings last August and we said: "All right, you go back and talk to your federal government because we want a December decision, because the housing starts are in the spring of this year and we want the houses that are started in the spring to be covered by this programme." Now you start to get the significance, Mr. Speaker, of April in Paris with Mr. Barnett Danson.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: He can't be there in April, Mr. Speaker. That means there can be no housing warranty programme in this province or in any other province.

Mr. Lawlor: This government has the constitutional powers to bring it in.

Mr. Drea: Look, I've had enough of the member for Lakeshore, let him just sit down.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will continue.

Mr. Lawlor: Get on with the job.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you we would like to get on with the job. If we could have started in December, we would have had—

Mr. Haggerty: Why didn't the government start then?

Mr. Drea: Because we believed in that bunch that the member belongs to.

Mr. Haggerty: What about two or three years ago when the government had all that money and didn't spend it?

Mr. Drea: What money? The member doesn't even know what he's talking about.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Scarborough Centre has the floor.

Mr. Haggerty: They are jugglers over there. They can put more housing on paper than—

Mr. Drea: The juggler isn't here. I'm going for the member's jugular and let him not forget it.

Mr. Lawlor: Remember the promise of calmness.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you why we didn't do it two or three years ago.

Mr. Haggerty: Tell us. Tell us why the government changes its Minister of Housing every six months.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will you kindly allow the member for Scarborough Centre to continue?

Mr. Ruston: He said he wanted a rest. He doesn't want to stand.

Mr. Drea: I don't need a rest. I just read that thing in the paper about the member yesterday when a fellow said there were 124 yellow dogs running after Nixon, but not the member for Essex-Kent. I hope he read that.

Mr. Ruston: No, I didn't read it.

Mr. Drea: I'll send him the clipping.

Mr. Ruston: The member must have written it in his own paper.

Mr. Drea: No. Doug Fisher did and he is not of us. He is of them.

Mr. Ruston: I thought he was with Dalton Camp.

Mr. Drea: No. Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you why we didn't do it two or three years ago.

Mr. Ruston: I wouldn't worry about the member either. Let him say what he wants.

Mr. Lawlor: He wasn't around.

Mr. Ruston: He doesn't know what to say, Mr. Speaker. I think you had better ask for the next speaker.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, if I have one more outburst from that member over there I wish you'd discipline him.

An hon. member: Like what?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will continue.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, to come back to why we didn't do it two or three years ago, we've always had a regard for the less fortunate provinces in this country. It is a matter of record—

Mr. Haggerty: He is really going to the bottom of the barrel now. He's got to run a little faster—

Mr. Drea: The member had better tell his friend Mr. Regan about that, because he's the one who advocated the position that I'm just going to talk about.

Mr. Ruston: Control the price of oil? He's the only one who does control the price of oil.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, two or three years ago we could have done this.

Mr. Haggerty: Prices review board.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Drea: The question was raised to us by the four Maritime provinces. Two of them are Liberal. They raised the question to us that if we went it alone in the housing warranty programme in this province they didn't have the resources, they didn't have the ability to keep pace and it meant they were precluded from doing so for at least a decade. And, my loud-mouthed friend, it is a matter of record—and he can look at the minutes of those interprovincial meetings—that time and time and time again this province said that we felt an obligation to those who didn't have the resources to bring in a housing warranty programme and that we would try one more time with the federal government.

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): Right on.

Mr. Drea: I say to you, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Haggerty: It's his ministry's jurisdiction.

Mr. Drea: —after 8½ months, and seven tawdry months by the federal government, this province will now have to bring in a housing warranty programme. But what I want to say is—

Mr. Haggerty: The responsibility is right there; right in the member's department.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): How about the National Building Code?

Mr. Drea: National Building Code? The member is so far out of date. We have an Ontario Building Code. Why does he think we brought it in?

Mr. Paterson: We've been fighting for it for 10 years.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I want to say something. After this duplicity—

Mr. Germa: What are they going to do about Ross Shouldice?

Mr. Drea: About what?

Mr. Germa: Ross Shouldice. He built all those houses; tell me about him.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will continue.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): He has to think of something to say first.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, after that record of duplicity since August of 1974 by the federal government—and I forgive the minister before the present one; after all, he was in a minority government. He didn't know when he was going into the unemployment line. But Mr. Danson has known. Mr. Danson had put into the Throne Speech of the federal government that there was going to be a housing warranty programme administered by the federal government, and that's a fact. When asked about it, Mr. Danson's department said, "We really don't know." Do you know, Mr. Speaker, to this date, and we are now at the end of March in 1975, the federal government cannot give the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations in this province an answer as to what they have in mind.

The reason I have dwelt so long on April in Paris, one great big junket along with the press, paid by the taxpayers, is that they told us we would find out in April what they had in mind. Mr. Speaker, if you can tell me about a single federal-provincial agreement that is going to be reached with the appropriate cabinet minister touring Europe to look at low-cost housing in Paris—

Mr. Paterson: Was the member looking at housing in Taiwan?

Mr. Drea: If you can tell me one single agreement that has ever been reached without a single political figure there—and I realize that the "Great White Father" down there is just back from a trip; I wouldn't want him to get into jet lag by coming to a meeting with us—not a single political figure there in April—

Mr. Haggerty: What did the Premier do in the meantime?

Mr. Drea:—all at a very, very, and I say this with the utmost respect, a very, very civil service level, but after all they are not the people who are going to make the decisions. Mr. Speaker, in terms of housing warranties. It isn't dirty tricks; it isn't the spirit of John Dean or something flying over Ottawa. I wouldn't say a thing like that.

Mr. Lawlor: Is that a concession?

Mr. Drea: But I will say that it was a deliberate, planned concept to sabotage the ability of the Province of Ontario to bring in a housing warranties programme because it would be an embarrassment to more than 20 years of the failure of the NHA or the Central Mortgage and Housing to inspect a single house adequately. If any one member can tell me—and I'm sure they've bought houses—if there is a single housing customer in this country who believes in "NHA-approved" any more, except as a device to get the builder off the hook, I would be very pleased to meet with the lady or gentleman.

When houses and their walls were collapsing around them, when the water was pouring in through the windows, the NHA was insisting upon a bannister down into the cellar stairwell because somebody might fall.

There is hardly a homeowner in this province who has bought an NHA-approved home and who has not called and said, "Will you do anything for me with the builder?" The builders said, "We have nothing to do with that. We just look at the specifications; the blocks are all 11½ ins. wide."

Is it any wonder that after 20 years of futility, failure and utter incompetence, some things in the Throne Speech of the federal government are suddenly subverted and used to stop the one province that can bring in a decent, logical, effective, efficient programme which will protect new home buyers?

Mr. Lawlor: This government is going to lose the next election because of it. It's subverted this government; it's undermining all its efforts.

Mr. Drea: I can understand why somebody of the member's political persuasion would be sensitive about subversion. I really can.

Mr. Lawlor: That's not the bandwagon of the member for St. David he is on. It's a little go-cart of his own.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Give it to him.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, the reason I raise this—and I don't like to—is that I feel betrayed. I'm not like all the rest of the people who say "You can't trust anybody in the federal government." I'm willing to give them the benefit of the doubt. I even meet with those socialist ones from—

Mr. Lawlor: He doesn't have to wring his hands about his own naivete.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I meet with everybody. I'm always prepared to believe, despite their past record or performance, that somehow there is a bit of rehabilitation or spark within them. I'm not like the Pharisee in the temple, Mr. Speaker, whose spirit does—

Mr. Lawlor: That's what the Pharisee said.

Mr. Drea: I said I was not like the Pharisee in the temple despite the fact that his spirit does pervade the NDP benches. I don't say, "Thank God, there goeth someone worse than me. Thank God I am here." I don't do that. I am always prepared to meet with anybody.

Mr. Stokes: It's very difficult for him to do that.

Mr. Lawlor: He just feels better when somebody else who's better than he goes by.

Mr. Stokes: It's almost impossible.

Mr. Lawlor: Why mention it?

Mr. Drea: To the distinguished member for Lakeshore, after listening to him for 3½ years—

Mr. Lawlor: The member is a lucky fellow.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: He's lucky enough that he can stand it, I guess.

Mr. Lawlor: I have stopped speaking because the member has stopped listening.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, after listening to the distinguished member for Lakeshore for 3½ years, there is only one thing out of the good book that always comes to mind and that is the Pharisee in the temple. I'm sorry I bequeathed the member his fate, but he reminds me of him so much I cannot separate it in my mind.

Mr. Lawlor: That's all the member gets out of the good book? My Lord, there are other things there too.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Will the hon. member continue with his remarks on the Throne debate?

Mr. Lawlor: How can I stay awake, if I cannot speak?

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, the reason I brought all this up about the housing warranties today is this—

Mr. Lawlor: What was the reason?

Mr. Stokes: Reluctantly.

Mr. Drea: Very reluctantly. I don't like to tell the people of this province what a bunch they have in Ottawa and what a bunch they have in the political party which supports them absolutely. I don't like to do that.

Mr. Lawlor: They are more embarrassed than the member is.

An hon. member: The member for St. David wasn't nearly as reluctant as the member.

Mr. Lawlor: Let the member bring in his own legislation.

Mr. Drea: My legislation is ready, I say to the member. But I will say this: It won't cover anybody for this building season because we have been deceived by the federal government. When the member's basement floods, or whatever it is, then let him send a letter to that fellow Danson, or send it right over there to the leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon), because he supports him all the way, and that is the reason I bring it up.

I don't mind the criticism when we are in a position that we haven't moved fast enough. But, Mr. Speaker, when you believe that the federal government in this country is honest and sincere and then you get stabbed so many times in the back, there is only one conclusion you can draw: It was deliberate, it was intended to hurt this government, and over the Secretary of State for Urban Affairs, whatever his fancy title is—and I again refer to him as that four-flusher from North York—perhaps the spirit of John Dean indeed really reigns.

When that house isn't any good, don't let the member write us a letter, let him write it to Danson, and forward it right over there to the leader of the Opposition.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: The member is just sore because he won't be in Paris in April, that's all.

Mr. Drea: I don't have to go to Paris in April, I am more concerned about the people with lousy houses in April.

Mr. Rushton: He's going to Taiwan—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ruston: —the member and the member for Dovercourt.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Scarborough Centre has the floor.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, just to recall the very sordid record—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: A little more respect over there.

Mr. Haggerty: Is the member causing the thunder up there?

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): It is coming down on the opposition's heads.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, just to recall that very sordid record, I would like to state that in August of last year we said we were prepared to introduce into legislation in this province a provincial housing warranty programme that would do the things that we said it would do. At the request of other provinces, because they believed in the federal government, and probably because of my own naiveté, we agreed to give the federal government one more time. Since then we have given the federal government four more times, in the latest of which—as I read in the paper; they didn't even have the courtesy to give us a reply—I read in the paper that they were going to do it.

It is now the end of March, 1975. Mr. Speaker, for practical purposes there is going to be no housing warranty programme that will cover houses built in this province this year. That grieves me. I have bought three houses in my time—

Mr. Haggerty: What about the provincial building code?

Mr. Drea: I am not going to pay any attention to the member so he can just be quiet.

Mr. Speaker: I have bought three houses in my time—and I feel very strongly about this. There should be a housing warranty programme in this province. There would

have been, except for the deliberate sabotage of the federal government. I would rather have seen an inept provincial government that couldn't bring in a housing warranty programme, than see a provincial government that wanted to do it, deliberately sandbagged by that bunch in Ottawa.

Mr. Ruston: This government has had 32 years to do it.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): It had 32 years.

Mr. Drea: That really grieves me.

Mr. Ruston: Too bad, we feel really sorry for the member.

Mr. Drea: Well then, maybe we'll send all the complaints about the bad houses to the member for Essex-Kent. He's got a big smirk on his face. I guess as a Liberal he figures that anybody who buys a house can take their own risks.

Mr. Haggerty: He noticed things outside the door.

Mr. Ruston: Is the member going to repeat this outside?

Mr. Haggerty: The member is hiding behind a skirt.

Mr. Drea: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I am hiding behind a skirt, I would like to say to you the only thing that the member for St. David has been guilty of—and she is a very distinguished colleague of mine—is that she understated the case.

Mr. Lawlor: He's trying to make up for it.

Mr. Drea: No, I am not making up for it. I am giving the House a month by month story of sordidness and duplicity unequalled in dominion-provincial relations in our time.

Mr. Lawlor: Oh, no!

Mr. Drea: Let the member talk to his friends in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Lawlor: There have been worse things than warranties.

Mr. Drea: Really? As a big real estate man, I suppose there may have been worse.

Mr. Lawlor: More important things than warranties?

Mr. Drea: I wish the member could tell the average wage-earner in this province that there is something more important than

the house he is going to buy which is his biggest consumer purchase.

Mr. Lawlor: The member has been able to live with it for an awful long time.

Mr. Drea: No, I haven't been able to live with it for an awful long time. It may be very nice for the member and his colleagues who draft the kind of agreement that doesn't work.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Drea: I haven't been able to live with it for a long time. The member has.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lawlor: It is the government's responsibility.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will continue his Throne debate speech.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I would love to continue in a very calm and equable manner. That's the way I started out, but every time I stand up—

Mr. Lawlor: It sure didn't last very long.

Mr. Kennedy: The member ought to listen politely.

Mr. Lawlor: He is the easiest member to get riled in the House.

Mr. Drea: Me?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lawlor: It's great fun.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, there are only four or five minutes left and I want to get on to some other important topics and I am going to come back after the adjournment.

I would like, for three or four minutes, to talk about a topic which is very dear to me. It splits the Liberal caucus no end and has the NDP wondering whether it's social justice or social decency.

Mr. Lawlor: Has it anything to do with the federal government?

Mr. Drea: No.

Mr. Lawlor: Good.

Mr. Drea: No, in this case they are merely simple.

Mr. Ruston: Tell us about Taiwan last August. Tell us about that.

Mr. Drea: I would rather go to Taiwan with decent people than I would go to a communist place with the people in the member's party. If that's the way he wants it, that's the way he just got it. I always prefer to stand and sit with people I would invite home to dinner. I don't like to sit with people I wouldn't want in my own house and that may be something very strange and very foreign to that party. When the member is talking to me, he had better recognize it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Ruston: I don't have to recognize anything he says.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Tell them to be quiet, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It would seem to the Chair that it is almost 5 o'clock. Perhaps the hon. member would move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I would be very glad to. I would like to tell you though—

Mr. Lawlor: He wants Francisco Franco home for dinner.

Mrs. Campbell: He'll never get there for dinner.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, perhaps if you could curb the raucous member for St. George, I might move the adjournment.

Mr. Lawlor: It is the member's fault.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment I would like to say that tonight, in case there are those who want to load up the Liberal caucus—I realize it is a very difficult effort—I want to talk about gun control and I intend to talk about the very sad state of Air Canada. Not that Air Canada is a matter under provincial jurisdiction but the meals and liquor served aboard are certainly a matter for provincial jurisdiction.

On the basis of what I am going to talk about I would move adjournment of the House at this time so that the private members' hour might commence.

Mr. Drea moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR: MEDICAL DATA BANK ACT, 1975

Mr. B. Newman moves second reading of Bill 9, An Act to establish a Medical Data Bank.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As this is the first private member's bill to come up for debate in this session, I think it is probably one of the more important pieces of legislation that this government could accept from an opposition member.

Mr. Speaker, the bill itself, An Act to establish a Medical Data Bank, is just as its title signifies. The purpose of the bill is to establish a data bank in which could and would be stored in computerized form the medical histories of persons in Ontario who wish to participate in such a data bank. And I emphasize: "Who wish to participate in such a data bank."

Such records of individuals, Mr. Speaker, would be of vital assistance in the case of an accident or sudden illness, when the patient's personal physician is unavailable for consultation, or any number of other reasons that one could cite. The details of a person's medical history would be immediately available to physicians and hospitals when a patient moved from one city to another, or changed doctors.

It's particularly important in cases of serious allergies, or when a patient is taking prescribed drugs with the possibilities of serious reaction as a result of the administration of a second type of drug. Some physical conditions may exist, Mr. Speaker, which could be adversely, even dangerously affected by drugs administered without the knowledge of the patient's history. Even the mildest of medication can be contra-indicated for people with cardiovascular, diabetic or kidney ailments.

The proposed data bank would be operated and maintained by the provincial Ministry of Health. Every public hospital would have an outlet for the medical histories of persons using the hospital, if they so wished to have their medical histories sent to the data bank. Written consent of the person concerned would be required before the record would be stored in the data bank, and this medical history could not be removed without the written consent of the person and that person's legally qualified medical practitioner.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that the participation and the use of this data bank would be strictly on a voluntary basis. There would be no compulsion whatsoever. My suggestion is that social insurance numbers be used for identification, simply because practically everyone does have a social insurance number. If the members who follow in the discussion of this bill have another suggestion that may be a little more valid, Mr. Speaker, I would even consider that as an amendment to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, anyone knowingly furnishing false information or contravening the provisions of the regulations concerning the medical data bank would be liable to summary conviction with a penalty of a fine and/or imprisonment.

The idea of the data bank was not mine. It comes as a result of an individual in my community, a fellow by the name of Jack Norris, a very concerned and informed local citizen, who has gone through a series of medical adversities. He has travelled the length and breadth of this country and knows from past experience that had his data been centrally located, it probably would have resulted in better and quicker treatment for the ailment he suffered in his many years of travel.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has discussed with me the pros and cons of the implementation of such legislation. As a result of his suggestions to me, I had the opportunity of sending a questionnaire to my constituents. It asked the following question: "Would you agree to have your past medical history and future treatment filed in a computer centre, so that in case of an emergency your medical history could be made available immediately to the attending doctor?"

Of the first 3,200 people who replied, 83 per cent, or 2,641, said yes, they would like to have their medical history filed in a data bank. There was 13 per cent, or 427, who said they would not, for various types of reasons. Most of the reasons suggested were the invasion of privacy. Only four per cent, a very small percentage, couldn't make up their minds. In fact, of the 10 questions that I did ask, the lowest percentage of those unable to make up their mind was in answer to that particular question. You can see it was quite significant, Mr. Speaker. The community to which I sent the questionnaire was vitally concerned and agreed with the idea of a computerized medical data bank.

Mr. Speaker, I know the legislation that I have introduced is not perfect. I depend on legislative counsel, or those who make the legislation, to frame the type of legislation

that in my estimation, would be good. If some of the members who may follow can make suggestions for improving the legislation, I think they should do so, because you can rest assured, Mr. Speaker, this is going to be an accomplished fact in the not too distant future.

In spite of the fact that many will say that there is an invasion of privacy or a loss of confidentiality, the advantages of the data bank far outweigh the disadvantages. As far as the loss of confidentiality or the invasion of privacy is concerned, I think we and/or the federal government can legislate to prevent the invasion of that privacy. I don't expect this government to do that, Mr. Speaker, because when it comes to automobile vehicle licences, that information likewise is confidential, but the government still sells it to Polk and Co., who could be making a substantial return on their investment.

Mr. Speaker, rather than discarding the legislation and throwing the baby out with the bathwater, I would suggest to members who will follow me to come along and make constructive suggestions for the improvement of this legislation.

When I first introduced this bill last year, Mr. Speaker, the Windsor Star, and a writer by the name of Harry Van Vugt, questioned some of the medical fraternity in the community as to the merits of the bill. I am quoting from his article:

The president of the Essex County Medical Society, Dr. Ben Dunn, said: "My immediate reaction to the establishment of such a bank is that fundamentally it is not a bad idea." Mr. Dunn added he supposed a set of circumstances could be set up in which a medical data bank would have great value.

There is the opinion of one doctor. He is not speaking for the medical fraternity; he is speaking as a private citizen. He sees the value of a medical data bank.

I know there are data banks at present. For example, in the province there is a Hospital Medical Records Institute that analyses medical records but only from a statistical point of view and not from a medical point of view. You can see, sir, that such records are being kept by an organization in this province at present.

Back on Sept. 7, 1973, at a conference in Halifax, Dr. Howard B. Newcombe, head of population research for Atomic Energy of Canada at Chalk River, said that computerized lifetime medical records would reveal events in people's lives which could show

influences that caused or contributed to illnesses. They would also show what happened after treatment. To quote him:

Past experience will point the way to the prevention of disease and its more effective treatment in the future, Dr. Newcombe told the 31st annual meeting of the Canadian Association of Medical Records Librarians. Continuous medical histories will teach us how best to preserve and improve human health and could teach us not only how to save lives, but how to save dollars as well.

I would assume, Mr. Speaker, that if this government is not interested in lives, at least it might be interested in dollars and so implement the programme. To continue the quote:

Conventionally the physician attains a brief case history by questioning the patient about past illnesses, and this practice will probably continue. However, in the future, medical histories begun at birth could supplement their statements about past sicknesses with more reliable data from linked medical records summaries in computerized form.

Mr. Speaker, you can readily see from Dr. Newcombe's comments that there is real value in a medical data bank. For example, supposing an individual wanted to donate various organs of the body on his demise to some organization or to a medical association that could make use of them, that person's wish would be immediately stored in the data bank. And, when retrieving the information from the data bank, likewise they would know not to dispose of the body, that there were certain organs in the body that could serve a purpose and perhaps could help another individual to enjoy a little more of life.

Likewise, haemophiliacs, heart condition patients and other patients could have their medical histories stored in the data bank, and upon retrieval there would be an indication to the medical practitioner as to the procedures that he or she might have to follow.

Mr. Speaker, there is always the general concern that there would be an invasion of privacy as the result of the establishment of such a data bank system. There is also the concern of some that once their information is stored in the data bank, someone who shouldn't know may be able to find out that during their youth they may have committed certain types of transgressions where medical practitioner's attention was needed.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, this would be voluntary. You would contribute your own medical history to the data bank on a voluntary basis, so someone who might have a history that he wouldn't like to reveal doesn't necessarily have to partake in the programme. That type of indiscretion might encompass some of us who are here this afternoon.

As for the right to privacy is concerned, look at all of the organizations that now have information concerning us. The Registrar General has records of births, marriages and deaths; and they are available to others. Newspapers publish biographies and stories of certain people. When you apply for a passport you have to provide certain information, and the same is true when you apply for OHIP. All of this is in some file computerized in various government offices. The old age security people know everything about you when you apply for the supplement; they know how little you have financially.

As you can see, a lot of personal information already is in a computerized form in some type of data bank operated by a government; information which was not put in there voluntarily but under pressure. My recommendation is that personal data should be placed there voluntarily. You should decide whether your information should be placed in a data bank before you apply for a social insurance number, workmen's compensation, a driver's licence and so on. In the United States, driver's licences which have coloured pictures, are put into data banks.

In the schools we have student record cards. We know exactly the problems we've had with student record cards, but still records are being kept of students, this time by individual teachers on a confidential basis and simply discussed with other teachers as the need may arise.

When you apply for practically anything in life today, as long as you fill out an application there is a lot of confidential information that is provided by the individual. We in Ontario knew enough that when we revised the voters' list regulations we did not put in the occupation of the individual. The federal authorities, I understand now will only ask on the new voters' lists for the name and address of the individual; they will not be concerned as to whether the individual is married or the occupation of the individual. Even voters' lists have a lot of personal information. And of course police records ad infinitum have personal data.

Mr. Speaker, as far as medical records go, today they are in the doctor's office. The nurse knows about them and the nurse's assistants may know. A dentist, a denturist or a dental therapist, a chiropractor, an optometrist, an oculist, an ophthalmologist, and even an acupuncturist, will have some medical history concerning the individual. Anyone in the health service field will have it. Psychiatrists come along and have it.

When we talk about psychiatrists, they have a rather peculiar and unusual system of giving psychological tests to individuals in the United States, especially federal civil servants or those applying for federal civil service employment. They ask the following questions, to which he has to answer true or false: "I go to church almost every week. My sex life is satisfactory. At times I feel like swearing. I have used alcohol excessively. I am very troubled by constipation. I like poetry. My mother was a good woman. I do not always tell the truth. At periods my mind seems to work more slowly than usual."

This now is asked in the United States in an attempt to get a psychological evaluation of an individual. So you can see, Mr. Speaker, how far they sometimes go to get information concerning an individual. Talk about invasion of privacy; what could be more of an invasion of privacy than the application for employment with some of the US agencies?

I bring this legislation up because here is the problem that an individual runs into when attempting to get medical information back from a doctor. This was a question asked on March 4, 1975, under the Star Alert column in the Windsor paper:

I need my husband's medical records for 1945 to 1959. Unfortunately, the doctor whose patient he was during those years has since retired and left his practice. He used to do most of his work at Hotel Dieu Hospital. We need the records to establish a veteran's pension.

Then it is signed by the individual.

They couldn't get it from the doctor, as the doctor had left. They applied to the hospital. The hospital searched the record and couldn't find any information. They did everything they possibly could, but all of that information concerning the individual's health record was unattainable. By computerizing it and putting it in a data bank on a volunteer basis, Mr. Speaker, it's there by dialing a number or punching out a number. By getting in touch with the computer,

all of that could be returned to the individual.

As far as developing techniques, the Fujitsu Co. of Japan has now developed on microfilm a plasma-type medical data entry terminal that is absolutely astonishing. It's extremely fast and can give all kinds of data right back, Mr. Speaker. Also it has a selection button and a light pen so that you can see whether what is being entered into the data bank is correct or not. You can make corrections even before it goes into the data bank. That is the latest thing out.

That news clip was in the Japan News of April, 1974, so Japan News will know that some of us do read the material sent to us.

Mr. Speaker, for a person moving from one country to another, you could see the value of a data bank. The individual could come along and have his information given to him as he moves about this global community.

I do recognize there are some dangers in data banks, especially as we've found in the United States. For example, in the United States right now they have over 850 government data banks containing more than 1.25 billion records on individuals. There are records of only 200,000 people in the system; yet in the 850 data banks they've got 1.25 billion records of people.

Likewise, the data bank concerning criminal records—it's called the National Crime Information Centre has over five million records of active files concerning people who have been criminally involved.

Mr. Speaker, in the minute or so I have left, there is a lot one could mention concerning the value of a medical data bank. It is so important that even this government, in the Ministry of Health, is now establishing exactly what I'm talking about. The government calls it the cash programme. It's a computer assisted school health system by which they have all of the records of the individual right from birth, practically; this is set up in conjunction with the schools so that they can forecast, simply by past experiences, certain types of health problems which may confront an individual.

Mr. Speaker, you can see that I have attempted to point out to you and the members of the House the value of a medical data bank. I ask them to support my bill. I likewise suggest to them that if they can make constructive suggestions to the bill not to hesitate to do this. You can rest assured, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have a medical

data bank in this province within a reasonable period of time and we are going to find that it is going to be of tremendous value to the health of the community, to the health of the individual and for the betterment of the province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oshawa.

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to Bill 9, an Act to establish a Medical Data Bank.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): That isn't a very enlightened approach.

Mr. McIlveen: What my hon. friend the member for Windsor-Walkerville didn't mention was cost. In recent months we have had to look with growing concern at the rising spiral of health costs in this province. As my hon. colleague, the Minister of Health (Mr. Miller), has pointed out on many occasions, the cost of health care delivery in Ontario is consuming a bigger and higher portion of the budget, a budget that must be used to cover all the province's other essential services.

Ontario's total public health bill rose from \$2.2 billion last year to \$2.5 billion in this fiscal year. Current estimates indicate this figure will increase to over \$3 billion next year, forming by far the largest governmental expenditure. To continue to support these dramatic increases in health care delivery is to court financial disaster for our province within the next decade.

Hospital costs are, perhaps, contributing most of the overall cost increase in our health care system. At the present rate, by the year 1980 the operating expenditures for Ontario hospitals could be \$400 per patient day, a figure we just can't afford. In fact, in my own history as a medical practitioner, I can remember back to the year 1952 when I was chief of staff of the Oshawa General Hospital. Ontario county at that time raised particular Cain because they had to pay \$4.32 per patient day for the care of ward patients. Our hospital in the city of Oshawa today has increased to a cost of over \$98 a day and it's rising annually.

The time has come for restraint and a realistic appraisal of where our expenses may be reduced. Yet, Mr. Speaker, here we have before us legislation calling for the establishment of a medical data bank in which could be stored the medical histories of persons in Ontario.

It is suggested that the Ontario Ministry of Health operate and maintain the central bank and that every public hospital in the province maintain a computer outlet. The cost of such a sophisticated system would be prohibitive and would hardly reflect a responsible approach to solving the medical care cost problems we currently face. In addition, such a plan would carry the risk of creating an even greater bureaucratic maze than presently exists.

In this bill, the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville suggests that the data bank would be of assistance to medical practitioners and hospitals when a patient moves to another city or changes doctors. To this I would answer that all hospitals keep records of patients in perpetuity. Resumés of medical records are available on request at any time, with the patient's consent. I must add that in most hospitals these complete records are available in their original form for several years—in our own hospital, for instance, for seven years after the service is rendered. Then the records are placed on microfilm, after which time they are readily available on request to any doctor.

Although there is no overall agency for computerized medical information in existence, there are a multitude of agencies which code specific conditions. For example, such groups as the Canadian Cancer Society, the Canadian National Institute for the Blind and the Addiction Research Foundation, maintain up-to-date registries and significant medical histories of patients who have been treated. Such records can be made available to a physician on the request of the patient and with the permission of his examining doctor.

The Canadian Medic-Alert Foundation is a privately-funded, autonomous organization which exists to serve individuals with specific medical problems. For a minimal fee of \$9, an individual can join this association, whereupon he receives a card and a bracelet outlining pertinent information. The history of the individual is subsequently stored in a computer and updated annually. Should the member become ill or disabled while away from home, the Medic-Alert Foundation offers a toll-free telephone service which the attending physician may use in order to obtain a more complete medical history than appears on the Medic-Alert bracelet.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us suggests that the data bank would be of assistance when a patient is involved in an accident. I contend appropriate treatment must be implemented before the information can be re-

trieved from any data bank. In addition, information, such as blood group typing, cannot be accepted from any service because of the possibility of an error in the recording or transmission of such information. All transfusions, except in extreme emergencies, must be typed and cross-matched on an individual basis. This information must be ascertained in each individual case at the time of the accident, irrespective of pre-existing data. Information concerning drugs or other medication a patient is taking might also, in an emergency situation, prove to be misleading in the event that the input into the data bank was not fully up to date.

Mr. Speaker, what is perhaps the most disturbing component of the entire data bank proposal is the breach of confidentiality which could occur. Medications prescribed for certain kinds of ailments, such as venereal disease, are often indicative of the condition treated. The common availability of such information could have serious detrimental effects upon the personal life of that patient, to say nothing about the effects on some marriages.

Further to this, the confidence and trust upon which the entire doctor-patient relationship is based could be seriously undermined by the very existence of a computerized information centre. I believe that in an increasingly mechanized existence it is virtually impossible to overemphasize the role of the privileged doctor-patient relationship in our system of health care delivery.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale.

Mr. J. Dukszta (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, the bill addresses itself to a major issue for both the medical profession and the patients. Storing medical data is obviously of some importance both to improving health care in Ontario and just as much to streamlining the technical proficiency of the system itself. But the issue of storing medical data is complex and needs a thorough examination before we proceed with it.

If the idea is useful, it is only useful, I would say, if it is universal. Nowadays people collect information in our society in the form of tax data, the various credit bureau, social security numbers and OHIP. Everywhere we turn around we collect information about individuals. It would not be that much more upsetting to collect more information. What is important to remember is how access to the information is controlled. That is the relevant and important point, not whether the in-

formation is stored or not. I think we can probably devise a method of controlling the access to information which will not destroy individuals. It can, in fact, protect both their jobs and their well-being without being subject to abuse. It can be done.

Before we agree with having a data bank, we have to have some kind of safeguards. Let me give you an example, Mr. Speaker.

A colleague of mine has a daughter about 12 who is a diabetic. Now, her diabetes was discovered three or four years ago and it has been very progressive. Because of her inability to control her diet, the child has been subject to fainting spells, and potentially could pass out in public or alone.

Now, as many diabetics do, she carries a band on her wrist which suggests what to do. If there was a central data bank—whether it was in emergency treatment, a hospital, or otherwise—a physician could immediately assess the information, which would give relevant data pertaining to treatment of this child. And that, obviously, would be very useful.

Now, let us think of another case. Suppose we live in a society where to have diabetes would be inimical to holding a good job. Now, we know it's controllable and to have diabetes is not something contrary to holding any type of a job.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Yes it is, and epilepsy too.

Mr. Dukszta: Okay, the member for Sandwich-Riverside said that in some parts of our society it is inimical. But I disagree; it shouldn't be. Let me put it this way. It should not be a reason for not being able to hold most of the jobs that I can think of. In our society if we made a rule that diabetes was inimical and some people with diabetes wanted to get a job and the data bank information was publicly available, then of course they couldn't get a job. That's an extreme example of what would be wrong.

Again, I come back to the point which is that the access to the information is more important than the information itself. If we come to the mental health problems which have been defined as within the purview of medicine, and if those were included in the medical data bank, then I think we are in real problem in terms of civil rights, because in our society there is a prejudice against patients who have been in psychiatric hospitals. There is a prejudice in terms of work availability, job opportunities, advancement—even emigrating to that august country south of us, the United States.

There are difficulties if you have been in a psychiatric hospital. Access to this type of information would be of great detriment to some people.

I agree that the bill allows for voluntary information. I am picking that point out, because I do not believe that any system can really work unless it is universal. But this type of information, if it is ever stored, must be recorded very carefully; because in mental health problems we are dealing with notional ideas and not with well defined entities in terms of medicine.

There are a couple of other points I would like to make. How would we make sure that information is available only to people who can be trusted? That's a major point for us to determine. A doctor who has been asked by a patient to take care of his health, obviously is an individual who should have access to it. If access is allowed only by permission, it would be a preliminary state of controlling it.

One of the more difficult control factors is that whoever is actually in charge of the computer could have immediate access to the information in the data bank. One way of preventing this or making sure that it doesn't occur is that people seeking access to the information must know both the name and the code number before they can have access to the information.

A lot of psychological research being done right now has this double security, this guarantee that only people who are allowed to have access to this information can do so, and other people who haven't got the code number or the name are not able to do it. Potentially, therefore, this is a very good safeguard, which has worked so far.

I should like to mention that in some other jurisdictions, such as Holland, medical data banks now are in existence. I have no information as to how the Dutch one works, what issues are involved, how people have objected to or praised the system there, but I assume that one can get data by writing to them. It has been in existence for some time and it has worked well.

One added safeguard, which has already been mentioned by the proposer of the bill—I think he implied it more than said it—is that this type of data bank should not be in the control of a private company. I can't imagine control of this information in the hands of IBM.

Mr. B. Newman: That's the trouble with the US banks.

Mr. Duszta: Yes, I tend to agree. It should not be in the control of IBM, and especially of a branch plant, so to speak. If we're going to set it up, it should be under the full control of the Ministry of Health, with all of these safeguards built into it.

Let us just think for a moment, if we are going to implement something like this, about the technical difficulties of implementing it. I do not accept the fact that it is going to be such an overwhelmingly expensive technological augmentation of our already expensive technology that it will bankrupt us in the way the previous speaker has suggested.

Every physician obviously could not have an outlet that would be connected to a central data bank. Only hospitals or community health and social services centres could have this type of an outlet. The outlet itself is not expensive. At the moment—and I'm certain if the government went in to it it would be even cheaper—the rental of an outlet—is only about \$200 a month, which is not overwhelmingly expensive. The running of the computer itself, of course, is expensive, but if the government had one major computer the costs would be virtually minimal when it finally comes to do it.

The advantages of it are enormous, because once the proper safeguards are introduced, almost all the information could be stored in the computer without any problem. But I want to stress that if every physician were to have it, I think it would be impossible to implement it. Therefore, if we're going to implement this type of a system, this type of technology demands once more, I think, that we must come to grips with what we have not been able to face, which is the immense changes in our whole system of organizing and delivering health care in Ontario.

A logical system would require that you have a centre, based in a geographical area—a catchment area, if you like to use jargon—in which all the problems of the people are dealt with in one particular centre, a centre that has 24-hour service, a plethora of various professionals, and supporting services—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's time is just about up.

Mr. Duszta: Well, I think I did actually manage to finish, but let me just say, as a final sentence, that to implement this we would need to implement at the same time

a different way of delivering health services, and obviously one way of doing it would be through community-based health centres.

Mr. Speaker: I might just draw to the attention of the three remaining speakers that there is 21 minutes left. Could we possible get our remarks over in seven minutes each?

The hon. member for Welland South.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to lend my support to the second reading of Bill 9, An Act to establish a Medical Data Bank, introduced by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

It is important that the government of the day support the bill in principle. Any programme to improve the survival rate in the case of an accident or a sudden illness by a simple procedure called a data bank, I think, should be enough to say that it should be in force.

I was surprised by the hon. member for Oshawa stating that it would bankrupt the government of Ontario. I cannot quite agree with that. I don't think he has provided sufficient evidence to say that it would bankrupt the Province of Ontario.

I think any information that is available should be readily available in the case of an accident. I can think of the accidents that occur along the highways, or industrial accidents that occur in industry and in the mines of Ontario. Often the first person at the scene of that accident is a first-aid attendant or an ambulance driver, and it is not too often there is an MD present. I think when a serious accident arises pertinent information should be available to that person, because if wrong treatment is given to an injured person it could cause more serious complications and perhaps mean a longer recovery for that patient.

If we look at the United States where they have paramedics, I think perhaps in the near future we are going to have them in the Province of Ontario, because at the present time the access to the medical doctor in Ontario is getting less and less all the time. It takes quite a time for a person with any sickness at all to get in to see an MD. On that basis alone, information through a data bank would be most helpful in emergency treatment.

In the matter of the records being in the hospital, I know that a number of patients who have received medical attention do have records in the hospital now. Perhaps through a system of the electronic age that

we are living in today, by pressing a button that information could come back to the first-aid attendant or to the ambulance attendant in an emergency, as well as being directed to the hospital.

I suppose when we look at it we have records presently being held by the police forces in Ontario, as well as the federal police force, and, through some sort of Telex I guess it is, in a moment they can obtain the information related to the person in question, and that information is most helpful. We find at the time a youngster goes into kindergarten in the school system in Ontario that there is a data bank there which is computerized and gives all the information related to that youngster. In fact, I suppose in time they will have on record all the different shots that a youngster received for communicable diseases. So in a sense the medical information is already available through certain data banks.

On the question of the cost, again I can't quite agree with the member for Oshawa. I don't think that is sufficient evidence to say that he does not support it. I think we have to look at the end result. If we can save a life I think that is more important than any cost. I am surprised that an MD would shake his head and say, "No, I am not concerned about saving the life of a person." I don't think he intends to shake his head to that.

Mr. McIlveen: I didn't quite say that. It is on the record.

Mr. Haggerty: I do support the value of the medical data bank in Ontario on a voluntary basis and I think the government should be moving in that direction. If they don't move this year they are going to have to move on it eventually. Perhaps in the year 2000 we will have to have it, because the doctors are getting further and further away from the patient all the time. The patient is going to have to look to some source to get the treatment that he requires, and I think through this source the information is there, and it is particularly valuable when it deals with emergency situations. I think my main concern is the emergency situation, so that the person has proper medical treatment at the scene. On that basis I support the bill of the member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, on Bill 9, in terms of principle I must support my friend from Windsor-Walkerville. I think that he has touched

upon something that is very necessary in the evolution of our medical and our hospital techniques across the province. To say that this data would have to be collected originally is not exactly true, because since the introduction of the computer into the Ontario Hospital Insurance Plan many of the ailments that are peculiar to the individual who has been insured, as well as the length of hospital stay, are already, for practical purposes, stored in a data bank. Mr. Speaker, if we can come out once or twice a year and say how many diseases or which particular diseases or ailments are afflicting so many, or on the opposite end of the scale, so few, residents of Ontario, means that actually for about 95 per cent of the people we have collected, within a given period of time, particulars of the ailments.

To take another tack there is the fact that we can prosecute physicians for abusing OHIP. We can tell how many doctors treated the patients and what they supposedly treated them for; so that documentary evidence is available. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, in principle, I don't think there is any question that Bill 9 is a logical extension of practices which already exist. That is not to say that Bill 9 does not fill a need in this province because for everybody who is insured or who has a number from OHIP or who gives the right number from OHIP, there are a great many others who are not, have not and do not.

Let's disregard the ones who didn't pay. OHIP only starts to take regard for individual people under the age of 18 when they go to work. We have teenagers and we have married housewives who haven't worked—I realize that's a phenomenon which may not last throughout our lifetime but, nonetheless, it is there. These people do not have individual or distinctive OHIP numbers.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that what Bill 9 is really talking about is that when someone goes to a centralized place for medical treatment—I don't think the author of Bill 9 has any concept of going to an individual doctor's office; he would have to dial or make some procedure. Nonetheless, when the person who was afflicted or who wanted medical consultation—regardless of the accident, regardless of the emergency—went to a centralized medical place a relatively accurate description of his past health practices could be obtained which would be a benefit to the medical practitioner. I think that's what he is getting at.

Mr. Speaker, in principle, I have no opposition to that.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): But?

Mr. Drea: No, I have no opposition to that. That may astound the member and I realize it's difficult to be over there and be astounded but he is going to be astounded.

I have no opposition to that at all. I think that makes very good sense. Where is the sense in a hospital of having somebody brought in at midnight, whom they don't know anything about, who appears to be in this state, that state or the other state? If they knew that the person was a diabetic or was this or that—I'm not familiar with all the medical conditions—they could treat them in a proper manner. When they don't know, it's trial and error. I know it's very gruesome to say but that's what it is. As I say, I agree in principle.

One of the particulars that concerns me a great deal is the question of where we have the multi-service facility. As I'm sure the drafter of this bill knows, more and more on this continent we're getting to a situation that doesn't just embrace the medical nor the dental. I suppose if it was only medical and dental there wouldn't be that much of a problem but it's getting into the medical, the dental, the social, the what have you. It's not because of social diseases; I want to emphasize that any concern that I have isn't because of the number of ailments that are called social.

One of the things that has always been there to protect the practitioner is the fact that the practitioner didn't have to turn over his records to anybody outside of the particular patient. One of the difficulties—and as I say, it's not in principle—in the mechanization or the implementation of a bill such as this is, that when they get into the multi-service facilities, when they are looking at the social sphere, when they are looking at the economic sphere, when they are looking at the legal sphere, when they are looking at the medical sphere, and when they are looking at the hospital sphere, the whole bit, where does the medical data bank stop?

It is all very well, Mr. Speaker, for you and me to say—and I know a great number of people say this today—that if it wasn't for poor health, particularly poor emotional health, someone who is over here on the heap would be you or I who are very successful. What concerns me about the medical data bank is who punches into it. I realize the author of the bill has gone to some lengths in principle to determine who exactly can punch the code numbers or what have you to get out the particular report on so-and-so.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that in principle I support the bill. I don't think it would be terribly expensive. We've already compiled the bulk of the data. I think it would be very beneficial to those who are brought into a hospital or a medical situation who are unable to give their own definition of their own medical history. But I would like to say that the thing that concerns me is exactly how far in the light of a very changing world that particular medical bank goes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In rising to make a comment or two on this Act to establish a Medical Data Bank I do so with experience in my own case that would be rather useful. I am prone to having kidney stone attacks, Mr. Speaker, and they never occur when I'm at home, it seems. I think they've occurred once when I was home, and that was in the middle of the night. So I've been faced with appearing at an emergency ward of a hospital.

If anyone has ever had a kidney stone attack, he knows the intense writhing pain he has with it, writhing around in the emergency ward while someone copies down or tries to get from him his case medical history in its entirety. As I writhed around on the bed, all this—

Mr. Burr: And the OHIP number.

Mr. Bounsall: —and my OHIP number, the whole bit—the procedure gets longer and longer. I've now had seven kidney stone attacks. I am asked: "Have you ever had a kidney stone attack before? Yes? Where was it? What was the treatment? What happened?" It takes a half an hour just to get the kidney stone history of previous attacks out of me.

Mr. Burr: The member should get a copy made.

Mr. Bounsall: Yes, I should carry around a copy in my wallet that I can provide.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Does the member for Oshawa take that along?

Mr. McIlveen: That is what they should do.

Mr. Bounsall: It would be much simpler for them, surely, to be able to punch a button under my name and my social insurance number or whatever number is chosen and

get the darn printout that would be handed to the doctor so that he can sit there and look at it.

I disagree with the member for Oshawa on the expense of this. I don't believe the setting up of a medical data bank would be expensive.

Mr. McIlveen: To heck with the expense—

Mr. Bounsall: I'm advised by my colleague, the member for Parkdale (Mr. Lawlor), that it costs about \$200 to \$215 to rent a terminal, or it used to when he was using it. That's not very costly. They can be placed in all hospitals. Most doctors could have one in group practice offices. They could be in health-discipline medical centres, which we hope this province will have in a widespread form in the near future as a means of delivering health care.

Mr. Ferrier: The member for Oshawa is just trying to make the work more difficult for the doctors.

Mr. Bounsall: I appreciate some of the comments which the member for Oshawa has made, but I think he's being a little bit conservative in saying that if we have this medical data bank, then one would therefore each time, or particularly in an accident, have to check the person's blood type. I think you could clearly take that from the record produced by the medical data bank.

I would like to say a couple of things about the record in the data bank. I think patients should certainly have the right to be able to look at their own medical records on request. Now we don't want them all belting in once a week to have an up-date, but they should be eligible to have the information that is in that bank provided to them once or twice a year upon request.

Also, as my colleague from Parkdale mentioned, I think for the system to work it's got to be universal. I don't think someone should have a choice as to whether or not the medical data is kept on himself or herself; and I agree with the member for Parkdale that there must be control on who can get that data out of that bank.

You know if you go into a hospital now for any sort of an ailment, Mr. Speaker, the whole hospital, or the nursing staff on your floor, all know what your problem is; and the various doctors you deal with get your whole patient history. None of us fear that very much, so I can't see why, for reasons of confidentiality alone, we shouldn't have it all in a data bank.

One has to work at keeping the data coming from that source confidential. A nurse can get it out by pushing a button and she hands it to the doctor in charge of the case, with the regulations saying that unless asked by the doctor, she must not in fact peruse the information therein, and that would apply to whatever technician might be taking it out.

To those who fear inclusion in one's data information on any sort of social disease, I would say that perhaps in that area you could say social disease information, unless it is of a continuing nature or an intensive medical problem in its advanced stages so that it really deserves to be included as one of the major contributing factors to health, could be excluded. If it's a case of a social disease having occurred in earlier years, with one incidence which has been cured and isn't continuing, isn't a major factor in one's medical history, that can be removed at the patient's request and need not be included in that medical history.

So there need be nothing in the medical history, if one's social disease contact has been on that basis, that would embarrass anyone.

Basically, the idea is a sound one. I can see it being very useful in the event of highway traffic accidents. I can see it being very

useful—this readily available information—as information related to organ transplants. Experts can code these computers so that if a kidney of a certain blood type and blood grouping, or whatever is required, turns up, the blood grouping of the kidney which is to be donated can be quickly matched through the central computer with that of someone in the vicinity or across the province and the operation for the transplant of that kidney undertaken.

By and large, Mr. Speaker, I support the principle here. The details of it need some working on. I would disagree with the bill in that it requires consent for the data to be recorded. I would certainly require it. I think that's the only way it would be completely useful and worth the cost of setting it up.

I do not believe it is that costly to set up; and in regard to possible failure of the computer, it can be stored in a couple of computers so that if there is a problem with one, it is still readily available in another.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: This completes this order of business.

It being 6 o'clock p.m., the House took recess.

ERRATUM

No.	Page	Col.	Line	Should read:
4	104	1	12	Mr. Lewis: Maybe I can ask the Minister of

CONTENTS

Monday, March 24, 1975

Sales tax on reusable containers, statement by Mr. Meen	319
Environmental assessment, statement by Mr. W. Newman	319
Liver disorders, statement by Mrs. Birch	321
Hope township garbage site, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Deans, Mr. P. Taylor, Mr. B. Newman	322
Ontario Northland Transportation Commission, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon	324
GO-Urban system, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon	324
Mercury pollution, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. R. F. Nixon	325
Toronto development controls, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Deans, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. R. F. Nixon	325
Housing policy, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Deans	327
Provincial park fees, question of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Laughren	327
Training school grants, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Good	328
Algonquin College, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Cassidy	328
Ottawa area amalgamation study, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. P. Taylor	329
Health and safety hazards at Elliot Lake, question of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Shulman	329
Grand River flood inquiry, question of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Breithaupt	329
Insulation materials, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Burr	329
Manpower training, questions of Mrs. Birch and Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Reid	329
Agricultural workers, questions of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Bounsall	330
Night traffic court in York region, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Deacon	330
Complement freeze, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Stokes, Mr. Deacon	331
Catalytic converters, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Ruston	332
Toronto Area Transit Operating Authority, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Germa	332
Court backlog in Windsor area, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. B. Newman	332
Admission requirements for medical training, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Shulman	333
Agricultural workers, questions of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Spence	334
Motion re House sittings, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	334
Environmental Assessment Act, 1975, Mr. W. Newman, first reading	334
Environmental Protection Amendment Act, 1975, Mr. W. Newman, first reading	334
Ontario Water Resources Amendment Act, 1975, Mr. W. Newman, first reading	334

CONTENTS

Labour Ombudsman Act, 1975, Mr. Reid, first reading	335
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Parrott, Mr. Riddell, Mr. Burr, Mr. Drea	335
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Drea, agreed to	355
Medical Data Bank Act, 1975, on second reading, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. McIlveen, Mr. Duksza, Mr. Haggerty, Mr. Drea, Mr. Bounsall	355
Recess, 6 o'clock	365



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, March 24, 1975

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MARCH 24, 1975

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Before we call the next order of business, the hon. member for Welland would like to introduce some guests.

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour and a privilege to welcome here this evening students of the Niagara College of Arts and Technology from Welland, whom I am proud to represent in the Ontario Legislature. They are in the charge of Mr. Bruce C. Milligan, B.A. They are enrolled in the law and security administration programme of the college.

These fine people are indeed excellent examples of the younger generation. These young people will one day take over the reins of leadership in this great Province of Ontario. May I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members join me in welcoming my young friends from Niagara College.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (continued)

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Give them the works.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): I'll tell you, I always do.

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): He always does.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Where are the Tories tonight?

Mr. Drea: All of the Tories don't need to be here tonight. I speak for them.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): The member

couldn't call a vote if he wanted to. He needs five.

Mr. Stokes: The Tories couldn't call one. They have only got four members here.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would you do the hon. member for Scarborough Centre the courtesy of allowing him continue his speech?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I was informing the member for Thunder Bay. He doesn't know it.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I think it should be put on the record that there is only one NDP member in the front row and there is only one Liberal member in the front row.

Mr. Stokes: And there are only three Tories on the east side. Put that on the record.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): I note there are only four out of 57 Conservatives on the other side.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I think it should be noted there are eight Liberals and three Tories in my sight.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: But the member doesn't see well.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Including the member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! Order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate at 5 o'clock this afternoon, I suggested there were only two things I was going to talk about tonight. One was gun control, which is a favourite of mine; it's anathema to the Liberal Party but a favourite of mine. I also want to talk about the very poor quality of the meals served on Air Canada. Once again a favourite of mine and anathema to the Liberal Party.

Mr. Paterson: Is that in the Throne Speech?

Mr. G. Samis (Stormont): Where are we, Ottawa?

Mr. Drea: One of the problems, Mr. Speaker, is when a party in Ontario gets so immersed in all the things that go on in Ottawa. They take their money from it, they take their—

Mr. Stokes: What is the member dredging that up for?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: If the member will just listen, he will learn something.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, now look, come on. I know I have a reputation in this House, eh? I have tried to start out today to be calm and peaceful—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Next joke.

Mr. Stokes: And he has failed again.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, look, seriously. When I came into this House 3½ years ago, I was so naive I didn't even think one could read anything.

Mr. Stokes: Boy, was he ever.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I watched the political pygmy from Huron today reading a whole speech with his two books up in front of him.

Mr. Stokes: Ah, that's not nice.

Mr. Drea: I have watched it for 3½ years. I go on without notes. I may make pauses—

Mr. R. S. Smith: There should be a slight change in that.

Mr. Drea: —but I have tried to abide by the rules of this House. I am not asking for any special privileges tonight, but I can assure you, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Ruston: The member for Durham (Mr. Carruthers) read his speech the other day.

Mr. Drea: —that if somebody wants to interrupt me tonight, they are going to get back far worse than they have had.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair recognizes your calm qualities and would urge you to continue.

Mr. J. Riddell (Huron): Does the Chair recognize his effect on the other members?

Mr. Stokes: Well said, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, as I said before the adjournment, I want to talk about gun control and I want to talk about the quality of meals on Air Canada.

Mr. Samis: Why?

Mr. Stokes: That's federal, too.

Mr. Drea: Before I do, Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that perhaps I didn't exactly clarify for everybody the things I was talking about this afternoon about the deliberate deception—by the federal government in regard to housing warranties. I want to say two or three paragraphs about that.

It is on the record that the government of Ontario, from last August, was prepared to introduce a housing warranty programme which would have protected—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): The member was in Taiwan at that time.

Mr. Drea: —everybody who bought a new home in this province in 1975 from the vicissitudes of the builder taking off because of bankruptcy or the builder being unable to qualify, because he wasn't there, on the quality of the house that was built. Mr. Speaker, throughout the last six months of last year and the first three months of this year this government has stood for that kind of a programme. The fact that there is not going to be that kind of a programme in 1975 lies directly with the federal government.

Mr. Haggerty: It said nothing in the Throne Speech.

Mr. Drea: And I couldn't care less which party it is that occupies the federal throne, because it is with them.

Mr. Stokes: Oh? Oh?

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I want to come to a very serious subject, which is gun control in this province.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Which the member supported the last little while.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, the kind of traditional Ontario that has grown up over more than a century now lies at the crossroads.

Mr. Haggerty: Particularly in the last 32 years.

Mr. Stokes: Crank him up. Wind him up.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Does the member have any notes there?

Mr. Drea: Yes, I've got lots of notes.

Mr. Gaunt: I don't like to pry.

Mr. Drea: Well, all right. Okay, come on. All right, I tried to be peaceful. I tried to be calm. If the comedians want to start it, okay.

Mr. Speaker, I really believe the Province of Ontario as everybody has known it, that has grown up over the past 100 years, is really at the crossroads today. A hundred years ago, or better—or, I suppose in particular areas a little bit less—people came here from other areas, people settled, they broke the sod, they tilled the soil, and they did four things at the crossroads: They put up a bank, they put up a school, they put up a church and they put up a general store. That was the basis of civilization in this province, and I think it was a very good basis of civilization, because they took care of the financial, they took care of the educational, they took care of whatever goods they needed, and they took care of thanking the Almighty for the fact that they were able to be here in Ontario. I suppose maybe there was a predecessor of OHIP. They had the good health or the good being to be able to farm the fields, and they did that for a long time.

Mr. Speaker, in the 1920s when the Americans were engaged in what they like to call their noble experiment, which was prohibition, in this province we were not. We accepted the fact that people in other jurisdictions had engaged in perhaps something we didn't think was very practical, but we did not impose it upon our own people.

In retrospect, now we can see what prohibition, or the noble experiment, did in the United States. It led to the corruption of the police force, it led to the corruption of the judiciary, it led to the real beginning of organized crime. In this province we were very, very lucky to escape that, notwithstanding the fact that after the Americans wound up their noble experiment, we went into prohibition for a very brief time, and after that emerged the various liquor control statutes which are still with us today.

I do not choose to speak tonight upon those liquor control statutes. Rather, I choose to speak upon the society we live in. I wish I could turn back the clock 20 or 25 years. I wish we could go back to "Toronto the Good."

Mr. Bounsall: Oh, no. The Orange Lodge again.

Mr. Drea: Well, Mr. Speaker, let it be recorded that the New Democratic Party doesn't believe in "Toronto the Good." The New Democratic Party obviously believes in permissiveness at all levels.

Mr. Bounsall: Oh come on.

Mr. Drea: Well the member opened his mouth; stick with it.

Mr. Bounsall: You can't turn back the clock; you just can't turn back the clock.

Mr. Samis: Make the best of 1975.

Mr. Drea: I wish we could turn back the clock to those days, Mr. Speaker. I wish we could turn back the clock to those days when I was in the newspaper business, and if there was one holdup in a day it was front page news.

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth): The newspaper is doing okay now.

Mr. Drea: Quite frankly in terms of the six days of the week at that time, it wasn't front page news very often. But today, Mr. Speaker, we are in the era of 1975. In 1975, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you every night on the radio you hear about the holdups, you hear about the armed robberies, you hear about the bank robberies, you hear about the abductions, you hear about the criminal assaults on females.

Mr. Speaker, what I am going to suggest to you is, and I suggested it a year ago, that we live in a climate, in a civilization of violence. Mr. Speaker, I am determined to be very pleasant tonight but the New Democratic Party think the climate of violence is very funny.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): The member for Scarborough Centre is the only violent one in the House tonight.

Mr. R. S. Smith: He has threatened us about four times.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I think in terms of the crimes on society that are being committed, I think it is very improper for a political—

Mr. Germa: Shouldice was one of the criminals. He didn't have a gun; he was a pirate in a \$200 suit and a member of the Conservative Party.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, let it be recorded that the New Democratic Party in this province really believes in organized crime. Let's put that on the record.

Mr. Samis: Tell that to the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman).

Mr. Germa: They all belong to the Conservative Party, with Ross Shouldice the leader.

Mr. Drea: Well I could tell my friend opposite about all the union goons for about an hour; but I am not going to, I want to give him time to walk out of here, so he can hide his face in shame.

Mr. Germa: Tell me about Ross Shouldice.

Mr. Drea: Would the member like me to talk about all his union friends who contributed to him?

Mr. Stokes: They sure got wise to the member for Scarborough Centre; they sure tossed him out on his he-knows-what.

Mr. Germa: How come they fired him if he was one of them?

Mr. Drea: Nobody ever fired me.

Mr. Stokes: The member got his walking stick.

Mr. Drea: Well, I tell you, Mr. Stokes, if you think they did, walk outside of that room and just say it tonight, because I would like to collect off you.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member will refer to the other hon. members by their riding, not by their names.

Mr. Stokes: Is that a threat?

Mr. Drea: No.

Mr. Turner: That's a statement.

Mr. Stokes: If that's a threat, the member is on.

Mr. Drea: Well come on. When I am done, when I'm done.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I was talking about the climate of violence. We have a climate in this province, particularly in this city, and it is not altogether remote from the situation in Hamilton or from Windsor or from Sudbury or from Ottawa. We are talking about the fact that the gun has become the great equalizer in all disputes.

Mr. Speaker, two years ago I talked about the fact that crimes, because of the gun, had shown a very vast increase. A year ago I read into the record all these statistics. I am not going to do that tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk to you tonight about the fact that hundreds of thousands of people in this province—most of them in big cities so far, but I am sure that if we let enough time go by many of them will be in the smaller communities—are very concerned about the fact of increased violence, particularly with the gun.

Mr. Speaker, it is on the record in this country that because of the federal Criminal Code we have allayed, I suppose, about 75 per cent to 80 per cent of the handgun crimes that are committed in the United States. I suggest that when the Metropolitan Toronto police commission can say that for every registered handgun in this city there is one unregistered one, and when it can talk about, in figures, 100,000 handguns registered in Metropolitan Toronto and 100,000 handguns unregistered in Toronto, then perhaps in a community of this size we should begin to have qualms—especially, **Mr. Speaker,** when I can suggest to you that the penalty for having an unregistered handgun in Metropolitan Toronto is exactly the same as being unable to produce your driver's licence upon request: \$50 plus costs, which I reckon at the moment is \$53.50.

Mr. Ruston: Is that the maximum?

Mr. Drea: Yes. But that's handguns, **Mr. Speaker.**

Mr. Ruston: That's the minimum?

Mr. Drea: No, it's the maximum.

For a number of years we've talked about the Saturday night special in Chicago or Detroit. Would anyone like to try the Monday-to-Friday special in downtown Toronto? Try my friend over at Hercules. It's a block and a half away, down Wellesley St., up one-half block. Try his Monday-to-Friday special on a rifle. He will offer a rifle with ammunition that is better than the rifle that the fellow who killed John F. Kennedy was able to buy. He will offer a rifle that is better than the man who killed Martin Luther King was able to buy. And he will offer it on a Monday-to-Friday special and put it on a neon sign outside the door.

Mr. Speaker, I will bring up something else. There was a fellow named Oswald who shot the President of the United States. The whole of the United States was appalled and

still is appalled about the fact that man sent away by mail and got a rifle and ammunition and killed the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you, in terms of Ontario today he was a piker, because he could go to the Simpsons-Sears catalogue or he could go to the Eaton's catalogue and he could send away by mail for a far better rifle, a far more accurate rifle, and far better ammunition than he used to kill the President of the United States, and we would send it to him here in the Dominion of Canada with no questions asked except, "Guns and ammo not sold to somebody under 17 years of age. Give your credit number."

They don't really care about the fact they're sending out a rifle. The rifle I'm talking about is a .303 Enfield, which was the standard British military weapon. They're not talking about that and they don't care about the ammunition. "Are you over 17, because we want to make sure you can pay?"

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk to you very realistically about gun control tonight. I know all of the yahoos and the rednecks from the farm country are going to say this will take away the .22 rifle from the stock man who wants to kill rodents or to shoot wolves or something that is going against his stock.

An hon. member: Careful now.

An hon. member: Tell the Attorney General (Mr. Clement) to pay attention.

Mr. Germa: The member has got some yahoos on this side of the House.

Mr. Drea: There are no yahoos on that side of the House, but for the member it comes to redneck.

Mr. Germa: In the rump there are some yahoos.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: With the member for whatever it is in Sudbury—and it won't be long—it's redneck all the way. He's had a long career in it.

Mr. Riddell: This will make good reading for our good rural friends.

Mr. Drea: Yes, it may make good reading to the member's rural friends.

Mr. Riddell: The member wants to believe it when he calls them yahoos and rednecks.

Mr. Drea: Well, the member for Huron is not going to be here very long because the riding has changed.

Mr. Edighoffer: The Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) isn't going to be missed.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Drea: The member for Huron is going to run against the Minister of Agriculture and Food? He's got to be kidding. Nobody wants to commit suicide—not even the member for Huron.

Mr. Paterson: That is why the Minister of Agriculture and Food won't run.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Riddell: I have never backed away from anybody yet, and I don't intend to start now.

Mr. Drea: Oh, bravery, bravery.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member will continue.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I want to come back to the facts about mail-order rifles in this province. It seems very odd to me that while this is a province that stands for the law-abiding—we send petitions to the United States; we tell them to please be law-abiding; and we can't understand why they don't go for gun control, because we would certainly be behind it—we in this province allow a situation where we can buy increasingly more high-powered rifles and high-powered ammunition.

Mr. Speaker, I've had a bit of experience with this kind of ammunition; I know what a copper-jacketed shell can do. I know exactly what it can do. We allow them to buy it by mail, although we say, as I've said before, they've got to be over 17 or they can't buy guns and ammunition.

Mr. Speaker, a year ago when I talked about this subject, I talked about the fact that Toronto was inevitably going to go the way of Detroit, Chicago and other American cities. I'll be honest with you: I thought it was five, 10 or 15 years away. Mr. Speaker and especially to the yahoo from Huron, I can tell him I had a murder in my riding about four or five days ago and I'm very glad to see he is on the side of the perpetrator.

Mr. Riddell: And who is the member suggesting did it, one of our good rural friends?

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, it used to be that we thought about crime and gun control in terms of the urban city. I would like to talk to you tonight about the suburbs. In the suburbs of Metropolitan Toronto we have a tactical squad, which I suppose is the polite name in Canada for the thing that's on television, SWAT—Special Weapons and Tactics. There is a tactical squad downtown. There is a tactical squad in Scarborough. I personally think that perhaps that alone is grounds for gun control in this province. I think it is grounds for gun control in this province that 83 per cent of all the gunshot offences in a rural area are committed with rifles—not with handguns but with rifles. I am the first one to agree that probably in terms of North America, in terms of handguns or restricted weapons, that the federal government, through the Criminal Code, through the administration of justice in the various provinces, has probably come to grips with it. I agree with that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the rifle and the shotgun, the non-restricted weapon, the non-concealable weapon. I don't want to talk about the sawed-off shotgun. I don't want to talk about the sawed-off .22. I want to talk about—if you want to have it that way—the .22 or the shotgun or the .303 that has been left intact. These, I suggest to you, are used in better than three out of four out of every one of the gunshot woundings or the gunshot killings in this province.

I am sure that the lawyers on the other side are going to say, "Well, they are not registered by the Criminal Code." I agree with them. They are not. I am sure that the gun nuts on the other side are going to say they can't be. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to agree to that because the cheaper the rifle or the shotgun the less likely it is to have a serial number.

That's all very well and I sympathize very much with Sen. Cameron in the Senate of Canada that he would want to bring in mandatory registration of those weapons, except that I understand the cost, as does this government. The cost of each one of those registrations where there is no serial number would have to include a ballistics test and, provided the ballistics test could be taken, it would be in excess of \$80 a weapon, which is a very prohibitive cost for a weapon that costs less than \$35—\$30, \$25, whatever.

Mr. Speaker, what I'm talking about is that we in the Province of Ontario embark on a whole new line with rifles and shotguns—a line that has already been pioneered by those who want to collect guns. Because

you see, Mr. Speaker, the people who ordinarily have to use a handgun in this province register the serial number of the gun. That use is because of their occupation, whether they are policemen, or bank guards, or somebody who has a gun for personal protection or what have you. They are registered because of the serial number of their weapon, because with every handgun there is a serial number registered. How do we reconcile the fact that registration appears to have done something? I call you back to my earlier warning that registration hasn't done very much, because for every handgun registered in Metropolitan Toronto there is one unregistered gun.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest we go to a very special category within the Criminal Code, and that very special category is for gun collectors. They are not going to be licensed because of their occupation; they are not going to have the serial number registered. They are going to have a great number of weapons licensed in view of the fact that they are of a character that would assure they can have this multitude of weapons in their place and they will not be used illegally.

Mr. Speaker, already within the Criminal Code is the requirement that if someone wants to be a gun collector he is licensed as to his personal character. I suggest to you, despite the fact that within two or three years there have been two—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Drea: Yes, there have been two gun collectors who achieved some notoriety and were charged. Nonetheless, the vast majority of gun collectors in this province obey the injunctions of the Criminal Code, obey the injunctions of ordinary society and conduct themselves very admirably.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to suggest to you tonight that in this climate of violence in Ontario, particularly in Toronto—and I realize all the rubes are going to have smiles on their faces, but there is a climate of violence—people are afraid, people are concerned. We don't want to become Detroit, we don't want to become Chicago, we don't want to become New York. And, thank God, we are not going to. But I suggest to you the time has come in this government that there be a firm declaration that the handgun is within the control of the federal government, and that abuses with a handgun are within the control of the judiciary who are controlled by the federal government. That is something none of us has any control over.

I also suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that before someone can go from a province to a federal government and say that there has to be something done, the province has to go with absolutely clean hands. Those clean hands are, sir, I suggest to you with the greatest of respect, that we go to the federal government and we say in this province that we are prepared to register the character of the person who owns firearms, notwithstanding the fact that the federal government has the jurisdictional right to deal with handguns.

What does it mean that we have the right to look at the character of people who have weapons above and beyond those who are cleared by the federal Criminal Code to possess handguns? It means that we are going to go to see the people who have rifles and the people who have handguns. It means that they are going to come into us and they are going to have to tell us what they want them for. It would be very easy, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, there is the hunter. He has got a hunter's licence. Let me point something else out to you. Every single person who wants to be a hunter in this province who hasn't got a hunter's licence must go through a mandatory gun control course and get a certificate before he is issued the licence. Not a single legitimate hunter is going to be bothered.

I suggest something else to you, Mr. Speaker, because I've been talking about this for two years.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Drea: Go on, say it again; just let the member say it. Go ahead. Mr. Speaker, for the last two years, not a single young hunter, not a single hunter who is going in for the first time to get a licence has complained to this government. They appreciate gun control because it's their lives that are at stake outside in the bush or outside in the turkey blind or wherever else they shoot. I would suggest something else to you. The death toll from the people who used to sit in the duck blinds, or used to sit in the other kinds of blinds, has dropped very drastically since we brought in this programme of control.

Now let's talk about the skeet shooters, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, if somebody wants to shoot skeet as a recreational endeavour,

he knows how to use his weapon. He knows what he is going to do. He belongs to a club. And in case one of the yahoos wants to open his mouth again, how many municipalities are there or townships—

An hon. member: Who is that?

Mr. Drea: Some of the members opposite. How many townships allow the inordinate discharge of firearms without a penalty? Think about it.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, if a person wants to—and the reason I say a person is that there are a great many ladies as well as men who want to shoot skeet—who want to shoot a shotgun off in the air with one arm.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Drea: They want to do skeet shooting. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you they have already obtained through their gun club, their hunt club, their recreation club, or what have you, the right to discharge firearms in a municipality.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Drea: They already belong to it. Those who are at target practices, who want to shoot on target, well, Mr. Speaker, once again I suggest to you because of the very vast prohibitions against the discharge of firearms in this province, they have already obtained an exemption under the municipal laws for the gun club.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to you that the very gun clubs that obtained that exemption, these are the gun clubs that handle the registration for us and the certification for this government of those who want to use a firearm or hunt, or what have you.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the last year since I talked about gun control in a very prominent manner, I have been to Detroit.

Detroit is one of the places that the New Democratic Party in this province would really enjoy. It is one of those places where the Ten Commandments hasn't done very much to discourage organized crime.

I have been in Chicago, Mr. Speaker, and in Chicago they think that—well, they really wish they had a Legislature like that of Ontario; that someone could introduce this kind of thing, and it had a reasonable chance of passing.

Mr. Speaker, at the time I went to Chicago, they had more than 38 homicides on a weekend. Now, these weren't husband and wife where he came home and—bang! bang!—or anything. Oh, no, after they took all those away, there were still more than 38 homicides.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, in the city of Chicago—and I almost got to meet the mayor, who is rather legendary. But I certainly got to meet his commissioner of police. And the commissioner of police talked to me about the fact that he understood the Province of Ontario is going to bring in gun control. He certainly wished the Province of Ontario would bring in gun control, because Chicago had recorded 38 homicides on the last weekend. And that didn't count domestic arguments, or else he could have added another 10 or 12 or 15. He talked about real live ones.

All right, Mr. Speaker, here we are two years from the first time that I brought up gun control in this Legislature. Two years ago, Mr. Speaker, we didn't have the number of aggravated assaults. We didn't have abductions on the streets. We didn't have cab drivers being shot through the head. We didn't have shoot-outs with tactical squads of the police. A year ago, Mr. Speaker, I would have suggested to you that realistically we were a long way away from having the kind of violence that unfortunately has become the lot of people in Metropolitan Toronto. I suggest to you, sir, that the time has come for gun control in this province and if the yahoos don't like it, let them stand up and run against it.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): They're on the member's side.

Mr. Drea: Let them stand up and run against it.

Mr. Breithaupt: They're on the member's side; he shouldn't ask us.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Who are the yahoos?

Mr. Drea: They're not on my side.

Mr. Lawlor: It's the yahoos who are against it.

Mr. Drea: The hero in the back row won't even open his mouth. He's on their side.

Mr. Lawlor: The yahoos are against it.

Mr. Riddell: If the member wants to come into my riding we'll go and visit these people he is calling yahoos.

Mr. Lawlor: Where do the Houyhnhnms come in?

Mr. Riddell: Stop referring to the rural people as being yahoos.

Mr. Drea: I'm not referring to the rural people. I'm referring to the member.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: I'm referring to him.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: I'm not referring to the rural people of Ontario. I'm referring to the political pygmy of the Liberal Party.

An hon. member: He is treading water.

Mr. Drea: I'm not treading water. I'll say it again. I'm not referring to the rural people of Ontario. I'm referring to the political pygmy of the Liberal Party and that's him.

Mr. Breithaupt: Let the member talk to his own members. Don't worry about us; we'll solve our own problems.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Breithaupt: The member for Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve) is leaving now. He can't take it any more.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, the only thing I can really find in objection to the position I have stated tonight—and I would ask the House to let me get the sentence out before the members holler, okay?—is "Radicals in Canada move from a scheme to restrict handguns to a major push for confiscation of private weapons." That is issued by the John Birch Society and a fellow dropped it off at the house the other night. He said I was one of the main efforts of the Communist plot in Canada to make sure the citizens were disarmed before they took over.

I really think after all this time, Mr. Speaker, it is very ludicrous that (a) I am a radical—

Mr. Lawlor: We know our Neanderthals.

Mr. Drea: I thought it was funny, too. And that (b) I am any part of a Communist plot.

Mr. Lawlor: No, never.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, there are those in the opposition benches who were with—

Mr. Lawlor: He spent all his time in Taiwan.

Mr. Drea: —Communist organizations which I had to take on but, however—

Mr. Germa: How about the Ku Klux Klan?

Mr. Drea: What was that?

Mr. Germa: Is the member with the Ku Klux Klan?

Mr. Drea: No. There were fellows who were with such dubious organizations as the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, weren't there?

Mr. Lawlor: How can the member make gun control effective?

Mr. Drea: The opposition supported us with the steelworkers. Don't get calm after the day is over.

Mr. Lawlor: Really, isn't the member whistling up the pipe?

Mr. Drea: Am I?

Mr. Lawlor: How can he make it effective? There are millions of guns around.

Mr. Lawlor: The member for Halton West (Mr. Kerr) shouldn't prompt him.

Mr. Breithaupt: For God's sake, don't prompt him!

Mr. Lawlor: Let him think for himself for a change.

Mr. Drea: The member wasn't the lawyer for the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, was he?

Mr. Lawlor: I wish I was. I could have made a fortune.

An hon. member: He wouldn't have to be here now.

Mr. Drea: No, I didn't think he was. I thought he had far too much honesty to try that one.

Mr. H. C. Parrott (Oxford): He's a fine man.

Mr. Drea: He wasn't?

Mr. Lawlor: Leave the poor old mines alone. How can the member make it effective?

Mr. Drea: I am never too sure about you. Were you or weren't you?

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. member for Scarborough Centre address the Chair, please?

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, with the utmost respect, it seems to me a very sad day in Canada or in Ontario when you cannot discuss the fact—and I raised the fact about radicals in Canada—I really think it is a very sad day when you cannot comment on the past history of some of the more distinguished members here.

I was saying: "Radicals in Canada move from a scheme to restrict handguns"—and I suppose that was me—"to a major push for confiscation of private weapons." Okay, may I repeat the headline? You see, Mr. Speaker, unlike some of the other people in here I don't read my speeches.

Mr. Bounsall: What point is he trying to drive home?

Mr. Drea: "Canada Faces Gun Confiscation," by F. Paul Fromm. This document was apparently published in the United States of America. He is talking about things that go on in the United States of America under the guise of talking about Bill S-14 in the Canadian Senate, and in passing he talks about the various efforts of myself and other distinguished members of this Legislature to bring in gun control in this province.

He raises the point that the decent hunter will be deprived. Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that under any gun control legislation which I have submitted to the government, or in any gun legislation that will be brought into this Legislature—

Mr. Lawlor: Oh, Paul is the last of the vigilantes; he is the last of the vigilantes. He is one of the Edmund Burke Society.

Mr. Drea: —the hunter will not be affected. The hunter in this province has already qualified for the right to carry a gun.

The apprentice hunter already has to go through a form of gun control, which incidentally is not run by this government but is run by a gun control club and is run very successfully.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): What is if the member wants? What is it he wants then?

Mr. Lawlor: It is not even run by the federal government.

Mr. Drea: I want to give the member for Waterloo North less business.

Mr. R. S. Smith: What's the point he is trying to make? That's what we are trying to figure out.

Mr. Drea: Since we have raised the point about—

Mr. Ruston: He doesn't know what he is saying.

Mr. Good: He just wants to listen to himself talk.

Mr. Drea: Since we have raised the point about gun control with the hunters, let's raise it again with the target shooters. The legitimate people, whether they use a handgun or they use a rifle, will not be affected by any legislation that will be brought in by me or this province, because they already belong to a gun club. Those gun clubs have done more to ensure the safety of the hunter or the target shooter in this province in the last 20 years than everything else combined, so they are not going to be affected. Who is going to be affected?

Mr. Riddell: The farmer who wants to shoot the rabid skunk is the guy who is going to be affected.

Mr. Drea: Keep talking, buddy.

Mr. Riddell: Sure, keep talking about the rabid skunk and other rabid animals that are a menace to livestock products.

Mr. Drea: This is the longest speech he has ever made, other than a grunt and a groan.

Mr. Riddell: Rabid animals affect the livestock. The farmers won't be able to shoot them under legislation that the member is proposing.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): Oh, come on. He is not saying that.

Mr. Riddell: That's what he said.

Mr. Kerr: No, no.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, indulge him; it is the longest speech he ever made.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): The member hasn't been listening.

Mr. Good: The member for Halton West was going to bring in legislation last year.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member for Scarborough Centre has the floor. He may proceed.

Mr. Drea: In short, nobody is going to be affected by any type of gun control legislation

except the person who is going to buy a weapon upon impulse. I am not saying that it is going to end criminal activity in this province; it is not. Mr. Speaker, you know that and I know that. The anti-social are going to be with us always. I think it is our duty to limit the anti-social—

Mr. Stokes: The impulsive buyer.

Mr. Drea: —or the criminally minded. I would have expected better from the member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: The impulsive buyer, that's what the member said.

Mr. Drea: I really would have expected better from him.

Mr. Breithaupt: But he is agreeing with the member.

Mr. Drea: From the criminally minded we cannot expect any improvement. As I said before, the Ten Commandments haven't made much impact upon organized crime.

Mr. Lawlor: They haven't made much impact upon anybody.

Mr. Drea: From the anti-social we can't really expect anything more. Our obligation is to try to eliminate that 1½, two or whatever to as small a proportion as we can humanly do in our lifetime. I suggest to the member for Thunder Bay that if he and I can move that a little bit closer, then maybe we will have justified our lifetime upon this planet. I'm sure he'd agree with me.

Mr. Stokes: I don't even own a gun.

Mr. Drea: You know, Mr. Speaker, one of the problems of making a serious speech in this Legislature—

Mr. Breithaupt: Yes?

Mr. Good: Is that the member doesn't know how.

Mr. Stokes: The member had better start with the premise that he is serious.

Mr. Drea: I'm very serious. If the member for Thunder Bay wants to take me on, my riding is Scarborough Centre; he can run against me and say, "Give everybody a gun."

Mr. Lawlor: Does the member for Scarborough Centre own a gun?

Mr. Stokes: That's a challenge.

Mr. Lawlor: Has he got a gun?

Mr. Stokes: I'll tell you what, I'll run in Scarborough Centre if the member will go up and run in Thunder Bay.

Mr. Germa: At Attawapiskat.

Mr. Breithaupt: That's as fair a balance as I have heard all night.

An hon. member: Right, a good trade.

Mr. Drea: Yes, I rather suspect that would get rid of both of us, and that would make for a good House with no social reform.

Mr. Lawlor: I'll agree to half of that; guess which half.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I'm not talking politics tonight. I haven't tried to.

Mr. Lawlor: You are above all that stuff.

Mr. Drea: I am talking to you and I'm talking to the Legislature on gun control. I realize I'm not the easiest person in this Legislature to get along with.

Mr. Lawlor: Hear, hear.

Mr. Drea: But in terms of gun control I have always talked from the heart, I have talked from the soul, I have talked from the brain—

Mr. Lawlor: Right out of the mouth of the object, so to speak.

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): The member for Lakeshore is provocative tonight.

Mr. Drea: I have always tried to do it in the utmost of sincerity, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lawlor: The member should control himself. The night is young.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that this year is the year of destiny in this province.

Mr. Lawlor: Destiny? My Lord! That's another word for going under.

An hon. member: It's the end.

Mr. Drea: All right, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to start my conclusion on this topic one more time—

[Opposition applause.]

Mr. Lawlor: I didn't know the member had got to the premise yet.

Mr. Drea: All right. Fine. They think it's frivolous.

Mr. Lawlor: No, we didn't think it was frivolous.

Mr. Drea: Okay, fine. They think it's frivolous—

Mr. Lawlor: Not at all. I think it is totally serious. That's why it is so damned funny.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you I have never discussed this topic in this House except to bring out the most serious implications. I wish I had been wrong a year ago when I said Toronto was going the way of Detroit and Chicago. I wish I had been wrong. I would love to stand up here tonight and say, "No, we're not." But we are, and the members opposite know we are. Every single one of them reads a newspaper, so they know we are. And I have just about had enough of the frivolity of some criminal lawyer from the Lakeshore. I've just about had enough.

Mr. Breithaupt: Who?

Mr. Drea: Either we are going to get gun control in this province—and it's not going to deal with handguns; it's going to deal with rifles and shotguns—

Mr. Lawlor: The member doesn't think his ineffective gun control is going to make any difference, does he?

Mr. Drea: And that stands for the great yahoo back there—

Mr. Haggerty: Order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Let's have a little order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you very seriously that a year from now—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Drea: I'm not going to talk about it—and I'll be here, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Ruston: No, he won't.

Mr. Drea: I'll be here.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): No, he won't.

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Want to bet?

Mr. Lawlor: That's what he means by destiny.

Mr. Drea: I'll be here, but about 50, 55, 60 or 70 in Metropolitan Toronto won't be here because they were blasted down be-

cause the government found itself confronted with all the people who said, "Oh, protect those who have the guns, protect those who have this, protect those who have that." It will be small consolation to those who have met their Maker.

I am not going to stand up again next year. I'm not going to read the statistics. I'm not going to talk about how many were killed in my riding—and they are killed in my riding.

Mr. Lawlor: The member can set up all his straw men so he'll be able to burn them down. The surrogate personality!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Let the member for Lakeshore beware he isn't the next one.

Mr. Lawlor: He dreams his dreams and makes his illusions.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lawlor: What member of this House takes exception to him fundamentally? Come off it.

Mr. Drea: The member for Lakeshore does.

Mr. Lawlor: He plays games and makes long speeches. It is all beside the point. I agree with everything he says, the poor beggar.

Mr. Drea: Well, we now have the NDP on record for gun control. He had better talk to his deputy leader who just came in.

Mr. Lawlor: I think there should be gun control. I personally believe so.

Mr. Drea: Yes, he does. Then why does he open his big mouth in here and object?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Would the member for Scarborough Centre get along with his debate in relation to the Throne Speech?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, why doesn't he?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): That is unparliamentary.

Mr. R. S. Smith: He is being provocative.

Mr. Lawlor: Can't he control his instincts?

An hon. member: Not very well.

Mr. Stokes: Let him tuck in his shirt.

Mr. Lawlor: Introduce the legislation and he will see where we stand.

Mr. Drea: Would the member vote for it?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes.

Mr. Drea: Okay, we are in.

Mr. Lawlor: Get on with it, lad. He fights ghosts. He wrestles with angels and he is not even Jacob. He has no ladder.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Lakeshore will have a chance to make his contribution to the Throne Speech later. Order, please.

Mr. Lawlor: He never gets anywhere.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lawlor: Figments, will-o'-the wisps, poltergeists.

An hon. member: He was worried that if he had him out of sight he must be wrong.

Mr. Breithaupt: Does that worry the minister?

Mr. Speaker: You have order now. You may proceed.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I think I've talked enough about gun control. Now that we have the support of the New Democratic Party, I don't think there is anything that stands in the way of the implementation of gun control as I imagine from the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, once the government has got our consent, I suppose it can go ahead. I didn't know we were such terribly important people.

Mr. Drea: I tell the member when the normal and the peculiar get together, there is not much else left.

Mr. Deans: And the member for Scarborough Centre is the peculiar.

Mr. Drea: We are the normal.

Mr. Lawlor: They the normal, are they? Oh, my God, how would we deal with aberration when it comes?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: We will deal with the member.

Mr. Drea: Yes, I will protect him. Mr. Speaker, I want to come to the second last point that I want to raise tonight. That is something I really think, provided the majority of the House will go along with me, I'm going to do something about. I would certainly like their opinions because I presume they fly as much as I do on Air Canada, or as little as I do, out of this province.

Mr. Speaker, in this province we give Air Canada the equivalent of a tavern licence for their airplanes. That's based upon the fact that supposedly they feed all of their people a meal or something. It's on the 50-50, and those in the House who are conversant with the liquor laws of the province will understand that. In any event, they are supposed to serve a decent meal.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk, first of all, about my experiences on flight 2904 on March 16, 1975.

Mr. Breithaupt: What did they run out of?

Mr. Drea: Food, that's what they ran out of.

Mr. Stokes: Was that coming to or going from?

An hon. member: Was that the flight from Ottawa to Toronto?

Mr. Deans: Would he tell us a little more about the trip so that we can understand it?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Let the member finish his address please.

Mr. Drea: Well, to those who have independent means, like the deputy leader or the House leader of the Liberal Party, these things are very minuscule but—

Mr. Breithaupt: That's the nicest thing he has ever said about us.

Mr. Drea: No, independent means—not independent brains. Mr. Speaker, I happened to be on this flight on behalf of the government. I made the mistake of getting on this flight with Air Canada on a Sunday afternoon without having had lunch.

Mr. Lawlor: Where was he going to? He can't complain about a charter service.

Mr. Drea: What? Listen, I don't take chartered flights. I regulate.

Mr. Lawlor: I know.

Mr. Drea: No, no. This was a regularly scheduled flight.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Ottawa to Toronto.

Mr. Drea: I just want to talk about the meal.

Mr. Lawlor: He is stepping on federal toes.

Mr. Drea: No.

Mr. Deans: Is it a federal problem?

Mr. Drea: No.

An hon. member: It's a dirty trick.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Let the member for Scarborough Centre continue.

Mr. Lawlor: Is it a federal matter?

Mr. Drea: Come on—it's no federal matter. We license them.

Mr. Ruston: Please speak through the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: Well, I wish everybody else would speak to the Chair, too.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: It would be a lot easier position for the Speaker to be in at this time if everybody spoke to the Chair.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, I am about to interject.

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Lakeshore got a point of privilege he'd like to rise on?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: He never has a point of privilege.

Mr. Drea: By all means.

Mr. Speaker: Okay, let's all settle down and come to order. Let the member for Scarborough Centre proceed.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, for some time it has bothered me about Air Canada. I come back to the deputy leader of the NDP—are they regulated by us or are they regulated by the federal government?

Mr. Speaker: I must remind the member for Scarborough Centre that you don't call a member the deputy leader. You refer to him as the hon. member for the riding he is representing.

Mr. Deans: Smarten up.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is it out of order to have your dinner in the legislative chamber?

Mr. Drea: The hon. member for Wentworth, my good friend the deputy leader of the NDP.

Mr. Lawlor: House leader.

Mr. Drea: Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the distinction. Air Canada is a common

carrier and it's under federal jurisdiction—no question. But, in terms of the liquor licence in Ontario they are under our jurisdiction. And I have some responsibility for that.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Drea: And that is what I want to talk about tonight. It is that very minor responsibility, which is the liquor licence or the tavern licence. We grant that tavern licence on the grounds they are going to issue a good, substantial meal. Now let me tell you what happened to me on March 16, 1975, on flight 2904, Mr. Speaker.

It appeared that there was some kind of meat. These are my own notations; I've signed them with the times and everything else. It appeared that there was some kind of meat. It appeared that there was some kind of juice poured over the meat. It also appeared that there was a half-stale roll. That I can testify to—it was a half-stale roll.

Mr. Deans: Was it a half roll that was stale or was it a roll that was half stale?

Mr. Drea: There was also a half-dried bit of cheese over the meat.

Mr. Stokes: That is why the member had to regulate them.

Mr. Drea: It was so half stale it was—

Mr. Stokes: That is why he had to regulate them.

Mr. Drea: There was some kind of apple delicacy for dessert, or something. This may be of substantial interest to everybody here. The girl asked me if I would like some wine and I said to her, "Is there a Canadian wine?" She said, "No, there is no Canadian wine because we lose so much business on it. It is rotten."

Mr. Paterson: It sounds like the legislative dining room.

Mr. Deans: Okay, who said that?

Mr. Breithaupt: Next.

Mr. Drea: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Liberal Party wants to go on record that Canadian wine is rotten, that is not my problem. Not my problem.

Mr. R. S. Smith: That is not what he said.

Mr. Drea: Well then, I will give way to a point of privilege; let him stand up and say what he has to say.

Mr. Breithaupt: We are sharing the member's experiences.

Mr. Paterson: I said you can't buy a bottle of Canadian wine in the legislative dining room.

Mr. Drea: That's not true. You can buy a bottle of Canadian wine in the legislative dining room any day of the week.

Mr. Good: You can't buy a half bottle; and that is always the way we order.

Mr. Breithaupt: After all, we are in the opposition.

Mr. Ruston: We drink only a small amount.

Mr. Drea: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think in this province, where there are a great many farmers who are engaged in the growing of grapes and in the processing of grapes that are essential for Canadian wine, the fact that the premier Canadian airline doesn't carry Canadian wine because "the public thinks it's rotten," is a very bad reflection on the Canadian farmer who grew the grapes, the Canadian processor who processed them and the Canadian vintner who made the wine.

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): And a Canadian airline and the LCBO.

Mr. Drea: A Canadian airline; yes, and that's what bothers me most of all. If I was on an American airline I couldn't care less if they had Canadian wines.

Mr. Breithaupt: Fly United.

Mr. Drea: Don't turn it around. The member was the guy talking about the tender fruit marketing board; that includes grapes.

Mr. Deans: Who is the member talking to?

Mr. Drea: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: On a point of privilege, I wasn't saying a word.

Mr. Speaker: State your point of privilege.

Mr. Deans: My point of privilege is that I want you to understand that I have a great deal at stake in the tender fruit industry, particularly the winemaking tender fruit industry. Most of my riding is made up of it, and I subscribe to the theory that people should drink Canadian wines, particularly Ontario wines.

Mr. Drea: Well then, why is the member laughing?

Mr. Breithaupt: May I speak on that point of privilege? He has more tender fruits in his riding than anyone I know.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kitchener has no point of privilege either.

Mr. Deans: I would like to get that comment of the member for Kitchener on the record. I will be passing that around in the next election.

Mr. Riddell: Point of order.

Mr. Speaker: What is the member's point of order?

Mr. Riddell: Just because Air Canada didn't serve a meal that suited his fancy doesn't mean to say they're running a restaurant up there.

Mr. Speaker: You haven't got a point of order either.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I have raised a point again, maybe beyond the comprehension of the yahoo from Huron, that we do license Air Canada as a tavern where they have to serve as much food as they serve liquor.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, on a point of decorum, would the Speaker ask the member to tuck his shirt in?

Mr. Speaker: If we don't have better order in this Legislature at this time, I'm going to ask the Speaker to come in and adjourn the Legislature.

Mr. Lawlor: Don't push that one.

An hon. member: The member's tender fruit is slightly bruised.

Mr. Drea: No; not a meal like that again.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Did the member drop a wing?

Mr. Ruston: Where are all the member's Conservative friends? Oh, there is one down in the rum— the member for Prince Edward-Lennox.

Mr. Drea: Well, I'll tell the member for Essex-Kent the only one who counts is here.

All right Mr. Speaker, I try to raise subjects of importance and they do have some impact in this province. We have a very big subsidy programme for grape growers, as I'm sure my friend from Wentworth knows.

Mr. Deans: I appreciate it too, I might tell the member.

Mr. Drea: Yes. We have some rather substantial special concessions to Ontario vintners in this province, which I am sure that my friend from York-Forest Hill, with his great regard for the rare wine store knows.

Mr. Givens: I'm a Mogen David man.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Only the member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) drinks Mogen David.

Mr. Deans: And he drinks it with the Premier (Mr. Davis).

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, coming back to the fact that Air Canada is issued a tavern licence by virtue of this province whenever it flies out, that tavern licence is comparable with that which is issued to other people in Toronto, Hamilton, Windsor, Sudbury, Kenora, Ottawa, Cornwall, right across this province. One of the conditions we put upon the people who have a tavern licence is if they serve food that is unpalatable—not food that is bad but just unpalatable—

Mr. Lawlor: The whole weird liquor policy has been severely under review. Why in blazes doesn't the government bring in some legislation—

Mr. Drea: That's not what his party said today.

Mr. Lawlor: All the Tories ignore what they already have. They haven't even brought in the McRuer recommendations of a couple of years ago.

Mr. Drea: And he is the member who stands for a saloon on every street corner, right?

Mr. Lawlor: The whole thing is out of date.

Mr. Drea: He is the one who wants a saloon on every street corner, right?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Lakeshore is out of order.

Mr. Lawlor: It's dreadful. Can the member defend that policy?

Mr. Drea: He is the one who wants a saloon on every street corner, right?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Except the member for High Park.

Mr. Drea: Does the member want a saloon on every street corner of the Lakeshore?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: I would like to talk very seriously except I keep getting interrupted by rubes and what have you. I was talking about the concept of Air Canada and I would talk the same—

Mr. Lawlor: On a point of personal privilege—

Mr. Speaker: State your point of privilege.

Mr. Lawlor: I think he called me a rube.

Mr. Speaker: The Speaker didn't hear that.

Mr. Breithaupt: Not only did he call the member for Lakeshore a rube but I think he meant it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Not only did he, but he is correct.

Mr. Lawlor: All my life, for all my life I have tried not to be a rube, just to be the opposite, a sophisticate; now I don't want to be either.

Mr. Speaker: There always has to be a first time for everything.

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What is the opposite of a rube?

Mr. Lawlor: A sophisticate.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member means a square.

Mr. Deans: Adjourn the debate and try again tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Is the member for Scarborough Centre ready to proceed?

Mr. Drea: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The reason I was raising Air Canada—and I come back to it—is once again it's under federal jurisdiction as a common carrier but as a tavern—and that's what it is; it's enabled to serve drinks as well as food—it is under the jurisdiction of this province. On the basis of the meal served to me on flight 2904—

Mr. Braithwaite: Where was the member going?

Mr. Drea: —on March 16, 1975, at approximately 4 p.m., I am going to ask the chairman of the Liquor Licence Board tomorrow to ask Air Canada to show cause why, if it cannot improve the quality of its meals on flights, we do not take its liquor licence away from it on flights departing from Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Not a bad idea.

Mr. Lawlor: Talk about squares.

Mr. Drea: My friend, I will read out of the Toronto Daily Star, and this was after me.

If you or I ran the airlines, leather steaks would be out. [That was on March 22, 1975; he makes a great deal of sense.] The only thing they care about on Air Canada when they leave Ontario is peddling you drinks. They couldn't care less when you get fed, how you get fed, or any other way you get fed.

I say that tomorrow I am asking the chairman of the Liquor Licence Board to take a long look into Air Canada on the basis of my complaint and the complaint in the Daily Star to get it to show cause as to why it shouldn't lose its right to serve liquor outside the Province of Ontario on flights that depart from here until it can provide people with a decent meal.

Mr. Ruston: Send the speech to every Air Canada employee.

Mr. Drea: Since I asked it, members can rest assured it is sure going to be a show cause.

Mr. Lawlor: It sure is.

Mr. Breithaupt: Now that is power.

Mr. Drea: Oh the member is on the side of the airline, is he?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Show cause down here.

Mr. Drea: He is on the side of Air Canada, is he?

Mr. Stokes: Yes.

Mr. Drea: The great socialist on the side of Air Canada; oh wow!

Mr. Stokes: I travel it twice a week and I think they're doing a fine job.

Mr. Drea: Does he? Good.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He is just afraid they will jettison him.

Mr. Drea: Terrific.

Mr. Deans: Talking about show cause, the member's shirt is hanging out.

Mr. Drea: He's right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is he showing his cause?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, it has been a very long afternoon and it has been a bit of a very long evening.

Mr. Stokes: Get that on the record, that the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development wants to know if he's showing cause.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, it has been a very long afternoon and a very long evening, I realize.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: It could be longer. Mr. Speaker. I realize I'm not exactly the calmest member who comes before here.

An hon. member: This is better than last year.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: Well, that's all right. Mr. Speaker, I realize when I come up twice a year I'm not exactly the calmest or the easiest, but I do speak from the heart and maybe that irritates a great many people on the other side, since they've been posturing, phoney—

Mr. Lawlor: There are three times as many of the opposition here as there are government members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Breithaupt: At least we're listening.

Mr. Lawlor: There are three times as many of the opposition listening to him as his own members.

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. member for Scarborough Centre please proceed. Is he finished?

Mr. Drea: Well, Mr. Speaker, I've never needed the audience the hon. member for Lakeshore has. I've never been a sycophant or all those kinds of things that need people to applaud them. I know where the party stands behind me, I know where the party will stand behind me in the next election, and I know how many people will be here in the next election. And he won't be.

Mr. Lawlor: A sycophant?

Mr. Breithaupt: So there.

Mr. Lawlor: Has he ever been a hedonist?

Mr. Ruston: All five members who are here, eh?

Mr. Breithaupt: Six.

An hon. member: Four, isn't it?

Mr. Drea: It's going to be a great pleasure that he will not be here.

An hon. member: All six members are behind the member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. Drea: He wanted to open his mouth. I sit in the third row of the Conservative Party. The third row of the Conservative Party happens to be known as Murderers' Row because that's where all the talent is.

Mr. Breithaupt: That's why he is alone.

Mr. Drea: If it wasn't for the third row of this party, clowns like the member would be around. And if clowns like him were around, the last of the big time spenders in Ottawa—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Drea: —would be around, the last of the big time receivers in Quebec would be around; and the last of the big time givers would be in this province. Now, take that one.

Mr. Lawlor: He was going to remain so calm.

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): Tell'em!

Mr. Lawlor: He was going to remain so calm.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, having gone through one of the two of my little indulgences in a year, I'm generally the nicest, easiest, calmest fellow to get along with, except for the rubes.

Mr. Lawlor: Poor old Air Canada, when he gets through with them.

Mr. Drea: The member might even fly on them as a good socialist. There is nothing like a good capitalist straightening out one good socialist outfit. That is what I'm going to do. He'll be pleased to fly with them.

Mr. Lawlor: What Haile Selassie needs is one good man like the member for Scarborough Centre. He'd have no trouble in Eritrea or anywhere else.

Mr. Drea: In all good favour to the hon. member for Lakeshore, principia non homi-

nes. If his party would take that as a motto, it might be better off. Would he like a translation or would he like to give it to me?

Mr. Lawlor: No, it is a terrifying thought.

Mr. Drea: It means principles not people. It might be very good for him to adopt it. Having introduced Latin into the assembly, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me it's time to close.

Mr. Lawlor: Has he noticed how the whole of consumer law has changed since he became parliamentary assistant?

Mr. Speaker: Order; order, please.

Mr. Lawlor: Before his time everything was great.

Mr. Speaker: Order, the member for Lakeshore. Order, please.

An hon. member: Throw him out.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, once again, *principia non homines*.

Mr. Stokes: Encore un fois.

An hon. member: He is reading it there.

Mr. Drea: No way. I never read anything in this House.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would sooner read a Liberal policy statement, for a change.

Mr. Drea: Come on, that's "principles, not people," and I realize that is a total anathema to the NDP. I realize their concern over it, but I would like to conclude on the Throne Speech.

Mr. Lawlor: That's something like the difference between the men and the boys.

Mr. Drea: What?

Mr. Lawlor: I am not going to tell him. He can remain as confused as he is.

Mr. Drea: Not me. I am the first one in a long time to bring Latin to the Legislature.

Mr. Breithaupt: Frequently in error, but never in doubt.

Mr. Lawlor: Non dubitandum est.

Mr. Drea: When the hon. member for Lakeshore wakes up in the morning—

Mr. Lawlor: I enjoy life too much; I can't sleep.

Mr. Drea: —he is going to think about the little motto I gave him.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: When he wakes up in the morning he should thank God.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude on the Throne Speech by mentioning a person I believe to be the foremost political leader, not only of this time in our province, not only at this time in our country, but certainly someone who has emerged as one of the great people who can meet the challenges of the post-war era as reflected in the 1970s—

Mr. Deans: Darcy McKeough.

Mr. Stokes: The member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: One has to show some modesty.

Mr. Gaunt: We knew he could do it.

Mr. Drea: —and that is the leader of this party, my colleague, the Hon. William Davis, the Premier of this province.

Mr. Deans: Oh come on, the member can do better than that.

Mr. Good: All eight of them agree, eh?

Mr. Breithaupt: I am underwhelmed.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech we have become the first government to tell people the truth about life in the 1970s.

Mr. Lawlor: Ain't much, is it?

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I really wish somebody would catalogue all these things. Every time I go to start a decent speech, every time I go to be calm, I am not trying to provoke anybody, you let every single one of these clowns, etc.—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I think the member—

Mr. Drea: I am getting tired of the interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Calling people clowns in this Legislature isn't really parliamentary procedure. I would think you would want to take that off the record. There are nicer names you can call them than clowns. Would you retract that word "clowns"?

Mr. Breithaupt: Say hon. clowns.

Mr. Drea: Sir, with the greatest respect, if you direct me to, I will; but I would like to

say to you there is a standing rule in this Legislature that precludes interruptions, cat-calls and that kind of thing. It has been a long time since I have seen it done. Sir, I am not asking it be done on behalf of me.

I have always demonstrated in this establishment that I can more than take care of myself.

Mr. Lawlor: At the moment he is not.

Mr. Drea: But if you are going to ask me to stop calling the Liberal opposition clowns, then I suggest to you—

Mr. Lawlor: We wouldn't dream of that.

Mr. Breithaupt: No, no.

Mr. Drea: —that you are going to have to call a complete moratorium on them. With the greatest respect, sir, I will abide by your decision, I will withdraw the remark.

Mr. Deans: It isn't worth it.

Mr. Drea: I will look upon them as hon. people no matter how much it disturbs me, but I suggest to you, sir—

Mr. Lawlor: It's okay, we won't object.

Mr. Drea: If you're going to do that to people like me on the government's side, Mr. Speaker, then I suggest to you that you make them obey the rules about no interruptions.

Mr. G. Nixon: Right on.

Mr. Morningstar (Welland): Right on.

Mr. Lawlor: Is he serious?

Mr. Speaker: Are you finished?

Mr. Drea: No, I'm waiting for a reply.

Mr. Speaker: I have no reply for the hon. member for Scarborough Centre. You retracted your statement and you may proceed.

Mr. Drea: Sir, you asked me to withdraw the remark.

Mr. Speaker: And I understand you did.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry for losing my temper. I withdraw the remark.

Mr. Speaker: Proceed.

Mr. Drea: I would just like to conclude on the following notes. We are the first government in this province, or in this country, or in North America, to have told people the truth. We are in hard times. Let there be no mistake about it; we are in hard times.

Mr. Breithaupt: The Tory government is.

Mr. Lawlor: It isn't as bad as it is going to be.

Mr. Drea: We are in times that—because of inflation and because of recession at the same time—defy conventional economic analysis.

Mr. Lawlor: No, only for the inept.

An hon. member: Silly.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I appeal to you, I withdrew my remarks. I don't want any interruptions, and that's in the book.

Mr. Lawlor: Whatever he may want.

Mr. Givens: Mr. Speaker, unaccustomed as I am to public speaking, I am ready to proceed with my remarks.

Mr. Speaker: As far as the Speaker is concerned, you will proceed when the member for Scarborough Centre has finished.

Mr. Stokes: I think he finished an hour and 10 minutes ago.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, this government has been very honest. We don't have the solution to the recession, the combination of inflation—and other things that are going to come.

Mr. Lawlor: He is telling us.

Mr. Stokes: This government is the cause of it.

Mr. Drea: If we were like the New Democrats, of course, we could pull out a little old rule book of the 1930s that's been annotated by Comrade Mao and call it the "Little Red School Book." It would give a solution for everything to come.

Mr. Breithaupt: The socialist hordes.

Mr. Drea: We don't do that because we're honest, because we're realistic and because we're not insane.

Mr. Lawlor: This government is so out of date it doesn't know the difference.

An hon. member: They have all the answers don't they.

Mr. Drea: We could go to the Liberals, to Her Majesty's loyal opposition. We could ask them for their solutions, but they have none. They have no policy. They can't even put down on a single piece of paper what they believe in or what they don't believe in.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They have a new one every day.

Mr. Drea: They won't do it, because they don't want anybody to see what they did on this day or that day. We have been ruthlessly honest with the people.

Mr. Breithaupt: Just read it in Hansard!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Which day.

Mr. Speaker: I think the remarks coming from the opposition side of the House are very provocative to the member for Scarborough Centre. If you wish him to proceed and finish, I would appreciate very much if you would just withhold your remarks at this time until he does finish his remarks.

Mr. Drea: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am very glad to see there's one rule for those who would like to be in power and those who are.

Mr. Samis: Come off it, finish the speech.

An hon. member: Get on with the speech.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, we have been rather ruthless with the public. We have told them the truth. This government doesn't have any magic solutions; neither does the government of the United States. They're trying, but neither do the governments of the 50 states; and neither do the governments of the other nine provinces. Neither does the government in Ottawa. I don't think they're trying—but you know, what the heck.

The fact of the matter is this. Civilization, society, everything we have known is now at the crossroads. I talked about that in terms of gun control, and I'm very glad to see I received the ridicule of the Liberal Party tonight. That made me very proud. I know I'm on the right track.

Mr. Breithaupt: It is fame enough for some people.

Mr. Drea: I'm very glad to see that in economic areas I received the ridicule of the NDP. That makes me feel I'm on the right track.

An hon. member: Me too.

Mr. Drea: I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, this government is being honest, is being forthright and is going to the people on this basis.

Mr. Stokes: When?

Mr. Breithaupt: When?

Mr. Good: They are scared to go to the people.

Mr. Drea: If that party had guts enough it would nominate somebody to run against me instead of playing Russian roulette.

Mr. Samis: Conclusion?

Mr. Drea: Don't answer; I know what I am talking about.

Mr. R. S. Smith: That's all it takes to beat the member.

Mr. Breithaupt: It's anybody's choice.

Mr. Drea: Why doesn't the member for Nipissing come out and try it?

Mr. Stokes: How was the Russian roulette?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, we've been honest. We don't have magic solutions. We don't have instant remedies. I don't think anybody does.

Mr. Lawlor: They haven't got a clue.

Mr. Drea: But I will suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, we have one thing on this side of the House.

Mr. Lawlor: They've calcified; they've lost it.

Mr. Drea: From 1943 onwards through thick and thin, through good times and bad times, through recession, through wars, through everything else—

Mr. Breithaupt: Even pestilence.

Mr. Drea: —there has been one solid thing in the Province of Ontario and that has been the Progressive Conservative Party.

Mr. Deans: It is on his shoulders.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that through the Seventies and through the Eighties there will be one solid thing people can rally round; not the riff-raff, not the rabble—

Mr. Lawlor: The member has lost his nerve.

Mr. Breithaupt: Their desire for power.

Mr. Drea: —but the Progressive Conservative Party of this province. Mr. Speaker, when we came to power in 1943 the hydro lines were broken down and everything else and we built the finest hydro-electric system in the world and we have it today. That's us. When we came the power in this province it

was because of that derelict bunch on the other side.

Mr. Breithaupt: At what cost?

Mr. Good: Who paid for it?

Mr. Drea: They couldn't even build a school. We have built the finest school system in this province—

Mr. Breithaupt: Who paid for it?

Mr. Drea: —or anywhere in this country.

Mr. Good: The people of Ontario paid for it.

Mr. Drea: We have provided more jobs for more people every year, year in, year out, in this province than the whole of the rest of Canada, and that has been done because of Conservative government since 1943. And that's us.

Mr. Deans: The civil service—most of them are in the Premier's office.

Mr. Breithaupt: The civil service.

Mr. Deans: Most in the Premier's office.

Mr. Drea: I'll tell members something else. We haven't provided the kind of jobs they write about in the newspapers—that Canadians have to be hewers of wood and drawers of water.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No way.

Mr. Drea: We have provided jobs for them which are the best jobs, the jobs which come from going to school.

Mr. Breithaupt: What did they do?

Mr. Drea: We have built the schools.

Mr. Breithaupt: Why aren't they so grateful as they should be?

Mr. Drea: I suggest to the House it would have been a monumental error to build schools to turn out the kind of graduate who couldn't do anything but labour work and we haven't. We have turned out the people who have made CANDU in this country.

Mr. Breithaupt: They rest on the seventh day. Great stuff.

Mr. Drea: They have made the nuclear reactor. We have turned out the people who make the airplanes in this country. We are turning out the people who are making the highways in this country.

Mr. Breithaupt: What about the Arrow?

Mr. Drea: I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, once again this is a product of the Progressive Conservative Party in this province.

Mr. Breithaupt: Amen.

Mr. Drea: And not the bunch of militant cowards who sit over there and wave their hands because they haven't got guts enough to stand for anything today, tomorrow or yesterday.

Mr. Breithaupt: Isn't it too bad the federal government was never involved?

Mr. Drea: Isn't it too bad what?

Mr. Breithaupt: Isn't it too bad the federal government was never involved?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There he goes apologizing for the feds again.

Mr. Drea: The only time the federal government was involved was when a fellow by the name of John G. Diefenbaker was the Prime Minister and that's when we got something in this province.

Mr. Breithaupt: If the member believes that, he would believe anything.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): What about the \$100 million the Tories were supposed to talk to him about?

Mr. Breithaupt: Or the Arrow, if the member likes aircraft.

An hon. member: Talk to Leslie Frost about it.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I hate to end on a partisan note but it is going to be a very difficult time for me when I have to vote upon the motions. There will be motions. I presume that somewhere over there in the rabble somebody can produce some kind of motion which will oppose this government on the Speech from the Throne. Mr. Speaker, it is going to be a very difficult day for me.

Mr. Breithaupt: There is nothing to oppose.

Mr. Drea: Because you see, Mr. Speaker, it is—

Mr. Breithaupt: Nothing was said.

Mr. Drea: —going to be very difficult for me to stand up when my name is called—

Mr. Samis: He said it.

Mr. Breithaupt: Tell us what is new?

Mr. Drea: I'll tell him after I get through punching a couple of them tonight it is going to be fun.

Mr. Stokes: Would he like to rephrase that?

Mr. Samis: Why should he?

Mr. Drea: No, it's going to be very difficult for me, Mr. Speaker, to stand up and vote for this government—not because of what this government stands for, not because of what this government has done, but because when I look across the floor I say to myself, "What am I voting against?" And that goes for the Liberal Party and it goes for the NDP. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. B. Newman: What do the polls say?

Mr. Breithaupt: What do the polls say?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is a hell of an act to follow.

Mr. Breithaupt: No problem there.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, it's been quite an afternoon—

An hon. member: And evening!

Mr. Givens: And it's been quite an evening. My only regret is that I told my wife and my daughter to go home, because I don't think they can possibly entertain themselves at home to the same extent that they could have been entertained here tonight.

My only concern is how one wrenches oneself back into reality and relevance after what has transpired this afternoon and this evening. To get back to the relevance and the elements of the Throne Speech—to discuss what we were really after—

Mr. Good: In the real world.

Mr. Givens: —in the real world, the world of relevance and reality; my first words are words of—

Mr. Lawlor: The member mustn't give himself airs now.

Mr. Givens: —commendation to the appointment of the Speaker. I too want to make comment as to his appointment as Speaker—the Speaker-in-chief, that is, sir—and to his affability of personality which all sides of the House can agree on. The only time that I disagree is when we have so much difficulty in being recognized during the question per-

iod. I have found it so difficult in being recognized when I want to ask you a question having to do 25 or 30 push-ups with my kind of avoirdupois, I have found that quite often I have had to—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Reminds the member of Ottawa, doesn't it?

Mr. Givens: But in this case we are in the opposition, so it should be easier, but I have found that I have neglected to ask questions and I have declined to ask questions because of the physical impossibility and the physical effort of having to make 25 or 30 push-ups from this chair, in order to avoid a kind of coronary—

Mr. Lawlor: Why don't those Liberals get together?

Mr. Givens: —a kind of coronary thrombosis which will result from making 25 or 30 push-ups.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: There has to be some benefit.

Mr. Givens: I didn't hear that interjection.

Mr. Lawlor: They should get together. We don't have any difficulty.

Mr. Givens: Well, wanting a bar on every corner, as the member for Scarborough Centre has pointed out, perhaps the member is in better physical condition than I am.

Mr. Drea: That's what he stands for?

Mr. Givens: I'm not in as good training as is—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member should try those setting up exercises while he's sitting down at the table.

Mr. Deans: Push up, push away.

Mr. Givens: —the hon. member for the Lakeshore.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Push-backs.

Mr. Givens: Mr. Speaker, unlike those who have heaped scorn and poured fire and brimstone on the Speech from the Throne, I think that the Speech from the Throne was a clever piece of work. I think it was a clever piece of work because it was designed for a specific and a particular purpose—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh really? That's usually the case.

Mr. Givens: —because I think it was designed for the purpose of preventing anybody from laying a glove on it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Pretty good.

Mr. Givens: And in this way it was a clever piece of work, because after all, there is always bound to be criticism of the Throne Speech anyway.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Did the member have that cleared with his leader's office?

Mr. Givens: And what can you criticize—I never clear anything with my leader's office.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That's obvious.

Mr. Givens: We agree in principle on a lot of things.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member doesn't believe that is true, though.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: He can't believe that.

Mr. Givens: What can you criticize when nothing is said, Mr. Speaker?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Givens: All you can criticize, Mr. Speaker, is what is left unsaid. But then I don't know anyone who has ever been shot down or who's been hanged for what they haven't said, and I've never seen anybody who has been held liable in a law suit for libel or slander for anything that they haven't said.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Remember that.

Mr. Givens: And you can't get into trouble for anything you haven't said, Mr. Speaker. The hon. minister from St. Andrew - St. Patrick and I know that very well.

Mind you, this speech has been in very marked contrast to the Throne Speech which we heard on the evening of Thursday, Feb. 13, 1975. You'll remember, Mr. Speaker, this was an evening session that stretched on to about 1:30 or 2 o'clock in the morning, when the Lieutenant Governor was dragged back from some dinner that she was at away out in Kingston or Peterborough or somewhere—

Mr. B. Newman: Chatham.

Mr. Givens: Chatham, was it? Wherever it was, somewhere in southern Ontario—and she came back here at 1:30 in the morning and she read a speech that was authored for her, that went on and on and on about the mir-

acles that have been accomplished by this Conservative government in Ontario. She went on page after page after page, a panegyric and paeans of praise for what this government has accomplished over the past six months. It was more than all the governments in all the provinces of this country have accomplished in the past six years.

But something very strange has happened since Feb. 13, because on the way to the opening of the session on March 11, a couple of Gallup polls took place.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It sure gallops all right; gallops in a fantasy.

Mr. Givens: And the author of this Throne Speech that we heard on March 11 was either replaced or he suffered a severe stroke of pen-in-the-mouth disease, because this speech was very, very reticent and very, very brief indeed compared to that speech of Feb. 13, 1975. What happened? What took place? What disturbed his articulation? What made him so short of breath all of a sudden? What cramped his writing style? What interfered with his handwriting? Something went wrong.

Mr. Deans: He had a stroke.

Mr. Givens: This brevity or lack of information in this Throne Speech is consistent with two possible conclusions which I come to in my mind. The first conclusion which I come to, Mr. Speaker, is that this government is so cocksure and so confident of itself that it is the best government of all time, as the hon. member for Scarborough Centre said, the best in the world, the best of all the provinces, the best of all the countries, the best of all the states of the union, the best of all the Americas, and the best in the world, and the people in Ontario are the luckiest in the world.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Right on.

Mr. Givens: Is there any place you would rather be? All we need is law and order. We have the best legislation on the books. If they really think so, bring down the budget on April 7 and call for an election this June. I challenge them to do so. I defy them to do so. Call the election this June.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What date does the member have?

Mr. R. S. Smith: The second Thursday.

Mr. Givens: I should be one of the last people in this Legislature to encourage them to do so, because I'm one of the worst off

in this Legislature because my riding has disappeared.

An hon. member: Same here.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: He should quit griping.

Mr. Givens: I'm not griping.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Sure he is.

Mr. Givens: I'm only stating a fact. If they're so sure of themselves then call an election in June. They say they've got the best of everything. Ask the people of Ontario to concur with that opinion, that they have brought about the best government in the world, the best government in all of Canada. Ask them to concur in that decision.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Don't forget it is the Ontario people who put us here. Don't forget that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ruston: Don't forget they will put them out. He that giveth shall take away.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for York-Forest Hill has a question.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I have heard that before. I will say it again. It has been going on for 40 years and those members are wrong.

Mr. R. S. Smith: They didn't put the member in the cabinet. If they had known that they might not have put his party in.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for York-Forest Hill has the floor.

Mr. Givens: On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, there is another conclusion one can come to about this brevity, this conciseness, this shortness of the Throne Speech, this pen-in-mouth disease: that the government is so disturbed, the government is so sensitive, so fearful, about the position that it's in, that it has retreated behind its bureaucratic bastions to lick its wounds, to reassess its strength and prepare for the future; that it has become sensitive to the daily outpouring of criticism and calumny that it's being deluged with every day—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Nuts. We have always been sensitive.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Calumny is right.

Mr. Givens: —the columns that it's getting, the editorials that it's getting, the commentaries that it's getting. The people are laugh-

ing at the government. They're smirking at it. They're criticizing it.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: How many people like the hon. member are there?

Mr. Givens: The people are carping at it. The government is worried. Why was it so short in its speech? Why wasn't it more bragging, which is more characteristic of its position? The people are angry at it and that has become the general consensus wherever I go. I don't know what you hear where you go, Mr. Speaker, but wherever I go the general consensus is that the Tories have gummed up the works in this province. That is what they are saying everywhere; every newspaper that you pick up; every comment that you read; every radio commentator that you listen to—that the Tories are gumming up the works.

That may change, as the member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) says, but that's what they are saying right now. And they are saying it day after day, week after week, and they have been saying it now for the past six to eight months. And this government is scared about that and that's why it became so reticent in the Throne Speech.

An hon. member: Right.

An hon. member: Dead on.

Mr. Givens: And right across this province—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We would rather be scared than over-confident. They can be over-confident and we can run scared.

Mr. Givens: All right, call an election in June. Right across this province there are pockets of discontent; there are people by the score who are discontented. They include the government's friends, the civil servants, teachers, doctors, denturists, realtors, farmers, travel agents, labourers, mining people, developers, investors, old people, young people—blaming the government for mismanagement and incompetence and worse. There are pockets of discontent all over the province.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I will bet even the Grits are on that list.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Givens: Put your ear to the ground, Mr. Speaker, and you will hear these pockets of discontent.

Mr. Good: Former Tories are on that list, too.

Mr. Givens: Former Tories all over the place—and this is the way they are talking.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for York-Forest Hill has the floor.

An hon. member: They pulled that one in Hamilton. That is what they did.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will continue.

An hon. member: They are being deceitful.

Mr. Givens: So I say that the reticence in the Throne Speech was deliberate. It was a result of this concern, if not fear—do they prefer that word concern?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are always concerned and the opposition is always overconfident.

Mr. Givens: It's uneasiness the Tories are feeling. We have talked about integrity and the Premier has talked about integrity. And the Premier becomes very uptight when we talk about integrity—when Fidinam is mentioned, when the Hydro building is mentioned, when Shouldice is mentioned, when methods of funding are mentioned.

The Premier told Judy LaMarsh on that CBC morning radio programme that he has become very sensitive and very concerned about the fact that there is too much name-calling in politics.

This makes him very concerned and very uneasy. He doesn't like it, and I don't like it.

The Premier finds in the wake and the backwash of Watergate in the United States that people have become very disrespectful of politicians and of politics. But at the same time he doesn't repudiate the kind of nonsense that the hon. member for St. David (Mrs. Scrivener) came out with—the Lucretia Borgia of the back bench of the Tories. She came out with this business about the dirty tricks the federal government has deliberately pulled in cutting off housing funds to the provincial government in order to make the Liberal opposition look better in the next election. The Premier didn't repudiate her remarks on that, so he can't be all that sensitive.

The Premier says that it's a question of competence as to who should govern this province. Now let's look at this concept of competence.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, was it competence to abandon the Spadina expressway and distort the entire transportation grid of Metro Toronto and leave it as a ditch with nothing else, and then receive the award as transportation man of the year? And even if he

showed competence to do that—and God knows we have argued this 100 times over—was it competent to abandon the subway and force us to wait for four long years while costs escalated before it could be resumed?

I appealed to my opponent in the election of 1971. I said: "I can understand why you have abandoned the expressway. You say the cities are for people. You don't want to have cars going downtown. Okay, but why don't you go ahead with the subway? You are ultimately going to have to put it into this ditch anyway. Why wait until costs escalate? It is going to cost you five times as much to build it now, and it isn't going to be finished until 1978."

For the good of the government, the subway could have been finished now, before the next election. Did it show competence by abandoning it in 1971, if cities are for people and we really needed public transit? Did that show competence?

Mr. R. S. Smith: It was all done to save the seat of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development.

Mr. Givens: Did it show competence not to build or plan any other subway in Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To save the people too.

Mr. Givens: And was it competence to make the Krauss-Maffei deal without going to the German government, knowing full well that the German government was supporting and subsidizing the Krauss-Maffei firm and that without the subsidization of the German government the Krauss-Maffei work on magnetic levitation would collapse? Did it show competence for this government to make a world deal in full view of the whole world and put an Act through this Legislature where we were going to have the world rights to sell it in South America, Central America, in Europe and all over the world and not go to the German government and assure itself that the German government would not pull the rug out from under the Krauss-Maffei company? Did that show ordinary common horse-sense, let alone business competence? What kind of competence did that show?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It showed that if their own government had confidence in it, it is all the more reason. The member is not logical.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Givens: That showed no competence at all on the part of this government, that showed stupidity.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) is going to have to come over here.

Mr. Givens: Does it show competence to continue with the Krauss-Maffei debacle now for another year rather than to abandon this fiasco, while at the same time insisting, as the Premier did today, that we shall develop an intermediate capacity system before anyone else in the world? What evidence is there that we are developing this intermediate capacity system that the Premier talked so much about? All we are doing is sinking good money after bad.

Is it showing competence not to subsidize the fare structure of Metro Toronto? We have just had a fare increase making the fares of Metropolitan Toronto the highest fares in Canada.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are subsidizing them.

Mr. Givens: Is this how cities are for people, that they are going to have three fares for \$1 and a 40-cent cash fare? Is this the way this government is helping to under-score and to support public transit by not supporting the fare system of Metro Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are.

Mr. Givens: Is it competent not to have a parking policy for the big cities of Ontario so that we encourage commuter parking and discourage long-term downtown parking?

What competence was shown in setting up the test track at the CNE and then restoring it to parkland at great cost and at great expense, which is being done right now at the Canadian National Exhibition?

What competence did the government show in the way it launched and operated its dial-a-bus system, which has now gone completely kaput, in Metropolitan Toronto?

I could go on and on. The fact is that four years after Spadina, what urban transportation policy does this government have, either in Toronto or Ottawa or Windsor or Hamilton, or any other major city in the Province of Ontario? And what competence went into building the Hydro building across the street without going to tender? How much extra did this cost the people of Ontario? How much money has there been made in that building across the street by the builder?

And what competence went into the imposition of regional government? People are resentful all over this province about the imposition of regional government, which even the Premier, at this late date, has agreed

to stop, with reservations—for the time being he's agreed to stop it.

An hon. member: Here comes the election.

Mr. Givens: And what competence does it show to have appointed non-elected political hacks, non-elected chairmen of these regional governments all over the Province of Ontario?

Mr. Speaker, I can't for the life of me understand on what basic principle of democracy it is necessary in these particular regional governments to have non-elected chairmen—chairmen who tax; chairmen who spend money by the hundreds of thousands of dollars and by the millions of dollars; chairmen who have responsibilities. Aldermen have to be elected, controllers have to be elected, mayors have to be elected, we all have to be elected, the Premier has to be elected. Everybody in this democratic structure has to be elected, but the people that this provincial government appoints as chairmen of the regional areas do not have to be elected. What competence does this indicate on the part of the provincial government of this Province of Ontario?

Mr. Breithaupt: They have to be defeated.

Mr. Givens: These people should have to be elected. They cannot be defeated. When we talk about competence, the government thunders across this middle aisle to us, "What would you do?" I never know whether the question is motivated by gall or frustration.

The government has the deputies, the experts, the consultants, the public relations flacks, the speech writers, the advisers—thousands of civil servants. Ask them a question and they become incoherent; suddenly a blizzard of paper breaks out from under the balcony as their assistants help them with the answer. The only time we get a coherent reply from the cabinet ministers is when their statements are prepared by their trained personnel. Give us 10 per cent of the help that they have over there and we will show them the answer to some of these problems.

When they thunder, "What would you do?" after 30 years of rule and reign, with all the expertise and assistance that they have, they have a nerve to ask us what we would do, what ministers we would appoint and who will be the cabinet material over here. So much for competence.

Another topic I would like to mention for a moment is the statement of *inter alia* and intergovernmental affairs on Toronto's 45-ft height limitation bylaw.

Mr. Stokes: Yes, what would the Liberals do?

Mr. Breithaupt: We would do better.

Mr. Givens: On the one hand, the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) says the city has a right to control growth. On the other hand, he says he upheld the Ontario Municipal Board's decision, which vehemently rejected and repudiated the city's right. Then he went on to say—and I quote:

Any system which attempts to substitute the subjective opinion of council in the place of objective criteria would be open to abuse and cannot be supported.

This decision by the minister was hailed as a landmark decision, even though what he said has been said to council a thousand times. It has been said by certain members of council; it has been said by people like me in public speeches; it has been said by lawyers; it has been said by the Municipal Board; it has been said by many people before; it has been said in newspaper editorials.

The fact is that there are several members of the Toronto city council who wanted it this way, who wanted to substitute their subjective opinion instead of objective criteria. That is why, after 18 months, they still haven't got objective criteria. They are unwilling and unable to bring these objective criteria into effect. That is why they won't have any within the next 30 days with respect to their new bylaw, and they probably will be hard put to have them permanently in effect by Sept. 30 after both temporary bylaws run out, the 45-ft height limitation and the new bylaw, which was to take its place. There are too many members of the Toronto city council who feel that way, they are anti-development in their philosophy and in their concepts.

What I want to know is, will the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs always have to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for the city of Toronto? When he was asked today about the 12 pending applications, he had nothing to say about them. He was at his mumbliest best as to what they were going to do about the 12 pending applications that came in before and after the 45-ft height limitation was rendered invalid.

I think the time perhaps has come to redistribute the powers with respect to land use and zoning, because when Metro was set up, the Province of Ontario had to determine what power should be metropolitan and what power should be local. Certain works were made Metro and certain works remained local; certain roads became Metro and certain

roads remained local; certain parts were Metro powers and certain parts were city powers. The same thing applied to the capital construction of parks, schools, assessment and so on.

In other words, with respect to large projects having to do with land use and rezoning, there are certain things that take place where the interests of the city are not paramount, where the interests of the city are not alone affected. They also involve other municipalities and even the Province of Ontario because Metro Toronto is the capital city of the Province of Ontario. Metro is affected, the province is affected. Perhaps there should be rethinking. Perhaps some of these projects are so large that their land use and zoning should become a Metro responsibility.

For instance, when you're planning something like Metro Centre, which is down on the railway properties and which affects thousands of people and affects the transportation facilities of the whole of southern Ontario, or when you discuss something like the Eaton's plan, or the Toronto-Dominion Centre, or Commerce Court, where Metro roads have to be altered, heavy services have to be altered, assessment has to be taken into consideration, transportation has to be taken into consideration and schools have to be built, Metro should not only have to be consulted but should be directly involved. Metro should have the power to decide.

It is too costly and too tortuous to allow the present local system to continue the way it is, having to be righted at the top by an appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board and then to the cabinet. It is too much of an obstacle course. Surely the cabinet has other things to do than to third guess Toronto city council. I think the time has come that these land-use matters are so prodigious and so gigantic in their size, affecting so many people other than just merely locally the people of the city of Toronto, that those people themselves cannot be the decision-making people who make the decisions with respect to these land-use and zoning matters.

Take, for instance, the Soberman transportation report that we heard so much about, which not only affects transportation in the city of Toronto and Metropolitan Toronto and the surrounding area, but affects hundreds of thousands of people in the environs of Toronto. The report keeps on talking throughout of transportation policy depending on land-use decisions. But transportation is a Metro responsibility right now and land use and zoning is a local responsibility. If transportation is

a Metro responsibility and land use is a local responsibility, how can one ever get the two things to merge? How can one ever get the two things to jibe? How can one ever get the two powers to coincide? This government will never be able to work them out under those circumstances. Indeed, Metro must be in a position to influence land-use policy beyond its borders if it is to have a viable transportation policy.

That is the trouble today with this provincial government, Mr. Speaker. It has no comprehensive urban policy; it has no comprehensive transportation policy; it has no comprehensive parking policy. It just lurches from Throne Speech to Throne Speech, from session to session.

I would like to say a few words about the policy of showing preference to Ontario students with respect to admission to government-supported schools. I'm talking about higher education—universities and professional schools—especially those which are short of facilities, such as the professional schools in this province, like medicine, dentistry and so forth.

I disagree with those who believe in a quota system because I think that a quota system can be insidious. I remember there used to be a quota system in Toronto many years ago when I was a boy, and people of certain races were excluded from certain professional schools. They couldn't get in. This was a bad thing.

There are certain people in the United States today who are advocating a quota system with respect to blacks and chicanos because they believe that's the only way the blacks and the chicanos in the United States are going to catch up with whites, who may have greater merit from the standpoint of their intelligence or their educational know-how. I don't think that that's good.

I don't believe that it is possible for landed immigrants to learn English and to be able to read and write it but not be able to communicate it to their parents. I don't believe that you can learn to read and write English to be able to answer very difficult examination questions and not to be able to communicate with your patients. I don't believe there is anything perverse about being brilliant and clever; I think it's a gift from God.

While I was in Ottawa, I saw many people there, many members of Parliament and many civil servants, who studied French for many years and couldn't learn from books or teachers how to read or write French or how to communicate in French;

they never did learn. I don't believe it is possible to learn how to read and write French and not be able to communicate with people.

I just feel that it should be possible in government-supported universities that long-time Ontario residents who support universities—and medical schools, dental schools, law schools, schools of engineering and schools of architecture—some of them all their live; they somehow should have some preference by virtue of their long-time residence. Some weighting and preference should be given to those people, not on the basis of any kind of a quota system, but some weighting on the basis of priority; not on the basis of race and not on the basis of anything of that sort, but on the basis of residence in Ontario, of being long-term taxpayers. When you take into account all the things that are weighed in the balance for admission into a course—their intelligence; how they do on oral examinations and written examinations; letters of reference; their background and every other thing—the fact of their residence, the fact of their domicile and the fact of the period that they've been in Ontario should have something to do with their admission.

For instance, when somebody is a landed immigrant and has a 90 per cent standing, and somebody has lived in Ontario for 20 years and has an 85 per cent standing, the person who has an 85 per cent standing should somehow be able to rank with the guy who has a 90 per cent standing who is just recently a landed immigrant. Somehow there should be some way of balancing this off.

I think this is an important question because I think the time has come when this matter of discrimination on the basis of marks alone is discrimination against those who are giving the tax support that enables the schools to exist. When it comes to rationing facilities that are in short supply, consideration should be given to those people who pay the taxes of the province.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Stormont.

Mr. G. Samis (Stormont): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I'd like to congratulate my colleague from York-Forest Hill for having brought the purpose of this whole assembly back to some sense of logic and reason after listening to the other member's speech, which I believe lasted an hour and 45 minutes. While it was entertaining at times, I

think it would be almost an absolute insult to the people in my particular riding considering the problems we face here today.

Mr. Speaker, I won't make my speech long, but I want to say that the people of my riding are faced with several problems, and they want action. They don't want endless diatribes and diversions on to Air Canada or anything that's federal. They want their elected representative to face up to the problems of this province and to deal with them.

In my particular riding, we are faced with very serious economic problems. Last year was a good year for us. We made a recovery. In late 1974 the recession hit the economy in Canada, and we are now feeling the pinch in Cornwall. Our largest employer, Domtar, is closing down for one week, putting 1,500 men out of work. Courtaulds, our second largest employer, has been laying people off for the past six weeks. Another one of our major industries is Sylvania; it is closing down completely in the summertime.

The people of our riding, Mr. Speaker, want action in the Speech from the Throne, not just some vapid, empty, philosophical treatise that only extends to six pages, or 12 minutes, and offers nothing for the working man, the old age pensioner, the farmer or the average person who is facing the economic problems of inflation and recession.

Whether or not a man is working in Cornwall, Mr. Speaker, he is worried about the fear of layoffs. He's worried if his industry will be next. Will his job be next? Will he be dumped? He wants the government to try to do something about it. I don't pretend it is the sole responsibility of the provincial government; obviously it isn't, but he wants this government to take its share of the responsibilities as defined within the BNA Act not to sit back and just give him a philosophical treatise on what society is all about.

It is not just the working man in Stormont; I also represent farmers in eastern Ontario and the farmer is no better off than the workers. I was rather interested in noting some statistics offered by our research department showing that the farmer in some ways is actually worse off than the industrial worker.

In the riding of Stormont, Mr. Speaker, from 1966 to 1975, the number of farmers has declined by 38.9 per cent; the number of non-resident owners has declined; the number of people in the total farm population is down from 5,883 to 2,850, a decline of 51.6 per cent; the total area of farmland, in acres, down by 23.1 per cent; the amount of improved farm land down by 25.8 per

cent; the amount of land under crops down by 29.1 per cent; the amount of improved pasture down by 21.9 per cent as well.

Mr. Speaker, the farmer is no better off in Stormont than the industrial worker who is suffering from the twin evils of inflation and recession in the form of layoffs.

I noticed the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, speaking for all of Ontario, wasn't any more optimistic and I quote from its brief presented to the cabinet:

Yet the evidence presented below indicates without question that Ontario is slowly losing its place as a pre-eminent agricultural province of this nation. This means, as well, that the population of this fastest-growing province is steadily moving toward dependency on other regions [and I emphasize "other regions"] for its food supplies.

It means, therefore, despite all efforts to date, our agricultural policy and programmes have failed to maintain Ontario's position as the most productive agricultural province in Canada. We contend that this failure is due to the policies and commitments of this government. [That's not the NDP speaking; that's the OFA.]

Past and current evidence indicates that the government of Ontario is primarily concerned about the promotion of industrial, commercial and residential development in the province; other programmes have taken second place. Certainly where farming has been in competition with industrial activities or long-range environmental imperatives have indicated redirections of growth, the dominating rule has been urban development goes unguided, unplanned, and agriculture must adjust as best it can, usually out of production.

If the OFA, which speaks for the farmers of Ontario, along with the NFU, expresses its dissatisfaction about the declining income of farmers, the same problem of inflation faced by the consumer is also hitting the farmers and they give some clear-cut examples in their brief, Mr. Speaker.

For example, the cost of ammonium nitrate from 1973 when it was \$69 a ton is now up to \$174 which is an increase of 152 per cent. Another nitrogen fertilizer, diammonium phosphate, has gone up 122 per cent. We can take other examples; baler twine, for example is up a drastic 400 per cent in two years; tractor tires up; the cost of corn. It goes on and on.

The Province of Saskatchewan has now supplanted the Province of Ontario in terms

of total farm revenue. Mr. Speaker, this province, which used to have a proud tradition of agriculture, whether in the western central part of Ontario or in eastern Ontario, is gradually going to the dogs when it comes to the farmers. It is proved by the statistics and the number of people who are leaving the farms; how few young people are going to the farms; how more and more farmers are farming on a part-time basis because they can't make ends meet.

Mr. Speaker, if you put it in the context of the people of Stormont, whether it's the farmer who is just trying to survive on the farm; the man who is working in a paper mill worried about his job; the man working in the textile mill worried about the economy; they wanted something far more substantial from the Speech from the Throne than they got last week.

Let me outline briefly, Mr. Speaker, the needs of the people of Cornwall. The primary need besides jobs right now is housing and the record of the provincial government, as outlined by the leader of the NDP last week, leaves an awful lot to be desired. The game it is playing of always blaming the feds for it just won't carry with the average working man. What we need in Cornwall, Mr. Speaker, above all, are houses and programmes geared to low- and middle-income people. The people of Stormont are not exactly wealthy. They need programmes designed to help the average man.

We badly need another senior citizens home in Cornwall, Mr. Speaker. The present one has a waiting list of 400. One is being constructed, and by the time it is completed it will be obsolete in terms of the needs of the area.

Another thing the people of Cornwall need, like the people of Ontario, is some system of rent controls. It bothers me, Mr. Speaker, when people call up and say their rents have been increased 40 or 50 per cent. They ask: "What can I do about it?" And as a legislator, you can't do anything about it, obviously, if the government says: "No rent controls; let's leave it to the market."

What bothers me even more than that, Mr. Speaker, is the poor people, the old age pensioners, the people on fixed incomes, who are getting hit hardest by these rent increases, because they have no alternative. There isn't enough public housing, and they're the ones who are trapped in the middle. The affluent upper middle class can move on to something else; but not the poor people, not the people on fixed incomes.

Another thing we need in eastern Ontario, Mr. Speaker, is far more aid to the industrial parks of the existing communities. We have the spectacle of Spencerville, an abnormal creature created by the provincial government with no input from the local people. We had the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett), who toured eastern Ontario last year, saying Spencerville didn't make sense. He said it would be extremely difficult to defend, and you'd almost have to be "off your nut" to advocate an idea like that. Then he did the flip-flop of the year up here in the Legislature, announcing it, defending it and saying it was a good idea for eastern Ontario. That's water under the bridge, Mr. Speaker, and it's gone.

All we ask in eastern Ontario, Mr. Speaker, is: Where is the aid promised for the existing industrial parks in Cornwall, Brockville, Hawkesbury, Pembroke, Belleville and Nanawake? These areas need help. The Speech from the Throne could have given some indication of where we're going. No such thing.

In terms of tourism, Mr. Speaker, we like to think that the eastern part of the province has tourist attractions that rival the rest of the province. Unfortunately, we're in a pretty stiff league when it comes to competition. We need more to attract people to the east, because many people just don't think there is enough to come and see.

What I would like to see the government do is get involved with the marina on the St. Lawrence River at Morrisburg to attract the boaters who are just down for a visit. They would be attracted to a full-size marina.

We would like to see some form of outdoor summer theatre in the vicinity of Upper Canada Village to attract people beyond just visiting the village itself. It would give them something to stay for. We would also like to see facilities of the golf course expanded.

Mr. Speaker, the seaway district snowmobile club has over 900 members, making it the largest snowmobile club in the Province of Ontario. And we would like to see the whole field of recreation in the wintertime, providing assistance for recognized snowmobile clubs beyond what they have to provide leisure and recreation facilities for these workers.

We badly need education facilities and post-secondary education facilities in Cornwall beyond what we have. During the by-election campaign the Premier promised that the freeze would be lifted, something would be done about it. We need it in 1975—not 1976 or 1977. When you're faced with unemploy-

ment, people leaving your riding, you've got to have something to keep them there.

City council of Cornwall has agreed, the University of Ottawa has agreed, St. Lawrence College has agreed and the board of regents of St. Lawrence College has agreed, it is needed. All we're saying is: Let's cut through the red tape, let's get the bureaucracy moving and let's get things started on the expansion of St. Lawrence College.

We'd like to see action to help municipal transit authorities. In Cornwall, again, public transit of the municipal sort is used primarily by the people on low incomes and fixed incomes. If they don't get help the rates obviously have to go up, and that hurts the people who can least afford it.

When it comes to the matters of layoffs, Mr. Speaker, we recognize it's not the sole jurisdiction of the province—it's federal. But all we'd like is some assurance that the government of Ontario is speaking up on behalf of the electronic industries, the textile industries and the pulp and paper industries in a constructive, positive way to the federal authorities to try to get people working in eastern Ontario as well as northern Ontario and any other parts that are faced with layoffs.

I would sincerely hope that the people on fixed incomes, when it comes to the budget, will be duly taken care of. We have inflation of 12 per cent; and then you see what they have to live on. I'm talking about the people who are not cheaters, chislers, or anything of the sort. They are people who obviously need help. Let me hope the government will recognize this at budget time.

For the farmers of eastern Ontario, as well as the farmers of any other part of the province, I would hope that the farm income protection plan would be adopted. It was advocated by the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald)—I believe it was last year—adopted by the NDP, and now adopted by the OFA. I hope the budget will incorporate some form of farm income protection plan to allow the small family farm to survive, and give some sort of attraction to the young man who is interested in agriculture but who sees no future in it and just isn't interested in taking the chance. A farm income protection plan could give him some security in view of his weak position vis-à-vis prices, market conditions and the weather. Let me also hope that on class 1 and class 2 farm land the government will take a much stronger stand on preserving it in Ontario.

Let's also hope that in 1975 the government also shows even greater flexibility on spending ceilings. Had the minister made the announcement he did one month earlier, quite

possibly we would have avoided the strike in Ottawa and the problems in Windsor and Thunder Bay. Let's hope that the minister this year is much more flexible and reasonable.

A final thing, Mr. Speaker: Quebec workers in Ontario have been a problem in the east. The minister has promised to do something about it, but we have had no sign of action, no agreement with the Quebec minister and no initiative toward the Quebec minister. Let's hope 1975 brings some sort of agreement on that.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, there are two things in the Speech from the Throne that concerned me somewhat. One was the reference to violence and law and order. It is rather fatuous for the Premier of the province to talk about violence on TV, unless he is talking about the Philadelphia Flyers or something of that sort, when it is a purely federal matter and he knows it. It is either political kite-flying or some form of red herring he is trying to launch. If he is constructive about violence on TV and if he is worried about violence on TV—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Does the member not think that is a responsible position? Tell us that.

Mr. Samis: I was just going to say it is responsible if the government makes suggestions about what it would like to see done about it. It's not within this government's jurisdiction. If the Premier is concerned about it, let him make some proposals about what he wants to do about it, but let him not use it as some political football to try to cater for votes.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It is no political football when one takes a position, and my friend knows it.

Mr. Stokes: Isn't the minister glad he asked?

Mr. Samis: The government knows it is just using it as a voting issue. We don't need another Richard Nixon-style campaign of law and order. We want constructive suggestions on what the government would do about it. When the Premier reads the Toronto Star tonight, I am sure he would agree it is an awfully complex issue when he talks about TV violence and children. Let's have something constructive if the government is going to use that as an issue.

Mr. Parrott: We are listening.

Mr. Samis: The final thing, Mr. Speaker, is on immigration. I would apply the same thing. It's a federal matter. If the government is going to try to float it as an issue,

let's have something constructive. Otherwise, don't use it. The Speech from the Throne is a purely political football to cater to certain groups.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member just told us to make representation to the federal government about the situation on unemployment in his area.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Samis: Where is the government's positive action if it is concerned about the problem?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: He is not offering any solution to the problem at all. He is playing politics; that is what he is doing.

Mr. Stokes: The member for Stormont just spent the last 17 minutes being positive.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Stormont has a speech to make.

Mr. Samis: Yes, and it will be terminated in two minutes, Mr. Speaker. Let me say as a freshman member I have serious reservations about the whole procedure of the House when it comes to the Speech from the Throne. I really wonder if two weeks or the equivalent of two weeks are necessary to debate such a speech. I really think the people of Ontario want action on the problems.

If the government has a budget, let's get on with the budget. If it has a list of bills it wants to get passed, let's get on to that; but

I really think putting two weeks on this is a waste at the taxpayers' expense. The people in my riding of Stormont, and I am sure all of Ontario, want action not words.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the member thinks the Throne speeches are bad, wait until he hears some budget speeches.

Mr. Stokes: The Provincial Secretary for Resources Development said if the member thinks the Throne Speech is bad, wait until he sees the budget.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is not what I said. I said the Throne speeches and budget speeches.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Do we have someone who wishes to adjourn the debate?

Mr. Breithaupt moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the House, as I indicated last week, tomorrow we will deal with three second readings; items 6, 5, 4, probably in that order. Then we will continue with the debate that is currently before us.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, March 24, 1975

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Drea, Mr. Givens, Mr. Samis	371
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Breithaupt, agreed to	402
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	402



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, March 25, 1975

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 25, 1975

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. N. G. Leluk (Humber): Mr. Speaker, I have pleasure in introducing to the House a group of grade 7 and 8 pupils from Parklawn Public School in Humber riding who are sitting in the east gallery. These girls are members of the 146th Girl Guide Company and are accompanied by Mrs. Friesen.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, last evening during the remarks by the member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea)—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Was he speaking last night?

Mr. Breithaupt: —I noted at page 344-2 in the report of Hansard some comments which perhaps were not heard by certain members at the time they were made due to some confusion and noise within the chamber. At that point, the hon. member said, "There are those in the opposition benches who were with Communist organizations which I had to take on." And then he went on with other remarks.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the remarks made cast a rather slanderous comment on those of us in the opposition, and I would ask that you, as a guardian of our honour in this particular circumstance, would require the member either to state exactly whom he meant or to withdraw his remarks.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Very good.

Mr. Speaker: I will take that under advisement.

Mr. Bullbrook: And I represent—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): You will take that under advisement?

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): The Speaker is not a cabinet minister yet.

Mr. Speaker: I see the hon. member referred to is not in the House so there cannot be anything done at the moment.

Mr. Deans: He is in the House. On a point of order, the hon. member referred to is in the House. He is standing there.

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): He is not in his seat.

Mr. Deans: It might be useful if he could take his seat and we could deal with it now.

Mr. Speaker: I'm not familiar with the statement. Perhaps the hon. member may wish to make a remark. We'll give him that opportunity.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Let the member for Scarborough Centre go ahead and say something.

Mr. Bullbrook: Go ahead.

Mr. Speaker: Did the hon. member for Scarborough Centre hear the hon. member for Kitchener?

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): No, I did not.

Mr. Speaker: Would you care to repeat your point of personal privilege?

Mr. Breithaupt: I have forwarded to you the draft page of Hansard, and perhaps if you might return it to me I would again read into the record the comments which could not perhaps be heard due to certain noise at the time, and therefore could not be referred to at that point for the benefit of the Speaker at the time.

The comments reported on page 344-2 of the draft Hansard for last evening, 8:45 to 8:50 p.m., are reported as follows. They are remarks of the member for Scarborough Centre:

Mr. Speaker, there are those in the opposition benches who were with Communist organizations which I had to take on but— And then there were other interjections. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that as the guardian of our privileges you require the member to either name the persons to whom he was referring, or that you require him to withdraw these comments which are offensive to many of us in the opposition benches.

Mr. Bullbrook: We know who he referred to.

Mr. Drea: Well Mr. Speaker, I would say the little remark that was given there by the member for Sarnia was really uncalled for.

Mr. Bullbrook: I want to withdraw that remark.

Mr. Speaker: I didn't even hear it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, at that particular time—and I suppose I could take a great deal of time this afternoon and I would justify exactly what I had in my mind last night.

Mr. Deans: Please do. I think that is what is being asked of the member.

Mr. Drea: Well, I certainly made it very plain to the member—

An hon. member: Thanks very much.

Mr. Drea: —that it didn't refer to him.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Who? The member for York Centre (Mr. Deacon)?

Mr. Drea: No, I am talking to the Liberal's deputy leader, my friend.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The member for York Centre is not a Communist.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Drea: The member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy) wasn't even here last night. It would have been awfully nice if he had been here, but he wasn't here last night.

Mr. Bullbrook: If it is not the member for York Centre, who is it?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It wasn't the member for Kent (Mr. Spence) was it?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Will the hon. member, if he has some remarks to make, please make them so we can get on with the business of the House?

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, there was a great deal of provocation last night. It was between another member of the House and myself. In the past, he and I have dealt with various organizations. Because of the provocation, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I talked a little bit too strongly. It is only in regards to one other member of the House.

Some hon. members: Who? Who?

Mr. Drea: Well, Mr. Speaker, they ask who. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I lost my temper last night.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): He was going to be so calm.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, there are very few times on which I lose my temper.

Mr. Roy: And I wasn't even here.

Mr. Lawlor: When did he keep it?

Mr. Drea: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that brings about the kind of remark and the kind of chuckle we could expect. I am trying to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that there was some provocation. That is no excuse on my behalf.

Mr. Speaker, the particular remarks the deputy leader of the Liberal Party has brought to my attention, I will very graciously and very apologetically withdraw.

Mr. P. Taylor (Carleton East): The hon. member has just said in the course of his remarks that he was only referring to one member, if I heard him correctly. Should we not have this member either—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member has withdrawn the remarks he made last night.

Statements by the ministry.

ALGONQUIN COLLEGE

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) was asking a question about Algonquin College, and I have a statement to make today in connection with that.

On Jan. 2, 1975, the chairman of the board of governors of Algonquin College and I agreed on the arrangements to be made to assess the situation at the college. We agreed that this report on the college would be presented jointly to us. The assessment of Algonquin was carried out in January and February by an independent study team.

Mr. Roy: I can't hear the minister.

Hon. Mr. Auld: At the beginning of March, I arranged with Mr. Thayer, chairman of the board of governors, to meet with him and the board on March 12 for a presentation of the study team's findings.

On March 12 I went to Ottawa for that presentation. The board seemed quite receptive to the report, and at the end of the presentation we wrote a joint press release which indicated:

There is no real deficit at Algonquin College when the capital replacement fund is taken into account;

The large capital replacement fund held in reserve out of operating funds is unduly large; and the Ministry of Colleges and Universities will undertake to provide clearer guidelines on this matter for the future;

There should be a plan to stabilize programmes, students and faculty so that the college can make operational adjustments, which may include a minor reduction in personnel for 1975-1976;

There is immediate need for improvement in internal financial management and reporting, together with other measures to assure a balanced approach in the administration of the colleges; and

The board of governors must emphasize its role as the college's policy-making body.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): We can't hear, Mr. Speaker. There is too much noise.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I also stated there would be no additional funds above those already announced for the colleges for the 1975-1976 fiscal year.

The board and I agreed that our first task was to digest the report thoroughly—I might mention that it is about 115 pages—and then decide on a plan of action.

Mr. Thayer, chairman of the board, called me the next morning and told me the board had agreed to meet during the first week of April—during the first weekend in April, I believe—to decide on a plan of action to deal with this and some other matters, and that he would not want the report released until after this meeting.

He told me he would be in touch with me shortly after the meeting, and at present I am waiting to hear from him; I expect that will be during the week after next.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Housing.

HOUSING PROGRAMMES

Hon. D. R. Irvine (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, the recent Throne Speech indicated this government's commitment to encouraging adequate, affordable housing for

all Ontario residents. Further to that, I am pleased today to announce two major new initiatives under the Ontario Housing Action Programme.

The provincial government has approved an \$8.8-million loan to the regional municipality of Halton to expand the city of Burlington Skyway pollution control centre. This expansion, at a total cost of \$17.5 million, will more than double the centre's present sewage treatment capacity. This will allow construction of at least 11,360 new housing units over the next five years.

Mr. Speaker, this pace of development has already been approved by resolutions of the regional and area municipal councils. Burlington is also prepared to enter into an agreement with my ministry which will further define the nature and location of these new units.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce a \$1.31 million OHAP loan to the regional municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth. This loan will pay part of the cost of storm and sanitary sewers for new development in Stoney Creek.

The new sewers will allow construction of 1,385 units in the second stage of the Albion Estates development. These units are covered by OHAP agreements with Carma Developers Ontario Ltd., the town of Stoney Creek and my ministry. In stage two, 45 per cent of the units will be for families earning less than \$20,000 per year.

Mr. Deans: What does that mean?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: It will also service a portion of the Saltfleet town centre and commercial development, and a possible 500-unit highrise apartment. In addition, it will provide for servicing a potential 1,735 units in the area.

The terms of repayment follow the OHAP formula, which is that the loan is interest free and repayment of the principal is in 15 annual instalments, beginning three years from the date the loan is received. These terms ensure the new facility will not be a burden to existing taxpayers in the area.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to express my appreciation to the regional municipalities of Halton and Hamilton-Wentworth, and to the area municipalities of Burlington and Stoney Creek, for their very willing responsiveness to the housing needs of the people of Ontario. I look forward to continuing my consultations with them in the future. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Labour.

ASBESTOS PROBLEM

Hon. J. P. MacBeth (Minister of Labour): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am advised by the hon. Michael Starr, chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board, that the review of the board's policy concerning lung cancer in asbestos workers, which was discussed at the recent meeting of the standing committee on resources development, is almost complete.

Several eminent specialists, including Prof. A. C. Ritchie, professor of pathology at the University of Toronto; Prof. R. W. Morgan, chairman of the faculty of preventive medicine at the University of Toronto, and others, have been researching this complex subject, including the research studies by others such as Dr. Selikoff of Mount Sinai Hospital in New York City.

While all of the reports are not yet complete, it would appear that based on extrapolative data arising out of the recent research, the balance of probabilities has shifted. Lung cancer in the presence of asbestos particles, but in the absence of asbestosis, may now be considered as occupational in origin within the revised exposures and other criteria. The revised criteria are currently being developed and a number of claims previously disallowed will be reopened by the board for review as quickly as possible.

Mr. Deans: What does that mean?

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): How come the Tories didn't applaud that one?

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

The Leader of the Opposition.

BURLINGTON BAY SEWAGE TREATMENT FACILITY

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Housing further to his statement. He referred specifically to the Skyway sewage treatment facility. Is the minister aware that for 90 days last year that sewage treatment facility was dumping raw sewage into the bay? Can the minister indicate how long it will be, let's say, seriously under the requirements, since there has now been a commitment to spend some additional money on it? Will it be five years during which time it will still be, let's say, inadequate for the requirements as they presently are, without having to cope with the additional housing that has been announced today?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Leader of the Opposition, I think this question should go to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. W. Newman). But I would reply that as far as I am concerned, what we are doing in the Ministry of Housing is to provide funding so the sewage capacity can be expanded and look after the problems in that particular area. We recognize that if we have to have more housing we have to have adequate funding, which the municipalities did not have.

I am not in a position to say to the member that there cannot be any housing added at the present time. I would like to refer to my colleague, the Minister of the Environment for that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to direct the question to the Minister of the Environment having to do with the Skyway pollution control centre, since, as I have said, it is already allowing inadequately treated sewage, if not raw sewage, to be spilled into the harbour there. What is the timetable, since the minister in his statement is indicating there will be an expansion of the housing being served by that facility?

Hon. W. Newman (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, going by memory I believe there was some modification made to the plant. The member will find the overflow is now taken care of and the plant is going to be expanded. I am not sure whether tenders have been called or are going to be called, but it is not very far away. There were some modifications made to clear up the situation that the member was talking about and I don't think he will find there is any average in 1975.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary question: Since the information available to me was reported in the Hamilton Spectator of Feb. 25, 1975, and it indicates the treatment plant is so overburdened that millions of gallons of sewage entered Burlington Bay on more than 90 days last year, that would indicate the problem was certainly in existence a few weeks ago.

Hon. W. Newman: What I just finished saying was there were some modifications made to the plant, which were completed late in the year, to pick up this problem that was in existence. The plant is to be expanded to cope with the present growth and the future growth of the area.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If you will permit a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, would the minister give us a further report on that, since there seems to be some doubt as to whether in 1975 "millions of gallons of sewage were

dumped into the bay," and it seems strange to predicate another housing announcement of the type we have just had on a facility that is already overburdened?

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

HOUSING ACTION PROGRAMME POLICY

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to put a further question to the minister. Is the minister going to adjust his policy so that announcements based on OHAP can be made regarding other areas of the province that do not come under regional government facilities? Is the minister satisfied that his other initiatives, so called, make up for the fact that the areas without regional government apparently are outside the purview of OHAP, which has been the basis, if not the building of houses, of recent press releases and announcement by the ministry?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I'm not entirely satisfied that OHAP as it presently exists will be the programme for the future. I've had requests from other area municipalities which are not within regional government jurisdiction and I don't believe that is the guideline. What we have endeavoured to do through OHAP is to provide housing in areas of low vacancy rates or housing where we deem it very necessary for home ownership. Now we'll have the limited dividend and home ownership, not necessarily related to regional governments but related to the areas where we have a need for housing. For instance, in Sarnia, which I visited last week with my colleague the member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson), we discussed the feasibility of that area being designated as an OHAP area. We have other areas which may need to be designated and I will certainly look into it.

Mr. Bullbrook: Did the minister enjoy his trip to Sarnia?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I did, sir.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would also like to ask the same minister to explain why—

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Cochrane South has a supplementary.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Yes. I wonder if the minister is proposing to designate the Timmins area as one of those areas where a great housing need exists, in view of the announcement by Texasgulf of its major expansion programme? Is he intending to designate Timmins or will he take a close look at the acute need that now has arisen in that community?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to assure the hon. member I will look at the requirements of that municipality. I have not, to my knowledge, received a definite request for housing, whether it relates to OHAP, or HOME, AHOP or whatever it may be. Certainly if the member will relate to his own municipality and have them send me a request we'll look into it, I can assure him, at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On a related matter, how can the Minister of Housing justify the present policy which applies these strictures on those areas which are not regionalized having to do with housing and the availability of land under the control of Ontario Housing Corp.? Wouldn't the minister agree that in the minds, at least of those people who pay taxes in areas not regionalized this amounts to the grossest kind of blackmail which is intended by the minister to force them into accepting the additional expenses and inconvenience of regional government?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Leader of the Opposition has failed to recognize there are other programmes which the Ontario government implements in rural municipalities or in areas which are not under any form of regional government whatsoever. We have the Ontario Home Renewal programme. I'll be making a statement in the House tomorrow, I expect, which will show him very fully that many municipalities have taken advantage of this particular programme. Approximately \$10 million worth of housing stock is being preserved. We also have our HOME programme which relates to home ownership and to rent geared to income so there is more than one programme. There are several programmes which would relate to areas not under regional government jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary on the minister's answer: Since OHAP, which at the present time is the spearhead of the initiative of the housing ministry does not apply to areas that are not regionalized, surely the minister must see that this is seen to be unfair by those citizens who don't even have an opportunity to negotiate on that basis? Is he not also aware that in the case of the 1,000 acres owned by Ontario Housing to the west of Brantford, the reason given for not developing those lands is that Brantford

and Brant county have not seen fit to move toward a regional government? I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that amounts to political blackmail.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, the case is not as the hon. Leader of the Opposition has said. We have not indicated to the Ontario Housing Corp. through the Ministry of Housing that we haven't developed the 1,000 acres in the Brantford area—or the Leader of the Opposition's particular area—because it doesn't belong to regional government. That is absolutely false.

Mr. Roy: The minister should be familiar with dirty tricks.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why hasn't the minister developed it then?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: We have asked the municipalities involved at least to develop a housing policy which we are willing to fund and we will fund. We have put money into his area.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is not my area.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: It is a little bit of the Leader of the Opposition's area, if I remember correctly. It may not be in the future, but right now it's some of his area.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No, as a matter of fact—on a point of order—the minister is exactly wrong. It is not mine but it will be mine in the future.

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): The Leader of the Opposition is exactly wrong.

TAY TOWNSHIP DEVELOPMENT FREEZE

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask the Minister of Housing to explain his action in putting a freeze on development in Tay township, since that very township has entered into a very expensive review of its planning procedures. On a basis of what was approved by the Ministry of Housing or his planning officials, who have allegiance to other ministers from time to time, they have followed their instructions, and still the minister moves in and without any consultation freezes the township. What is going on here?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, again in reply to the Leader of the Opposition, this

is a matter that was given very careful consideration by my ministry and by myself. The freeze was requested by the planning board in that area because they were not in agreement with some of the severances that have been processed in the last few months, especially in Tay township. What I have said to the member for the area and to the people that are directly involved is that we will lift the freeze as soon as we have proper planning controls; and I'm quite willing to do that immediately.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: The implication then is that the bylaws in Tay township are unacceptable to the centralized planners who advise the Minister of Housing, and he therefore froze it. Is that right? They have bylaws and they've spent money on planning, but because the minister doesn't like it, he has frozen the township, right?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: No, Mr. Speaker, that is not right. I'm sorry if I gave that inference. The request came from the local people.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is the planning board.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: From the local planning board which has the responsibility for planning in that area.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The elected council are also local people.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I think it is incumbent upon my ministry and upon myself to ensure we have planning principles established throughout all of Ontario. As long as I'm the Minister of Housing, I'm going to do that. When I put a freeze on, it's on the condition the local municipality ensures it plans the same as we do throughout all Ontario. When they've done that, I'll lift the freeze.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Since the minister is so concerned with doing what the local people want, is he aware that the elected council, representing the local people in the township of Tay, has passed a resolution condemning the actions of the Ministry of Housing in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am well aware the council passed the resolution. But I say to all the hon. members here that I think it is about time the local people in any municipality decide on their priorities, whether they want to have good planning or whether they want to have development haphazardly.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

GO-URBAN SYSTEM

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I'd like to ask the Minister of Transportation and Communications if he would get us a report on the commitment the province still has in financing the research and development of the magnetic levitation train, that we really haven't heard about in this House for some months.

Mr. Roy: A good question.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Does the minister recall assuring the House that there would be a three-month review of our commitment and a report given to the House? Is he aware that his colleague, the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett) and also his employee, the president, I guess, of the Urban Transit Development Corp., have both stated they continue to have confidence in the programme and that it continues to be under research and development?

Hon. J. R. Rhodes (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I certainly recall the commitment I've made and I intend to honour that commitment. I will have a full report to make to the House very shortly, and I'll let members have all of the details.

Mr. Roy: Which day is the minister scheduled for that goodie?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, perhaps you will permit me to reply to another portion of the question asked yesterday concerning two sums of money, the \$3.4 million the hon. member asked about concerning the Canada Systems Group and also an amount of money owed to Spar Aerospace of \$100,000. I'd like to advise the House that I've been informed by the chairman of the board of the Krauss-Maffei company that the outstanding claims have been settled with the sub-contractors and no amounts remain outstanding at this time. I will repeat again that I certainly will have that report very shortly with all of the detail necessary.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Have we paid the bill for cutting down the trees at the Exhibition? Weren't there \$1 million worth of trees cut down?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I'm afraid that I can't accept the figure of \$1 million. It seems to me we did have a figure in the vicinity of \$52,000.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's close.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The Leader of the Opposition's math is off again.

Mr. Roy: Is the minister going to claim that from Krauss-Maffei?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We are discussing the matter with Krauss-Maffei with a view to getting that money back, but we do intend to see that the CNE is reimbursed for that \$52,000.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Besides the trees, of course, there is the concrete embedded in the ground there. Surely it is the responsibility of the ministry, or Krauss-Maffei under the direction of the ministry, to put that back the way it was. If he can put it back the way it was for less than \$1 million maybe he is a miracle worker—

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —maybe he can even make the trains go.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I trust the hon. member has had an opportunity, in his thoroughness, to read the agreement that was drawn up between ourselves and Krauss-Maffei at the termination.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They were supposed to pay for it.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: And if he will recall, one of the conditions was that at the expense of Krauss-Maffei the CNE site would be restored to a safe and usable condition. It does include the removal of those very items he was talking about. The only area where we have any arrangements still to be made is regarding the trees.

Mr. Roy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary.

Mr. Roy: Would the minister confirm or deny a report that appeared some time ago that in fact the ministry's people in Germany now are putting wheels on the Krauss-Maffei vehicles? Is that a fact or not? And if it is, isn't the minister adopting a policy of staying with wheeled rapid transit?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Once again, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is probably six to eight months late with his question, because that very statement was made by myself some time back.

Mr. Roy: When did the minister say they were going to put wheels on?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I said it was the intention of the OTDC, in continuing with the experimentation, to look at other methods of suspension. For the hon. member's information, maglev is nothing more than a suspension system; and if we can make the system work without maglev and by using a wheeled vehicle for suspension purposes, not for drive, then of course we will certainly look at it.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Leader of the Opposition have any further questions?

The hon. member for Wentworth.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Has the member for Ottawa East heard about the wheel?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Why it is I always have to compete with the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development?

I have a question of the Minister of Housing.

Mr. Roy: Stick with the wheel.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The member for Ottawa East should quit reading his own press releases and read someone else's.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I have difficulty hearing the member for Wentworth.

HOUSING PROGRAMMES

Mr. Deans: Thank you. I have a question of the Minister of Housing. Given that the home ownership programme now underway in the Hamilton area doesn't provide homes for anyone earning less than \$11,400 a year, given that the majority of people—60 per cent, I would think, or more; I haven't got the exact figure—earn less than that, and given that this new statement provides only 623 units of the 1,385 for people earning less than \$20,000 a year, when is the minister going to bring in a programme that will provide housing for people who are working in the plants and in the offices and earning average wages in the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should know that we have that programme right now. We've had it for some while.

Mr. Deans: Where is it?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I think it is time the hon. member and the municipalities understand that we must have their acceptance of family rent-g geared-to-income housing, and that if we don't integrate housing in Hamilton, Toronto or any other place in Ontario, then we have a problem in terms of rental accommodation.

Now we are coming out with a limited dividend, as I announced last week, of \$42 million for rental accommodation, with rents to be stabilized over 15 years. We can't do the impossible. We've got to have the co-operation of the members, the municipalities and the people in the municipalities to accept those who make less than \$11,000; and that community acceptance has not been forthcoming as readily as I would like to see it.

Mr. Deans: Acceptance? That's balderdash. Let me ask the minister about the Hamilton project. Can the minister explain reasonably to the House how it can be that the minimum income requirement to get into the HOME programme could have risen from approximately \$8,500 in November to \$11,400 in March to get into the same HOME programme? The houses cost less, the taxes are lower and yet the cost on the land is almost twice as much, and in some cases more than twice as much. Is that the result of government bungling in land purchasing?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Well, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Just say no.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: The income requirements—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Is the member all through?

Mr. Deans: I'm just talking to the minister's colleague.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Okay. The income requirements are related to the land value, the servicing costs, mortgage interest rates, house costs and whether or not one can keep those stable. I would say it is not very often that it will happen in any one particular area. They have increased in the area the member is talking about, certainly; they are bound to.

Mr. Deans: By \$3 million in five months?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Well, they will increase depending on the four factors I mentioned.

The member should understand that; he's been in the housing game long enough.

Mr. Deans: Well, let me ask the minister another question with regard to his programmes in geared-to-income accommodations. How is it that the minister is prepared to establish criteria in the geared-to-income programmes that were announced on March 20—where they were building 200 units in the Hamilton area and a number of other units across the province—how is it that his ministry can establish criteria for the establishment of a fair rent and also a fair rate of return, and then it can't do likewise in the private sector, which is gouging the public day after day with rental increases that are unjustified and unwarranted?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, that is a judgment the NDP have made time and time again. There is absolutely no way that anyone can prove, in the majority of cases, that the private sector is gouging in regard to the amount of rent increases.

Mr. Deans: Has the government ever conducted a study or named a board to investigate this?

An hon. member: Yes.

Mr. Foulds: When? Name one.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: The member has a very short memory, apparently. He is not able to understand that there have been very sizeable wage increases during the time there have been zero or minimum rent increases. Anywhere rent increases are controlled by government, as in British Columbia and the United States, it's failed. Our government is saying today and will say tomorrow that supply is the answer to having rental accommodation at affordable prices.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): A supplementary: Does the Minister of Housing or his ministry have any studies which tell this government how the million or so families in the province earning less than \$12,000 per annum are managing to survive in the housing market; and what kind of economies they are having to make in food and clothing and necessities like that in order to meet the cost of their shelter?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker I don't believe I can have a study of that kind prepared overnight. I would think it might be incumbent upon the federal government to prepare a study, as a matter of fact to prove to the people of Canada that their inflationary

budgets have had a very detrimental affect in regard to housing for our people.

Now, we have a study underway in relation to condominium conversion to rentals, and vice versa. We have a study going on, but it won't be completed for some while. All I'm saying to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, is that we have many people who earn less than \$11,000 throughout Ontario. They'll have housing if the Ontario government carries on as it is. We intend to have housing for all of the people.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member have further questions? We're having too many supplementaries. If any other members want to ask original questions, they may.

ASBESTOS PROBLEM

Mr. Deans: A question of the Minister of Labour with regard to his statement on the payment for asbestos disease as a result of encountering an occupational hazard. Can he explain when this process will begin? Can he tell what process will be used by the Workmen's Compensation Board to reach all of the people who, by his own terms, have "had exposure to asbestos fibres"? The next part of the question is this: Has this ministry or the Ministry of Health, or jointly, conducted a study into the effects of asbestos on the families of the workers? And is the minister aware of the study conducted by Dr. Anderson at Mount Sinai in which he investigated 354 cases and found that in 35 per cent of the cases the asbestos carried home by the worker has affected the family of the worker to the same degree as it had affected the workers in the plant.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker—to answer the last part first—my ministry has not been looking at the families of the workers. But I'm sure the Minister of Health (Mr. Miller) will, in due course, have some comment to make on the situation the hon. member from Wentworth has mentioned.

Now he asked earlier when this process would start, and I would hope that the examination would start in the next two or three days with the claims of which the board is aware. That would be an automatic review by the board.

I don't want to suggest there are a great many of these claims, but there are a number the board is presently aware of and it will review its files on its own. But if there are any people who think their claim should be reviewed, I would suggest they write to

the board and ask, just so that they won't be missed. But I'm not suggesting it depends on that. The board will institute this automatically.

Mr. Deans: Supplementary question: Might I ask the minister if it is his intention to make known by publication in newspapers that this process has been changed and that people who believe they may have come into contact with asbestos, will be given a fair hearing by the board and a reappraisal? And when is the government going to make an evaluation of the value of that particular product to the economy over and against the disastrous effects that it is having on the health of both workers and their families, and come to some reasonable conclusions?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, to answer the last question first again, I am not so sure that the disastrous effects of asbestos properly controlled—and I add that rider properly controlled—are any worse than the effects of many other of the noxious substances we are dealing with in modern industries; as I say, properly controlled, I'm trying to return to the first part of the question—

Mr. Deans: How is the minister going to make it known to the public at large?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: As I said earlier, sir, I don't wish to stir up a lot of hopes that there are a good number of these cases outstanding. I don't think there are very many so I would hesitate to advertise it widely and perhaps give members of the public an indication that there are a great number of them; they might get up their hopes falsely. There certainly will be, I assume, some publication of this today.

The board itself will be doing this automatically in all cases and it was suggested if people such as the member hear of cases, they should write to the board. I will take up with the board the matter of whether it deems it advisable that any kind of notice should appear in the newspapers.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: One supplementary.

Mr. Shulman: In those cases the minister accepts will the widows' pensions be dated back to the time of death or are they to begin now?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I would have to reply on present board policy for that.

If the policy should be changed, I assume I will be in on some discussion of that change. I don't know what the board's policy is in similar cases. It will be reviewed, let me say that.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? The member for Huron.

LEAD POLLUTION

Mr. J. Riddell (Huron): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of the Environment: Since reports before the Ontario Environmental Hearing Board on lead pollution thus far have clearly established lead as a health hazard and since the hearing board has had innumerable delays and adjournments, and on top of it all has had no power to act, will the minister intervene and take action to eliminate lead pollution by the smelting companies?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, when we first set up these hearings in Toronto, in consultation with the Minister of Health, we felt we would have a thorough hearing of the whole situation. The working group on lead—the Minister of Health's group—and the Ross Robertson report were both brought before the hearing, and I think it has been a very serious hearing to this point in time.

The reason for the adjournment at this point in time is the board is waiting for some medical testing that was done, waiting to get the results finalized. That was the reason for the adjournment. I understand it is going back—I am not exactly sure of the date—some time in April, as soon as these tests are completed, to wind up the hearings.

In the meantime, we have been working with the companies, and the member knows I changed the regulations on emissions after the hearings started. We are also working on control orders with one of the companies right now, so the hearings are not holding up the abatement programmes which we are moving on.

Mr. Riddell: Supplementary: Since it is a known fact that blood lead levels rise during the summer months—and we are approaching that time—and since the hearings have been filled with delays, would the minister not agree that any further delay in eliminating lead pollution will cause a health hazard to the local communities and will he take some action? Did he read the March 1st report which said 80 children die annually from

lead poisoning and 80 others have severe brain damage?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I think one has to be a little cautious in making statements like that. The member read it in some article. I don't have the article with me but he will have to ask the Minister of Health as far as the medical facts are concerned. I can assure him I have had consultation with the minister on it. I have seen the Ross Robertson report; to make broad statements like that is not the right thing to do in this House.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Cochrane South.

ONTARIO HUMANE SOCIETY GRANTS

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Acting Solicitor General: In view of the fact he supplies only \$50,000 a year to the Ontario Humane Society, is the minister aware that there is a serious lack of inspection carried out by the Humane Society on complaints about cruelty to animals and this kind of thing? Will the minister make some effort to supply more money to the Humane Society so that there can be inspectors to carry out this work in Ontario, particularly in northern Ontario where there's a lot of difficulty in having these kinds of inspections carried out at the present time?

Hon. J. T. Clement (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the responsibilities of the Humane Society. I am aware of its need for increased funding. I am meeting with the Humane Society on Thursday of this week, and I anticipate this is one of the subjects which will be discussed at that time.

Mr. Ferrier: Is the minister prepared to see that this very important work is not neglected, as is being done at the present, and that a solution will be found so that inspectors can investigate the complaints that come in without the long delays in investigating as at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that the Humane Society is not discharging its obligations. I am aware that its costs, like everyone else's, have escalated. As I said earlier, this will be one of the matters I think Mr. Hughes will be discussing with me. I don't know the full extent of the subjects for discussion on Thursday, but I imagine this will be one of them. Depending on the outcome of those discussions and the need that is demonstrated, then I would of course

be obliged to pass that on to the Management Board and my colleagues for consideration, as I would in all matters.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Carleton East.

ALGONQUIN COLLEGE

Mr. P. Taylor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the Minister of Colleges and Universities: I thank the minister for sending us a copy of his statement. Can the minister say whether or not this statement and the degree of agreement apparent in it between his ministry and the Algonquin College board means that Algonquin College will not turn away 2,400 first-year applicants next fall, and can he say whether or not the board will dismiss 140 staff members?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I think that statement is pretty clear, and it says just that. There is no question of them not accepting first-year students in the fall. I think I made that clear at the time; and it certainly is implicit in the statement that I just read and in the statement that I gave, on behalf of myself and the chairman, immediately following the presentation of that report in Ottawa a couple of weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker: One supplementary; the hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Roy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After reading the minister's statement, and in view of his statement of a while ago that he wanted to study the task force report and get together with the board of governors sometime in April, is he not precluding the merits of the study by saying that there will be no additional funds for 1975-1976 even before he has digested this task force report?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, the report was presented to the chairman, a number of members of the board, myself and two members of my staff. The report said, as I indicated in the statement, that they had no immediate financial crisis and, in fact, they had no deficit for the current year, when one took into account the very large operating surplus that they were carrying.

I don't know that I can say any more than that, other than the fact that we indicated that no students would be turned away, and that there would not be major staff cuts. I think I did indicate at the time that the president told me their normal turnover would be about 120 staff in a year, and that to meet their anticipated deficit for next year—

which they were still not sure of, in the light of the report that we had presented them—if it was the amount they had indicated of \$1.4 million, that probably meant something in the order of about 50 staff, which, if their current figures were correct, could be met by attrition.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary; the hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Would the minister not agree that his statement to the House was both unsatisfactory and misleading, because it did not deal with the problems of the 1975-1976 deficit? And can he say what, if any, solution he suggested to the board of Algonquin about how it could solve that 1975-1976 deficit?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The answer to the first question is no. The answer to the second question is implicit in the statement that I will be meeting or hearing from them after they have had an opportunity to thoroughly study the report and discuss it with their staff.

Mr. Cassidy: Then the minister shouldn't pretend the problem is solved, and that's what he did.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

THUNDER BAY GOVERNMENT COMPLEX

Mr. Foulds: A question of the Minister of Government Services, if I might: In view of the fact that the new government complex in Thunder Bay, often referred to as a mini-Queen's Park and soon to be known as "Jessiman's Folly," is inaccessible to pedestrians and remote by bus transportation or any kind of public transportation, why is it that his ministry put in only enough parking spaces for one-third of the staff who are using the building, let alone the public generally? And what is the minister going to do to upgrade the parking and the accessibility of the building?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, I don't accept the figures from the hon. member. Of course, I don't normally accept the figures that he might come up with. We do realize there is a shortage of parking, mainly caused by the vehicles of the Ministry of Natural Resources and we are in the process now of making arrangements for a separate parking compound for those vehicles.

We are also in the process, Mr. Speaker, of enlarging the parking lot as soon as weather

permits. We have additional land there and the parking lot can be enlarged. Then there will also be additional parking provided on the site when the Ministry of the Environment laboratory is constructed.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that the minister didn't accept my figures, why all this expansion; and when will it be completed?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I will not accept the very erroneous figure that the member has suggested, that only one-third enough parking is provided, that is not correct.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Huron-Bruce.

RASPBERRY APPEAL CASE

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Why did the Ontario government appeal the award of Mr. O. J. Hartman in the raspberry case to the Ontario Court of Appeal, particularly when the government has lost the case twice previously?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Well, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that it is wise to take—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister is feeling very relaxed these days.

Mr. Bullbrook: He must have got his exemption.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —the appropriate opportunities that the law provides, and that is what we are doing.

Mr. Gaunt: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Why is the Ontario government refusing to supply Mr. Hartman elite stock for foundation production since the demand for certified raspberry plants exceeds the supply?

Further, if I recall correctly, Judge Winter in his assessment of damages referred to the government's refusal to supply the Hartmans with plants in 1973 as "high-handed and vindictive."

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Where have we heard that before?

Mr. Gaunt: Since there is no explanation, why is the Ontario government trying to destroy Mr. Hartman?

Mr. Roy: That's very close to a dirty trick.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Nobody is trying to destroy Mr. Hartman. Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friends over there— and they are not going to like this—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —would persuade their federal colleagues to pay half the shot, as they should but refuse to do, then we would go ahead and do it. But as long as the fellows over there, who are the perfect apologists for their friends in Ottawa, leave us to carry the whole cost for their programme, we are not going to do it unless we have to.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Yorkview.

OHC BRIBERY CHARGES

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, a question—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The time is flitting fast away. There are several more questions that have to be asked here.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Tempus fugit, fellows.

Mr. Young: I have a question of the Attorney General. In view of the fact that one Frank Jones, former employee of Ontario Housing Corp., pleaded guilty to accepting a bribe from Pacific Paving, Mr. Jones being among several OHC employees who have been charged with accepting benefits, could the Attorney General tell us what action is being taken in respect to Pacific Paving of Markham, named as the ones who have paid the bribe to Mr. Jones?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, no, I can't tell the member. The usual procedure would be to charge the person that offers the bribe.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No, that's not the usual procedure.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Oh yes, it is. Will the Leader of the Opposition tell us about bribes then.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Go ahead. The minister hasn't done it before.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Clement: I will get back to the hon. member with that and detail whether, in

fact, that industry or corporation has been charged. That is the usual practice followed by the Crown attorney in that particular category.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Could the minister explain why, in all of these cases involving OHC employees, we have yet to see one company being charged? This question has been asked about five times in the House and we're still awaiting a report. Why is it that none of the companies has been charged under the Criminal Code with giving a bribe which is an offence?

Hon. Mr. Clement: I am not aware that no companies have been charged. I wouldn't be prepared to admit to that until I ascertained it from the officers involved.

Mr. Roy: We are supposed to get a report every month.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of the Environment has the answer to a question asked previously.

CATALYTIC CONVERTERS

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the member for Essex-Kent (Mr. Ruston) asked me about hot catalytic mufflers and the damage they were doing in causing grass fires. There was some problem. However, most of them now located on cars which create problems have a heat shield both above and below the catalytic converter. In some cases they are completely insulated to eliminate this problem.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa East.

PRELIMINARY COURT HEARINGS

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Attorney General. Could the Attorney General explain whether he's made any representation to his federal counterpart, Mr. Lang—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Minister of Justice.

Mr. Roy: Yes, the federal Minister of Justice—to make amendments to the Criminal Code to stop the abuse in relation to preliminary hearings, which in fact has affected the former Solicitor General (Mr. Kerr) and the federal Minister of Labour in relation to

the Hamilton Harbour case? Has he made any representation about changing the Code?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago, as the hon. member probably knows, together with the other provincial Attorneys General I met for 2½ days with the federal Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada. At that time we discussed a series of subjects and the minister advised us that he would be introducing several amendments to the federal Criminal Code. He anticipated the introduction would possibly be in late April or early May of this year. For obvious reasons he was not at liberty to detail those changes because he hadn't put them before his caucus yet, but he assured us that as soon as they were introduced he would send a dozen or so copies to us.

To the best of my recollection there were no discussions that I am aware of dealing with preliminary hearings per se. There were discussions dealing with a range of other subjects. I don't recall any discussions dealing with preliminary hearings. I can't say that I'm anticipating no change in that area because I don't know the nature of his proposed amendments, but I don't recollect having discussed anything pertaining to those with him.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Roy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Provided it's short.

Mr. Roy: Yes, just one quick supplementary: Does the minister not agree there's been an abuse and that possibly preliminary hearings should be, in fact, in camera? This would stop speculation and people reciting evidence that has gone on in the preliminary hearings.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Yes, it probably would and one tends to be sympathetic perhaps to individuals who find themselves affected in a very adverse way because of the type of situation and the speculation. However, I think on balance that the court process—whether it be a trial or a preliminary hearing—except in the most unusual circumstances, should be open to the public.

Mr. Roy: Right.

Hon. Mr. Clement: There's no way the court could anticipate what evidence might be put forward in a preliminary hearing, and

accordingly the court could not really rule on whether it would be an in camera hearing until that kind of allegation was made—

Mr. Roy: Would the minister ask for it?

Hon. Mr. Clement:—at which time the court has the right—and exercises it usually at the request of the defence—not to allow the media to publish details. I don't think one should get into the Star Chamber type of court activity and hold these matters in camera. I think, on balance, I would have to say no; I can't share the member's point of view.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Nickel Belt.

INFILTRATION ALLEGATION

Mr. Laughren: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Attorney General. In view of correspondence directed to him by the Development Education Centre in Toronto, has he yet determined whether one Hugh Brian Gallagher, a former RCMP officer, has infiltrated organizations under what may be false pretences and whether he is presently operating a private investigator's business without a licence?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, I haven't heard the name of the individual mentioned by the member until this moment. I have no knowledge of it, but I will look into it.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions.
The hon. member for Welland South.

NON-RETURNABLE CONTAINERS

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of the Environment. Since the recent announcement by the minister directing the soft drink companies to provide new containers, removing the non-returnable containers from the market, what steps, if any, is the minister going to take to remove the waste from non-returnable containers now being used by one of its own government agencies, the LCBO?

Hon. W. Newman: I didn't quite catch the last part. Is the member talking about the LCBO?

Mr. Haggerty: Yes.

Hon. W. Newman: Okay, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that question was asked, because we had our inaugural meeting this morning with the

solid waste advisory board. I had occasion to go down and address these ladies and gentlemen from around the province at the inaugural meeting this morning. I took the opportunity at that time to outline to them some of the high priority programmes we want them to have a look at. One of the high priority items that I've asked them to look at is the wine and spirits business.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

ANTIBIOTICS IN ANIMAL FEED

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food concerning the use in animal feeds of antibiotics that cause transfer of drug resistance in harmful bacteria: What is the present status of the use of antibiotics in animal feeds in Ontario and in Canada?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: What is the state of it?

Mr. Burr: Yes, what is the status. Are antibiotics still being used in animal feed?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, but under the supervision and control of the food and drug officials at Ottawa. That's a federal jurisdiction, and they have actual control of the whole thing. As far as I know there is no problem. I've never heard of any.

Mr. Burr: Supplementary: Could the minister tell us whether the 1969 restrictions in Great Britain on antibiotics in animal feeds are still in force?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: In Great Britain?

Mr. Burr: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I couldn't answer that.

Mr. Speaker: The question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. Morrow from the standing procedural affairs committee presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee has carefully examined the following applications for private Acts and finds the notices, as published in each case, sufficient:

Town of Seaforth;

City of Hamilton (No. 1);

City of Hamilton (No. 2);

City of Hamilton (No. 3);

Quinn Lumber and Builders' Supply Company, Limited;

Borough of Etobicoke (No. 1);

Borough of Etobicoke (No. 2);

The Widow's Home of Brantford;

Township of Goulbourn;

City of Kingston;

University of Windsor;

Carmel College;

Borough of Scarborough;

Huron College;

Township of Bruce;

City of Sault Ste. Marie.

Your committee further recommends that copies of the Canadian Parliamentary Guide be purchased for distribution to the members of the assembly.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, with respect to that particular committee, could I raise a point of order with the House leader of the government concerning the matter of substitution, which has been suggested earlier on? Can the minister advise us if it will be his intention to suggest that particular committee do review the matter?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is yes, and the resolution standing in my name, No. 4 on the order paper, will be called tomorrow.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might trespass and make a brief statement which is of great interest to northern Ontario? Will that be all right?

Mr. Martel: If the minister is giving us some goodies.

Mr. Speaker: Any further reports? May we revert to ministerial statements for a moment? The hon. minister.

Mr. Roy: He should give us a schedule of goodies.

Mr. Martel: Tax the mining industry fairly.

Mr. Roy: Those terrible feds, eh? Some more dirty tricks.

DRYDEN MUNICIPAL SERVICES

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that on behalf of the government of Ontario, I have today signed a new subsidiary agreement with the federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion to provide approximately \$3.2 million for selective municipal servicing improvements in the town of Dryden.

Our government and the government of Canada have agreed to provide sums of \$1.6 million each towards this project.

To complete the provincial-municipal aspect of the agreement, my colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier), met this morning with municipal representatives in the town of Dryden, where he represented the government of Ontario in a signing ceremony. The Dryden agreement, which hon. Donald Jamieson has signed on behalf of the federal government, is the latest in a series of subsidiary agreements to be signed under the authority of the 10-year Canada-Ontario general development agreement established in February, 1974. As hon. members will recall, similar subsidiary agreements were signed last year to initiate projects in Cornwall, Thunder Bay and other parts of northwestern Ontario. Projects covered under the terms of this latest agreement—formally known as the Dryden Development Infrastructure Subsidiary Agreement—will provide the basis for a substantial increase in the supply of housing, which is urgently needed in Dryden to support expanded commercial and industrial activity.

Mr. Roy: Another federal dirty trick!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The signing of this agreement underlines our recognition of the town of Dryden as one of the strategic centres for the northwestern Ontario region.

Traditionally, Dryden has been heavily dependent upon the forest resource sector as its major source of employment and municipal tax revenue. Now, with the significant new developments under way and anticipated in the area, and the town's strategic location on major road, rail and air transportation routes, this agreement will help sustain on-going economic activities and support continued growth.

Meanwhile, plans are moving ahead for construction of improved sewage treatment

facilities in the city of Thunder Bay under the federal-provincial subsidiary agreement signed in Thunder Bay last May. This project is to cost an estimated \$23 million, and as with the Dryden project the cost will be shared equally by the two senior governments.

Since the Dryden agreement marks another step in the Ontario government's Design for Development programme for northwestern Ontario, I would like to take just one moment to bring the hon. members up to date on the progress of that programme in the northwest. Under the Design for Development programme, several millions of dollars of provincial funds were allocated last year for basic improvements in northwestern Ontario. The largest of these is a 51-mile resource road between Dryden and Fort Frances, which is now under construction at an estimated total cost of \$8 million.

As was expected, conditions have changed somewhat since the Design for Development programme was set out for northwestern Ontario in 1970. The city of Thunder Bay, which was established that same year, has since made admirable strides toward its goal as the leading urban centre of the northwest. Several other goals set out specifically in the Design for Development—notably the employment goals set in 1970 for the year 1985—have already been achieved.

At the same time, conditions have been improved for the two major industries on which the economy of northwestern Ontario depends. The pulp and paper industry is healthier than it was in 1970 and the mining industry faces a more promising future than was foreseen five years ago. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, the government of Ontario is re-evaluating the Design for Development programme for that region of Ontario with a view to bringing it up to date so that we may set new goals and identify new projects in keeping with the region's changing needs.

I will be pleased to report to the House as those new goals are set and projects are designed to help this promising region of Ontario achieve its full potential.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. Roy: I have a bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Hamilton Mountain.

MASORA UNIVERSITY ACT

Mr. J. R. Smith moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Masora University.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa East.

JUDICATURE AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Roy moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Judicature Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, this government in 1972, in its Throne Speech, promised to allow further use of French in courts in this province. Unfortunately, we have not seen any extension of this. So I'm trying to assist the government—I've done it last year and I'm doing it again this year—by presenting a bill which in fact would amend section 127 of the Judicature Act and permit the use of French in certain areas of this province; in other words, areas that have been designated as bilingual districts under the Statistics Act of Canada. This would permit the use of French in writs, pleadings and proceedings in certain areas of the province; for instance, in eastern Ontario, parts of northern Ontario and so on.

Alors M. l'Orateur, cela me fait énormément plaisir de présenter cette législation. J'espère que le gouvernement va l'accepter, c'est tout à fait raisonnable, je ne vois pas pourquoi il ne l'accepterait pas. Merci.

TOWN OF SEAFORTH ACT

Mr. Riddell moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the town of Seaforth.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS CODE AMENDMENT ACT, 1974

Mr. B. Newman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Ontario Human Rights Code.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to prevent discrimination on the basis of a physical handicap.

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Young moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Ontario Energy Board Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Young: The purpose of the bill, Mr. Speaker, is to expand the jurisdiction of the board to enable it to approve terms and conditions of supply agreements between the companies and the consumers, particularly in the area of water heater and conversion burner rentals.

QUINN LUMBER AND BUILDERS' SUPPLY CO. LTD. ACT, 1975

Mr. Walker moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Quinn Lumber and Builders' Supply Co. Ltd.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

BOROUGH OF ETOBICOKE

Mr. Leluk moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Borough of Etobicoke.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

BOROUGH OF ETOBICOKE

Mr. Leluk moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Borough of Etobicoke.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

RETAIL SALES TAX ACT

Mr. Edighoffer moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth): The purpose of the bill is to reinstitute section 11 of the Act which was repealed in 1972. This bill would allow for remuneration to those who collect the retail sales tax and a minimum and maximum amount of the remuneration should be included in the regulation.

CITY OF KINGSTON

Mr. Apps moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Kingston.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

BOROUGH OF SCARBOROUGH

Mr. Drea moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Borough of Scarborough.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT, 1974

Mr. McIlveen, on behalf of Hon. Mr. Rhodes, moves second reading of Bill 12, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 1974.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): This is disgraceful, Mr. Speaker. A matter of this splenetic importance—one had coiled oneself like an adder to strike and there's nothing to strike; the minister is away. There is a void in his place.

The section in question involves moving to a new date, under section 29 of the old No. 2 Act, the whole school bus matter which the government had a great deal of trouble with and on which he has received a certain amount of mail and explanatory comments from the department. It is not possible to argue the matter, because there's no argument, and we accede to the alteration of the section as it stands.

Mr. Speaker: Any other members wish to speak on this bill?

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): The member for Oshawa is twitching in his seat over there.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member wish to reply?

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): We have been waiting for this moment for 3½ years.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): All the bill does, Mr. Speaker, is change the date of the Act from April 1 to Sept. 1.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Why?

Mr. McIlveen: This is done in conjunction with many members on both sides of the House who have been in contact with me, plus the Ministry of Education, the boards of education and many bus companies. They just couldn't be ready for the April 1 deadline

and they preferred it extended to Sept. 1, which we agreed should be done.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

POLLUTION ABATEMENT INCENTIVE ACT

Hon. W. Newman moves second reading of Bill 8, An Act to amend the Pollution Abatement Incentive Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron.

Mr. J. Riddell (Huron): Mr. Speaker, section 11 of the Pollution Abatement Incentive Act spells out that "this Act shall be deemed to come into force on April 1, 1970, and is repealed on April 1, 1975."

The Act as amended simply extends the date by which pollution abatement equipment may be installed and made operational in order to qualify for a grant under the Act.

The final date for the installation and operation of equipment for abatement of pollution, or the treatment or disposal of waste in order to qualify for a grant, is April 1, 1976. The final date for which application for a grant may be made under the amended Act is June 1, 1976.

I am assuming the reason for extending the deadline date is that a number of industries or private and public concerns have pollution abatement programmes under way which will not be completely installed or operational before the original date for grant eligibility has expired. Some of these businesses have no doubt applied for the grant, but unless the deadline date had been extended, their eligibility for a grant would have been nullified.

It is important that every encouragement be given to industries and other concerns to implement pollution control measures. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we support the bill.

I suppose a deadline date was established in the first place to encourage industries and other sources of pollution to take immediate action in bringing pollution under control, but if some incentive is not provided after April 1, 1976, what assurance is there that new industries, businesses and so on, will not ignore a pollution abatement programme? New enterprises are obviously going to be assessed the complete cost of installing pollution abatement equipment. This would tend to put them at a disadvantage from the

standpoint that it is financially more difficult to establish a new business than it is to make a few minor alterations to an already existing business.

It would be interesting to know how many industries, municipalities and private and public places of business have considered the grant adequate to provide enough incentive to install pollution abatement equipment. How many companies, organizations, private individuals or municipalities are making use of the grant under the present structure, which limits the grant to the amount of the sales tax? Perhaps the minister could elaborate on these matters when he responds during the second reading of the bill. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): We have no objection to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to comment on second reading? The hon. minister.

Hon. W. Newman (Minister of the Environment): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the agreement runs out on April 1, 1975, and what was said in the early part of the statement is quite true. Many companies have ordered pollution abatement equipment and the Act says it must be in place and operational by April 1, 1975. We are just really extending the whole programme for one year to April, 1976, with an additional two months period of time for them to file their application or get their equipment operational to take them to June 1, 1976.

There are many other programmes that are available to industry on abatement equipment. One is the federal accelerated depreciation programme and we, through the Ontario Development Corp. have loans that are available to industry for abatement equipment. As members know, the whole idea is to get the sales tax back on their abatement equipment.

I can assure the House that as of April 1, 1976, it will probably be part of doing business for any company that we deal with in the Ministry of the Environment that it must put on certain abatement equipment in the installation of a new plant or in any plants that are existing. Any new abatement equipment will be part of doing business on the part of the company and they will pay. There won't be anybody trying to get around it; it will be part of doing business.

There is a tremendous backlog of orders. In sales tax alone, we estimate it's somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$5 million in tax, so members will get some idea of the tremendous amount of equipment that has been ordered for abatement devices by the various industries in the Province of Ontario.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 12, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 1974.

Bill 8, An Act to amend the Pollution Abatement Incentive Act.

CHILD WELFARE AMENDMENT

Hon. Mr. Brunelle moves second reading of Bill 4, An Act to amend the Child Welfare Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for—

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): Mr. Speaker, if I may, I have a few brief remarks on this bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: As members are aware, there have been relatively few changes to the Child Welfare Act in the past four years. During this time a number of developments have occurred that have had a substantial impact on child welfare services in the province and necessitate action to ensure the smooth functioning of programmes and services delivered to children through the existing Child Welfare Act.

One of these developments has been the increase in the cost of child welfare services. Yet while these costs have been rising, the cost-sharing arrangements between the province and the municipalities, as they are set out by the current Act, have remained rigid. As a result, the municipalities are paying an increasingly larger share of the total burden. Thus we find it necessary to revise the Act to permit the Province of Ontario to increase its contribution.

We also find it necessary to build more flexible financial management procedures into the regulations under the Child Welfare Act to allow the province to respond more quickly to changing patterns of service. In order to achieve this objective we are seeking to revise the Child Welfare Act in two ways:

1. By removing details of financial management from the Act to the regulations. Such details would include cost-sharing percentages.

2. By simultaneously providing for an increase in cost-sharing by the province in a set of revised regulations. These new regulations will provide both a continuance of 100 per cent provincial sharing for services to Indian children with reserve status and services to unorganized territories, and the move to 80 per cent sharing for all other services.

In introducing this change we anticipate this will greatly benefit the vast majority of municipalities. We also recognize that a few municipalities may be adversely affected with the new arrangement and we are, therefore, introducing provisions in the regulations to reduce the impact on such municipalities through an offsetting grant system. While introducing the Child Welfare Amendment Act providing for this improvement and the cost-sharing arrangement, I would like to mention a number of changes which we have found to be necessary through our experiences in operating under the current Act.

There are two proposed features of significant interest about which I would like to make special comment. The first of these features relates to the introduction of provision for non-ward agreements. This provision will allow children's aid societies and the ministry to deal with children who for one reason or another require service outside their own homes, without requiring that a form of wardship be taken by the society. Our object here is to encourage and foster situations in which children and families can be served without the removal of parental rights through the wardship process. It is our conviction that there should be no need to remove parental rights, if the parents of a child requiring service outside his own home are willing to co-operate and work with the Children's Aid Society toward assisting that child.

The second significant feature of the Child Welfare Amendment Act, 1975, will provide permission to children's aid societies to enter a home in which one or a number of children had been abandoned and to place a repre-

sentative in that home to live with and care for the children until the parents return to the home. This will also apply if a parent is present in the home but unable to care for the children and is incapacitated to the extent that he is unable to give his or her consent. We believe this provision will in many cases prevent the premature removal of children from their homes and particularly prevent the removal of children at times when they are frightened and confused.

In addition to the financial changes I have just mentioned, we are introducing procedural changes relating to the operation of a Children's Aid Society and to relationships between societies and the courts. We are strengthening and modernizing some of the definitions currently in use in the Act. At the request of family court judges, we are clarifying the jurisdiction and powers of judges of the family court and county courts. We are deleting the requirements for trial de novo on an appeal hearing. We are also moving to clarify the wording of several sections of the Act which we have found through experience will require such clarification. We are removing from the Act a number of administrative procedures which more properly belong in the regulations and we are providing for the introduction of such procedures in the regulations in many cases on a more simplified basis.

In addition to this, we are clarifying the rights of parents and children relative to a number of sections of the Act and, of course, we are repealing the sections of the Act which have become obsolete through past experiences with the Act or because of changes in the area of child welfare. I should note, at this time, that although we are introducing more relevant language and are allowing some recommendations of the Ontario Law Reform Commission, we do recognize that there are still many other significant recommendations of the commission. These are under continual discussion and will require further changes in the Child Welfare Act at an appropriate time.

In preparing the Child Welfare Amendment Act, 1975, we have consulted with several groups concerning our proposed changes and, in particular, the following: family and county court judges; the ministries of the Attorney General and Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs; Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies as well as individual societies; the Provincial-Municipal Liaison Committee and the official guardian's branch of the Attorney General. I

should add, Mr. Speaker, that members have also made recommendations to us from time to time.

Over the past few months, we have reviewed the current Act clause by clause to determine all areas which require some immediate attention. I feel the changes we are introducing are absolutely necessary at this time. I am satisfied that this amendment will serve to improve the existing Child Welfare Act, providing a fairer balance of management between children's aid societies and the provincial government and a more effective code for everyone involved in this field of child welfare.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the minister made an opening statement in regard to the Act because the statement he made on introduction and first reading indicated that there was nothing in the Act, other than changes for financial responsibility between the municipalities and the province and some other minor insignificant things. Really, the Act has about 15 principles to it and as one goes through the Act one finds a new principle in almost every page.

On this side of the House it was indicated to us last Wednesday that this Act would not be called for some time and personally I did not find out that it would be called until yesterday afternoon. We've had very little time or indication from the House leader as to when this important Act would be called. It has been difficult for us to research the Act properly on the basis of the opening statement of the minister and on the basis of the fact that we were given such short notice, particularly when we were told last Wednesday that this Act would not be called until after April 7.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Who gave them that understanding, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. R. S. Smith: The House leader. It may be fine for the minister to shake his head and say "That's the way the game goes" because that is the way the game goes around here. There is no responsibility on the House leader insofar as notification to the opposition is concerned. In fact, one thing is indicated and another thing is done and that's rather misleading to say the least.

Anyway, since last night I've tried to put a few comments together in regard to the Act. Certainly the minister's opening statement today makes it a little more clear what

he is trying to do although I do not believe the Act will reach the needs or requirements of change which are still needed in the original bill.

I'd like to comment and the only way I can do this is practically on a section-by-section basis because every section has a different type of principle to it. If anyone can find the one principle in this bill and say "That is the principle of this bill" I would like him to point it out to me because it is impossible.

Mr. Martel: Defy him to find it.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Yes, I defy him to find it. Therefore, on second reading the only way I can reasonably deal with the bill is the way the bill is presented to us and the way the minister has indicated that the changes are being made in the bill.

In the first section of the bill there is some question as to the amendment as proposed on what "director" means. According to my reading of the amendment, a director could mean that we would have a number of directors under this Act and there would be no one who really has overall responsibility within the ministry, other than the minister himself, for the enactment of the legislation and for the administration of the Act itself. I find in section 1, part (c), the new definition of a director could cause a great deal of consternation if eight directors are named to deal with eight different parts of the Act. Knowing this ministry, that might well happen and there would be nobody with any overall responsibility.

Mr. Martel: No one's accountable for anything.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): No one is accountable.

Mr. R. S. Smith: That's right. What we have now is an Act for which there is no responsibility, other than, of course, by the minister who is presenting it. Obviously he's not going to be the one to administer it unless he's going to have two jobs—director of this branch as well as minister. Then, of course, we would have somebody with the ultimate responsibility.

I would question that as an amendment which should be looked at rather closely as, in effect, being one of the parts of the Act which are rather misleading.

The next parts I would like to mention are those sections of the Act dealing with financing. Of course, this is the only part of the Act which the minister put forward in

his previous remarks on the introduction of the bill as the one principle in the Act. I think if one looks at his first remarks, he indicated that was the main principle, but of course it really isn't the main principle; it's one of a number of principles, but I don't think it is the main principle.

I question the statement the minister made just a few minutes ago when he said that the 60-40 split between the province and the municipality as to the cost was as rigid as that. He knows as well as I do that there is nothing as rigid as the ability or the will of the minister to want to bring in an Act to amend the Act already in place. Certainly it is a little more rigid than regulations but he has had the opportunity every year, on every day the Legislature is sitting, to bring in an Act to change that 60-40 split. I believe that it should be left in the Act and the provincial responsibility insofar as costs are concerned should be spelled out in the Act.

I also believe that the change to alleviate some of the municipalities' problems by decreasing their portion of the cost from 40 per cent to 20 per cent is a good thing and is perhaps one of the few good things that we can find in the Act. But, on the other hand, to take that out of the Act and put it into regulations, and say that it becomes less rigid, I think is rather misleading because it's only as rigid as the minister and the government that he represents want to make it.

As I said before, every day that the session is sitting he has an opportunity to bring in an amendment to change any of the sections of the Act. To put it in regulations is to put it rather behind closed doors so that he can go and deal with the municipalities on a rather different basis than here in the Legislature, where he should be putting his policy forward.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): He wants to avoid the scrutiny of the Legislature.

Mr. R. S. Smith: The other point I would like to make relates to the division of this financial responsibility. I don't see any move in this Act to bring to the regional governments that have been set up across this province, any responsibility insofar as the costs are concerned. It is now left mainly to the smaller municipalities and the provincial government on the new 80-20 basis that the minister announced just a few minutes ago. The regional governments, I believe, have a responsibility as well. And even if we did break it down to an 80, 10 and 10, at least we would have established the precedent that regional governments have a responsibility in the area of child welfare care just as the

smaller municipalities are left with a part of the cost and part of the responsibility as well.

As I understand it, in Metropolitan Toronto the total cost of this type of service is taken up by the Metro Toronto government, and the individual municipalities within that area are not charged back the 40 per cent up until now, and the 20 per cent from now on, but rather Metropolitan Toronto has that responsibility. I can't understand why some movement is not being made to have regional governments given at least part of the responsibility, if not the whole responsibility, insofar as these costs are concerned.

There are millions of dollars being poured in to regional governments to keep them alive and to keep them floating; I can't fathom why the small costs that are involved here, insofar as a region is concerned, could not be taken up by them.

There are a number of other things I would like to mention. The minister has indicated in some of the amendments that the guardianship of all children will come within the reference of the societies. He touched today on non-ward agreements where the rights of the parent or guardian will be protected. He spoke of keeping the child in the family and out of the care and protection of the society as much as possible in the best interests of the child. We certainly agree with that.

There is also the other case of those children who under the Juvenile Delinquents Act are made wards of the society. Here we find there is an effort on the part of the government—and one can see it across the province—to continually move these children from the training schools of our province and keep them in community settings where we hope they will be better off in the long run.

The problem here is that at least in some of the training schools, as bad as some of them may have been and as bad as some of them may still be, there was the opportunity for psychiatric assistance and for other professional help that is not being made available to the same children when they are kept in the community or in the home. If the government is going to move to keep children from the training schools in this province—and we heartily agree that that should be a goal of this ministry and of the government and of society in general—then it also has the responsibility of providing to the child the expertise and the professional help that he is being denied because he is not being retained in a training school.

As I said before, it is not our position nor is it the position of the government, I'm sure,

to attempt in any way to keep a child, who can be bettered and can receive treatments outside of the training-school setting, in the training school. I certainly agree with the ultimate intention—obvious intention as far as I'm concerned at least—that training schools would diminish, if not disappear. On the other hand, I would remind the minister of his responsibility to provide psychiatric and other professional assistance to those children who would otherwise have been sent to the training school, and not to leave these emotionally disturbed children in the home or in the community without any assistance.

I don't know about the area that the minister comes from, but I know that in my area and in most areas in this province, perhaps outside of Metro Toronto, and even in Metro Toronto, there is a great lack of service for those children who are emotionally disturbed and whom we are trying to keep in the community. There is, in fact, in many areas of the province no service to that child who perhaps has a double handicap. He's just shifted around from one place to another. He's assessed or reassessed or not assessed, but there's never really any service provided insofar as treatment is concerned.

I believe that that is perhaps one area that this bill misses completely and that is the area where the first responsibility of the ministry lies in regard to many of the matters that are touched on in the bill but really not dealt with. I would place that as perhaps the most important section of the bill which really does not deal with the problem as it exists.

The minister made some comments today on the right to give care to children in the home. We on this side certainly agree with the provisions in the bill that provide for the homemaker to be able to move into the home and look after the children in that setting, rather than wrenching them from the home, if it is at all possible to make it go with the homemaker. We agree with those sections of the Act which provide for that type of assistance.

Under the second part of the bill, the protection and care of children, there are a number of the things that I have already discussed. But there are other matters that should be looked into in regard to the removal of children and those matters that deal directly with the courts and the question that the minister brought up in regard to the re-definition of the responsibilities of the family court vis-à-vis the other courts in the province.

I will leave the remarks of our party in regard to those matters to the member for St. George. She has had much more experience than I in family courts, and perhaps much more experience and much more knowledge of the matter than any other of us in the House, as she has dealt with these matters on a day to day basis for a period of time.

These are the only remarks that I have to make. Our party generally will have to support the bill, not because of what it does, really, but because it does move some things ahead in the area of child care. But it still leaves much to be desired. It is not the panacea for the next few years, as the minister perhaps tried to tell us in his opening remarks this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the rumour for the past couple of years at least that we were going to have some fundamental change in the care of children in this predicament—and really the bill has nothing in it. There are two clauses, and the minister was quick to draw on both of them, that are a change, really, an advance. One is dealing with putting a homemaker in the home, which I understand was being done anyway. But this makes it legal. The second point, of course, is the volunteer agreement.

It would appear that the bill makes the ministry concerned about prevention. Really, the bill hasn't changed one jot. It's 30 years out of whack. It is still a bill that is primarily concerned with institutionalizing people—in this case young people. But it doesn't move in the direction of prevention that this party has been advocating—and my friends, I think, from the Liberal Party have been advocating—at least for the last couple of years.

Therefore, I want to spend some time, Mr. Minister, in dealing with what the bill doesn't do. As my friend the member for Nipissing says, there is no real principle. It is just in sections—a little here, a little there.

I am also a little offended at the time factor. It is rather a lengthy bill and I spent, fortunately, seven or eight hours over the weekend—when I should have been enjoying my family—in trying to compare the bill with the old office consolidation, which is no easy feat. I agree again with my friend, the member for Nipissing, when he says that we should have had more time and that the director is really left up in the air.

I work with a group of people involved in a variety of fields in the field of commu-

nity and social services, and that is one of the things they drew to my attention. They were very concerned. They said: "Really, there are no lines of accountability." That was their wording: "No lines of accountability."

The director is appointed by whom? I guess that's the minister—but who is he accountable to? No one really knows, because we are dealing with a semi-autonomous group. There is no improvement there.

As I said, there are, so far as I'm concerned, only two major things and they're not all that major. Let's deal with what is wrong with the bill, whether it is the old bill or the amendments. The minister has 20 pages of amendments, which I would have hoped he might have moved, in the field of prevention. I'm going to cite some examples which could easily have been introduced.

We should have started to deal with natural parents, Mr. Speaker. As you know, if we put a child in a foster home we will pay to the foster parent \$125, \$140 or \$150 per month for each foster child in that home. Yet if we take a mother or a family where the father might be handicapped for any reason and there's a low income—and money is one of the prime causes of disruption—we will watch the family be destroyed before we will move in with financial assistance and support the natural family. Then we'll turn around and if there are three or four children we'll spend \$500, \$600 or \$700 a month to have them placed in foster homes. Or, if we don't place them in foster homes, we place them with a Children's Aid Society in some building somewhere and the costs are astronomical.

Let me show you what I mean. In 1972, Metro Toronto Children's Aid Society spent, for care, for prevention, for working with families, \$2.5 million on 9,125 kids or young people. It spent another \$9 million on 1,400 children who are institutionalized. In other words, to support young people in their homes so that the natural families don't break up, we spend less than a quarter of that budget; that is on about 15 per cent of the children or the young people who have problems. Conversely, we spend three-quarters of the money putting young people in institutions. In other words, we spend about \$9 million once they're incarcerated in some way, shape or form.

I've heard the rumble—I've talked about it to the minister for the past 11 or 12 months at least—that this bill was changing. Surely to God, in this day and age we could have moved, in the bill, to support the nat-

ural family, to prevent the breakup of the natural family. But we don't do it and we'll have the same thing persisting, Mr. Speaker. I guarantee you we'll be spending more money for care than for prevention and there's nothing in the bill that forces the change. As long as the bill doesn't do it—maybe the government should say 50 per cent of the money in the Children's Aid Society budget must be spent on care before the crisis occurs; and, in fact, the minister should send the social worker right into the home, if need be to spend some time there. I'm sure we could do better hiring more social workers to get into homes, than we could providing for the care of kids once they're in an institution.

But we don't do that. We operate in the dark ages and we continue to do so. We come in and we pat ourselves on the back for one or two little clauses such as we won't make them Crown wards through a voluntary agreement; or we will put a homemaker in the home; which is a good move because that way we're not taking the child out of his natural setting and putting him in an institution, we move someone in. We should be moving someone in even if the parents are there, if that be the case, for preventive purposes because there might be two or three children who need help. But no, we do it in reverse. We take the kids out and we find a foster home.

There are some good foster homes. I don't want to say that foster homes are all bad; there are some people who do excellent work. But the only study I've been able to get my hands on was done by an acquaintance of mine five or six years ago involving 299 children; of the 299 children, 73 had more than two moves by the time they were five years old. Anyone who knows anything about children is aware that the formative years for children are one to five, or some will say one to seven. But 36 per cent of those children, or 73 of them, in fact moved more than twice by the time they were five. Can you imagine the traumatic experience as we move those children from foster parent home to foster parent home? It is simply destructive.

Part of the problem, of course, is that we don't screen the foster parents and there is insufficient support for foster parents once they are in place. How often does the field worker visit the foster parent home? Once a month if they are lucky; once a year or once every six months? There is no real support for foster parents because the direction of the bill isn't towards prevention.

As a result, we even have the breakup in the foster home. We have the breakup in the natural home, then we have the breakup in the foster home and possibly two or three moves. By the time many of the children are five or six years of age, we have destroyed them as people. The bill doesn't change that one jot, except that one little item, and that is that we will bring a foster parent into the natural home.

As I say, I am just quoting this one study—it's the only one I know; I know the minister doesn't have any more. If he does such studies on the frequency of moves within Children's Aid Societies, perhaps he would produce them, since the province has demanded that information from the 51 or 52 societies in the province. I guarantee that information isn't available to us. Yet we go on; we change acts without information.

Those are two of the main points, Mr. Speaker. Section 6 of the old bill, which should deal with prevention, doesn't really. Look at what section 6 of the bill says and tell me where it mentions prevention, except perhaps in clause (h):

Every Children's Aid Society shall be operated for the purpose of

- (a) investigating allegations;
- (b) protecting children where necessary;
- (c) providing guidance;
- (d) providing care for children assigned or committed to its care;
- (e) supervising children assigned to its supervision under this Act or any other Act;
- (f) placing children for adoption;
- (g) assisting the parents of children born out of wedlock or likely to be born out of wedlock and their children born out of wedlock; and
- (h) any other duties given to it by this or any other Act.

Where is prevention in the Act? It is not even there. Surely this government recognizes now that once we institutionalize people, costs are vastly higher, much greater than if we move toward prevention.

I had real hopes for this bill, Mr. Speaker. I spoke to the director of the children's aid societies for the province—Dr. Dymond's brother, I believe. I spoke to him; I spoke to the Children's Aid Society people in Metropolitan Toronto; I spoke to them in my own locality. They were terribly disappointed by the Act. As for all of this nonsense that we heard about some major changes coming, there is nothing there.

The volunteer agreements present a real dilemma. Has the minister ever considered what is going to happen if a lot of people decide they are going to voluntarily surrender the child like that? Where are we going to put him? We don't have placement for him now. We don't have enough foster parents today for those we have Crown wardship over.

Now, in an agreement, if the parent feels quite comfortable that he can surrender the child for two, three or four months by agreement, how many, when the frustration gets them down, finally say, "No." They throw their hands up in despair and say, "For a while." Look at mother-led families where the mother can't cope with it for a while. We've all heard them, when they deal with family benefits, say: "No, I surrender the children." The only deterrent, of course, is that it might be for two years, but I'm wondering what the minister is going to do if there are a number of people who take that course of volunteering. I don't think he'll be able to cope.

Then there's discrimination against a single person. The minister won't remove that from the Act when adopting a child, will he? It's still in there. Under special circumstances we might, but it's still there.

The minister might consider, along with what I've suggested, supporting the natural parents to prevent the family from breaking up. Some of those people who take children via the route of foster parents can't afford to simply adopt the child. Therefore, the minister might consider, once the child is legally adopted, supporting to some degree a family which wants the child but can't afford it, rather than institutionalizing them again. I'm sure these aren't new ideas. I didn't get them myself. Somebody gave them to me.

I want to deal as well, Mr. Speaker, if I might, with a number of other points. I am firmly convinced now that before a Children's Aid Society is permitted to remove a child from his natural home the onus should be on the society to show that adequate services designed to prevent the need for removal have been given to the natural family. And if the Children's Aid Society hasn't been able to give the support necessary to the natural family, then before they can remove that child, I think they're going to have to move in to give that support. They just don't move in and take the child out without first attempting to keep a child in the home.

In other words, the onus is going to be on the Children's Aid Society to prove that it can do a better job than the parents, providing the parents have some assistance—a social worker coming in and spending some time there; some monetary assistance, if necessary—to overcome the shortcoming which is causing the distress within the family.

I'm saying that before the Children's Aid Society can take that child out of its natural surroundings it must prove that it has attempted to help the family and can't, and only then. That's a departure but I suggest that's the only way we're going to move to prevention.

The societies will be forced then to get the field workers in there more frequently. They will have to be accountable for what they're doing. It won't be a matter of simply popping up on behalf of someone's complaint.

I realize that a part of the minister's rebuttal will be: "What happens if the child is in danger?" I realize that is a vital concern, but I think that comes under a completely different sort of situation. The ministry has a study that indicates that. I don't know how accurate it is. It's on the number of children abused in Ontario over the past five years. It doesn't show that many, on my reading of it anyway, to make me nervous. There's certainly not sufficient child abuse in the province to simply move in and take the kids out as we're doing at the present time. As I say, we have to be careful of the abuse to the child, but that can be improved. If we are going to have someone who is going to make a complaint, the person will substantiate that complaint. But the Children's Aid Society can move in pretty regularly, and does now, and removes children for a short period of time, which can lead to wardship. I'm saying that we don't allow that to happen until there are extenuating circumstances and, more important, they have attempted to help the natural parents before they are allowed to remove a child from the home.

I'm repeating it, but I think it's important enough: Only if we find the society has tried to support the natural parents to help them overcome the difficulty within the natural setting then, but not until then, should that be allowed to happen.

I think they also have to prove that what they are offering is a better alternative than what the Children's Aid Society is offering. I have read the report—I quoted from it a

few moments ago—on the number of children who by the time they are five have moved.

In the same report there is a section which indicates that of the 299 children we were talking about some had to be moved because of a weakness in the foster home. In fact, those who were moved because of weakness in the foster home represented something like 90 per cent. I wonder if we don't take the child out of the natural home without assisting the child and put him into a foster home where the breakup occurs once, twice, three or four times when the child has to be removed. What I'm saying is the Children's Aid Society is going to have to prove it has a home setting, if it is going to remove a child; that where they are putting the child is better than where he is.

We don't know that because I don't think we have the statistics, as I said earlier. The only study I have is from a worker who now works for Browndale but who worked for the Children's Aid Society in Toronto. It indicates that 90 per cent—primarily young children from two to five or two to seven—are moved two, three or four times because there are weaknesses in the foster parents' home.

I'm saying that when it is taking a child out of a home the Children's Aid Society should have to prove that it is better than where he was. The minister can't do that. I don't think, because I don't think he has the statistics on the frequency of moves which occur in the province. Until he has that I don't think he or the Children's Aid Society has the right to say "That child is in bad shape and we are moving him" unless they can prove that where they are moving him or her to is better. Unless we do that, I think the children's rights are being violated. I think they are being violated if the minister can't prove to me or to the parents involved that where the children are going is better.

Again I say to the minister that what is going to happen if he puts in the bill those last two points I spoke about is that the Children's Aid Society will move very definitely to prevention. It will be more difficult to take the child out and yet the responsibility is on them to guarantee the protection of the child. The Act does none of that yet. I'm sorry, it's just void. The bill is useless in many respects. The hopes that many people had for it are dashed, I'm afraid, because it's just not there.

Friends of mine, Mr. Speaker, to the minister, would argue that the children should not be placed for adoption without the consent of the natural parents under any circumstances. I'm not sure, so I'll save that one.

I'm going to ask the minister, due to the shortness of time, that this bill go to committee, not of the whole but standing committee, because my information is that there are people who want to make representation on the bill. I am going to ask the minister when I sit down if he will send it to the social development committee outside the Legislature so that people can come forward and make presentations.

Mr. P. Taylor (Carleton East): Don't hold your breath.

Mr. Martel: We might be able to talk this minister into it. I might have less chance of success with others. I would think this minister will let it go to committee.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Did the minister make that commitment?

Mr. Martel: Well, I'm trying to flatter him right now. Don't push it to hard.

Mr. Bounsall: It is a little too early in the game.

Mr. Martel: That's right. We are just trying to get around to that.

I think there should be a grievance procedure too. I think any individual or family involved with the Children's Aid Society should have the right to appeal to some type of committee, if they feel their rights have been violated, if they believe a representative of the society is failing to respect their autonomy, their individuality, their culture or their race, or if someone believes he is unable to establish a useful relationship with the assigned representative. I've talked to a number of people—and maybe the good judge can tell us—and there are a lot of people, as I understand it, who simply don't hit it off with the case worker assigned to them. The great difficulty in getting a new case worker assigned to work with a particular family is that it is frequently impossible to obtain.

We are talking about children and the needs of the family. It seems to me we shouldn't have the difficulty, but invariably it is there. There is no recourse on any of these things I have listed in the Act—none at all. It seems to me that that should be in the Act because that's the only way one protects an individual's rights, through someone who has some channel—I'm afraid I'm not a legal beagle—where one can say, "Whoa, I think my rights and the rights of my children are being violated here." Don't tell me we can go to a judge or something like that. Once he has heard

the case, it doesn't have to go that route. Again, that is left out of the Act.

I might even suggest that this independent grievance committee might include two or three members, someone from the Ministry of Community and Social Services—maybe the director, as it would give him a responsibility—someone from the Canadian Civil Liberties Association and someone from consumer service or someone who might represent some advocacy group or someone like that. In other words, when there is a failure insofar as the parents are concerned and they can't communicate with the worker assigned to work with them and the child in question or the children in question, they can appeal to some body. I just think the cards are loaded against the parent in the situation.

I have a handbook that was written by a group in 1973. It's called "In a child's best interest" and is by Operation Family Rights. I don't work that much with them, but they indicate to me—and I have checked with a number of workers—that really the natural family is behind the eight ball almost from square one. It might be different in the various courts, depending on the judge who might have an influence.

The social worker from one place has put comments about the child, and the parent doesn't know they are down. Someone has complained about the child, and that is in the record. Everybody else sees the records but the natural parents. There they are, up against this body of people trying—I guess some of them desperately—to keep the family together with the reports of possibly a variety of people—teachers, field workers, a whole group of people—against them.

I just don't know how the parents stacks up against that group. He knows or she knows that they are up against lawyers and professional workers. What's the feeling that must go through a parent in one of these hearings? It must be traumatic for the parent, let alone the child, because they're all lined up against them; everybody has seen the reports except the parent. Now possibly the judge might be lenient. They might see the full reports, but my information is that they don't see all of the reports against the child; some of them may be good, some of them bad. But the social workers discuss it amongst themselves, that's for certain.

I think there has got to be more protection there, too, for the natural family. In other words what I am saying, Mr. Speaker,

is that the thrust of this Act should be to keep the natural family together wherever possible. If it costs more money to subsidize the natural family, that's fine. If it means moving field workers right into the home, that's fine. I simply say that there is not enough effort being made in this Act to do that.

In fact, even the title of the Act bothers me, Mr. Speaker. I might ask the minister to change that: The Child Welfare Act—welfare. It's not a connotation of welfare. I don't care what you call it; somehow you might drop the word welfare. That's not what we're talking about, is it? If you're talking about well-being of the child, say that. But the Child Welfare Act—even the title is repulsive as far as I'm concerned.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algonia): What is the member's suggestion?

Mr. Martel: I'd call it the Child's Rights Act—call it whatever you want, but not welfare. We're not talking about welfare in the term that most people understand.

Mr. Gilbertson: Come up with some constructive ideas.

Mr. Martel: Oh, I will, because that's why I want it—

Mr. Gilbertson: Why doesn't the member come up with some good constructive ideas?

Mr. Martel: If the member would listen I am trying to put forth a bunch of constructive ideas to protect the natural family and to prevent the natural family from breaking up. Everything I've said has been pointed towards the prevention of the destruction of the natural family.

Mr. Gilbertson: Come up with some good ideas on how to keep families from breaking up.

Mr. Martel: That is what I am talking about—I have suggested that in the estimates on many an occasion. The biggest one, I am told, is monetary.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to go on. I'm disappointed, as I say, in the Act. I'm also disappointed in the time we've had to review it; I simply don't feel that I have done an adequate job in preparing to speak to this bill. I haven't had time. I haven't been able to consult with anyone to—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): The member is doing an extremely competent job for someone who hasn't had time.

An hon. member: Very, very good.

Mr. Martel: Thank you, I appreciate the kind remarks. But I would urge—because of this and because there are a variety of people in the community, Mr. Speaker, who want to have an input—if we're sincere about changing the direction of children's aid societies and making it preventive and making it our aim to, in fact, support and maintain the natural family we can't go ahead with this Act until we put in some gut changes. I want to move those amendments—and I'm sure the Liberal Party does too—when we move to the committee. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, through you to the minister, I would ask that the minister send it to committee.

Give us time to do a major job. The minister has had a year to bring in an Act—and it has been rumoured for that long—that has nothing in it, really, of any real substance. Surely to God you can send it to committee, where we in fact can bring in people who are interested and those of us in this Legislature who want to see the direction changed. Send it to committee where we can make those changes. I would hope that the minister himself would get directly involved in changing the Act to where it has something meaningful rather than the drivel for 20 pages that I read on the weekend. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. George.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize with my portion of this debate my complete agreement with what has been said by the member for Sudbury East on the question of referring the matter to committee. I think that is one of the most important things, because some of the things which the member for Sudbury East has said, I think, perhaps come from not seeing the procedures as the court gets involved. But I think if the members of this committee could hear from parents who have been through this deal, which has not really been substantially changed, then maybe there would be out of that a meaningful Act for the protection of children and for the protection of the family.

I won't go into those areas covered by my colleague so ably, but the first emphasis I have to put is the fact that I can't think of how long it was—certainly when I was with the city in the early Sixties; certainly at Metro in the middle and late Sixties—the biggest battle that we ever had as elected representatives was to try to get funding and a thrust for funding for prevention. It is the hardest thing in the world, because if you

want to have statistics, it really is like trying to prove how many people didn't get killed because we had crosswalks. It's difficult to bring statistical evidence forward. Nevertheless, the destruction which takes place with children is in my view something that we couldn't live with if we really got down to cases to see it happening.

One of the problems, of course, is the Children's Aid. Without question they try to do a good job for the most part, but they have two dreadful limitations. One of them is that, basically, they have never had financing for this purpose. Secondly, we have to understand that certainly in this area—and I can't speak for the rest of the province—very often you are bringing, through the social worker, a middleclass approach to a situation.

It is true that quite often it is the judge, oddly enough, who tries to look through what appears on the surface to understand that a child is a much-loved child, notwithstanding some of the superficial material that is brought to bear. I must say that this is particularly true in the case of native children in a large urban centre, because you don't have the kinds of people who are trained in the field of social work who can at the same time help with native children and families before the courts. I am afraid in Toronto that Millie Redman was called upon far too often than she should have been to come into the courts to help judges to understand the problems of the breakdown of a native family in a large urban environment.

Certainly, I have some reluctance to go as far as the member for Sudbury East would go in trying to make the Children's Aid first prove that they had given assistance. This might work in a smaller area, but I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that, because of the lack of prevention, far too often there are emergencies at a particular point in time where there really isn't the ability to do much other than to take a child into care. Usually if that emergency is of that nature—and I'm not just talking about child abuse—then the Children's Aid Society, in effect, really is in the position of having to bring the circumstances to the court. Of course, at that point in time it is open to a judge to make an order pursuant to the provisions, which may indeed return the child to the home or may make other provisions.

In principle, I must say that I am pleased with the provisions for homemaker services to be brought in. I don't want to speak in any partisan way about it—it is a step for-

ward—but I would like to be assured of just what kind of funding we're talking about, and what the limitations are really going to be as we work through regulations over which this assembly has no jurisdiction.

The other area in which I commend the minister is the matter of removing the trial de novo procedure on appeal. Certainly, I'm sure that the judges of the family court would be most pleased with this provision, because they are the ones who really take the time in these cases, often talking to the children, trying to understand the situation. It was certainly frustrating when none of that transcript was available to the judge on appeal. It was, in effect, a rehearing, or a hearing by that judge anew, without the benefit of any of the experiences of the judges in the family division. I may be prejudiced, of course, but I happen to think that that particular court does take time and does have concern in these cases. So, on those two points, I certainly commend the minister.

But as part of the overall philosophy of the Act, one of the things that is interesting is that the minister must have known that there has been a great dichotomy in the courts across the province on what constitutes, for example, a place of safety. It seems to me that the judges ought to have some guidance from the legislation as to whether—for example, there being no other place, suddenly, in the middle of the night, for a child—a detention home is in fact a place of safety or whether it is to be regarded purely and simply as a holding place for children before the courts under the provisions of the juvenile delinquents legislation.

There is a case where I think this minister perhaps might like to hear from those functioning in this province in this area, so that that kind of concern may be considered.

I wonder what we mean when we say, under section 18(3), that a judge shall give reasonable notice before committing a child to the charge of the society. Before I want to see that provision I want to know what options are open, or what is the purpose of a notice. And where do we find some provision, which would be an alternative provision to a training school, for example, or to one of the other facilities which would be somewhat of a holding facility?

It is great to say a judge will give notice, but very often a judge who feels that a child ought to be in the protective custody, if you like, of the children's aid society, whichever one it might be, is faced with the fact that there are no facilities for that child. This

again, I have to say, is particularly true of the child who is before the courts as a juvenile delinquent and who is a female child. The facilities for looking after girls under these circumstances are limited, and there are many reasons for this, as I have said before. A boy before the courts quite often is before them for a joy-riding offence, a theft or something of that nature, but very often the girl is very self-damaged as a result of the offence which brings her before the courts.

I really don't know what we are talking about by notice in those circumstances. Perhaps, however, I have misread it; like the others, I have not had very much opportunity to check it.

It is interesting, too, that we seem to be concerned about the quality of reporting. I must say I have some problems with it myself, because you do often get those who are inclined to report anything and for reasons which are not the most uplifting reasons. But if we are going to continue to have the provision in the Act—is it section 41? I am sorry, I don't have the consolidation before me—that requires reporting, then I would point out that there are still no teeth in it. Yet the minister has eliminated the section about children engaged in street trades for the obvious reason that it was unenforceable. I wonder what he is doing with this particular kind of thing.

Basically, Mr. Speaker, I think the Act, having been delayed this long, is brought forward much too hurriedly if we are concerned with the well-being of the child. It needs further work and further input from those who in fact are working with children in these areas,

It is almost amusing, I suppose, to see that the minister was going to be very sure in this Act that it be made clear that both parents have responsibility for the maintenance of the child. But the minister has still left section 37 alone, which gives to the father his supreme right of decision as to the religion of the child. This is the sort of thing that I wonder if the government really thinks through.

Many of these children are in the care of a mother who has been deserted. Many of them are children who have problems because of that desertion. I only mention it simply because, once more, this government is so anxious to ensure that the Act spells out an equality of responsibility without equality of right or privilege.

Mr. Speaker, I am very sad to have to speak this way about this Act, which I had looked forward to with such anticipation. Is it before us because we are trying to give a

goody to municipalities at this point in time? Surely, now is the time for this government to express itself on its position as to the status of a child in a community, such as ours, and what his or her basic rights are. And this has been left totally unsaid.

I can't emphasize too strongly my very real concern that those who know the business that this is—and it's a business again under this Child Welfare Act—that those who function in the field should have an opportunity, including parents who have been through the courts, to come before the committee and to express themselves as to their very real and, in some cases, very traumatic experiences. That is, if we really care.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. Bounsall: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before I get into some of the detailed remarks I have on the bill, I would like to approach the minister head on—no flattery involved at all—about sending this bill to committee outside the House. I don't know whether the minister has ever sent one of his bills to committee outside the House but in my opinion, I think the minister himself would find that this is the only reasonable way for a matter like this to be handled. It's a procedure that the minister needn't fear at all.

The minister and his staff have valid reasons for putting the particular time sequences in the bill; they have valid reasons for making the changes that he's done. This is an opportunity for the committee and the public, in a way that you can't get inside the House, to become fully aware of the reasons for the changes and what is hoped for by the minister and his staff in the changes that are in the bill.

It's a really good way of having the public and those people most concerned with the administration of this Act, the various children's aid societies, to really be aware of what is on the minister's mind and the minds of the staff.

Secondly, I don't believe I have been in committee with any bill in which some good constructive changes have not occurred; ones with which the minister has agreed; ones that emerged which no one on the minister's staff had thought of prior to the printing of the bill. For that reason alone, even if only one change occurs, that is an improvement. By sending bill to committee, it is very much worth it.

For those reasons I would say to the minister, send it to committee and don't be concerned what will happen in committee. The minister hasn't taken a bill there, although before he became a minister he must have observed the procedure. After the first couple of days it becomes a fairly clumsy, reflective type of practice in which all parties, including the minister, are interested in getting the best wording for a given section and the best solution to cover the problem. The bill may state it one way, but upon due reflection on the problem and what steps need to be taken to meet that problem it becomes clear to all concerned that another way of doing it or an additional phrase or two would fully cover the situation.

The minister can get this in no other way than by sending that bill to committee outside the House. When he does, he'll find that there will be some members of the community, many of them may be directors of the various children's aid societies, and some may well be presidents of foster parents' associations across the province or presidents of organizations bringing in foster children from outside the country, who may wish to speak to this bill and come and make a real valuable contribution to that discussion.

It is a type of discussion that I would very much like to see, one which would be of benefit to all the members of this House, and as a result be of benefit particularly to the children of the Province of Ontario who unfortunately require the protection of this particular Act. That's the group which we have to keep in mind. That's the group that we are serving here and we want them served in the best possible way. We should take in their interests any procedures that we can take at this time to see if the Act which covers them can be improved in any way.

I urge upon the minister not to be apprehensive about sending this outside. It will be an educational experience for us all, rather than one which the minister of the government should be apprehensive about. I urge him very much to send this bill outside the House. Although I'm not on the particular committee to which this bill would go, I would be in full-time attendance because I have an interest in this area.

Speaking quite briefly—and I will speak briefly at this point to the bill in the hope that the minister will send it outside the House to committee—I congratulate him on the provision of homemakers to be placed

upon the premises. I too wonder, as the member for St. George does, about the funding for this. This could be more costly than any other sort of service we've provided?

If the minister is thinking of a staff member of the Children's Aid Society or some other resource person from the community moving into a home and living there for four or five days until the parent or parents return and sorting out whether that situation could continue or whether the children should be moved, then he is talking about not a small expense.

I can see where this provision of a homemaker is exceedingly applicable. I know a situation could arise of children coming into care, where one finds that three or four or five children have been deserted. A crucial situation arises. It comes to the attention of the society. They go in and determine this to be the case. They are stuck with four or five children on their hands immediately and the problem is right there.

Where do they place them? They are various ages and they inevitably get placed in more than one location. There are very few group homes that can take five children in one fell swoop or any short-term foster homes in which five children of various ages can be placed. What you have is two children in one place, two children in another place and a third child in yet a third place until one determines just the extent of the protection needed. If it's a case of desertion, this usually means inevitably Crown wardship and trying to find adoptive homes for them.

Because these are emergency foster placements the children may be there only a few days or weeks before one finds a slightly more permanent foster place, all the while leading up to some adoptive home if Crown wardship is awarded.

Placing a homemaker in that home for those days which it takes to determine whether or not one should seriously consider taking them into care with Crown wardship in mind as the final stage keeps the kids together anyway. It prevents them from being split up and being in the emergency foster placement situation, in yet one more place, before they get into the long-term foster placement leading to adoption.

I agree very much with the provision of these homemakers. At least, in the initial instance when protection is required, it prevents the splitting up of the children and makes for one less move, all of which is very unsettling for a child, irrespective of the age of that child.

It is well known that babies and very young children are very upset by any change of locale and there are very few 13, 14 or 15-year-olds as well who aren't upset, uncertain and pretty uptight about being moved to a different locale, be it a group home or a very supportive foster home. The whole thought of the move and trying to settle in and find their niche in whatever environment they are in is pretty unsettling and that is pretty well known. I see the provision of the homemaker as a step forward in that the children will not be split up in the initial instance and we save one more foster home placement. For that I give the minister full credit. I hope we fund this programme enough so that kind of homemaker service can be provided quite often in our communities.

Various other sections of the Act, Mr. Speaker, leave me disappointed. I agree with the member for Sudbury East and his comments about needing support for the natural parents—and the lack of it which really exists—and the complications this gives rise to.

I won't mention the name of the person involved but I remember one case in which the mother deserted. The father found himself with a 10-month-old girl on his hands and he was in a job location that was sort of half-work; he was half-working at the time. He needed to be present at various job sites in order to secure himself a position, even the half-time positions he was getting, and he had no way in which he could take care of the 10-month-old child.

In all honesty and trust he brought his 10-month-old daughter to the Children's Aid Society because he felt they would help him in this circumstance. To make a long story very short, in spite of his being able, at one point, to provide himself with a housekeeper—who turned out to be a woman older than himself by a fair degree, who needed a place to live for her 12-year-old child and herself—the Children's Aid, in their wisdom or lack of it, said this was not a good relationship and refused to accept that type of situation. He lost that child.

The Children's Aid Society won the Crown wardship case on that child, but she was three years old when they won it. They lost it in the first instance. The Children's Aid won it on appeal. A judgement was involved, on their part, that the provisions he had made were not somehow acceptable. They made a judgement that he might at some time—as if it was any of their business—get involved emotionally with this housekeeper whom he brought in, even though she was

older than he and it's none of their darned business. He was, in fact, providing a home for his own child but the Children's Aid decided this provision of a home was not appropriate. If there had been some alternative support given to the natural parents, this man might have taken his 10-month old daughter, rather than the Children's Aid, running the risk of the Crown wardship occurring and the Children's Aid Society permanently receiving his daughter. If there had been some other supportive agency in the community to which he could have gone for help he wouldn't have risked the permanent loss of his daughter. There is nothing in this Act that gives an alternative placement position to the natural parent, and this is very much lacking.

My colleague from Sudbury East mentioned there should be a province-wide committee to which various people connected with the Children's Aid Society could appeal on the placement of children. I would second those thoughts that there should probably be a province-wide committee to avoid going through the courts and all the expense of the courts, both on the part of the Children's Aid Society with their virtually full-time court worker on staff or the expenses for the person or the province through Legal Aid's provision of legal staff. It should be a committee to which decisions go so that Crown wardship could be reviewed and the yes or no decision rendered in a fairly reasonable fashion. I think it would have helped in the case of this particular man and his 10-month-old daughter, who was three years old before he finally lost her. It could have spoken and could have indicated which way it would have moved.

I think the decision in this particular case of this man, calling for provision or an alternate home for his own child was wrong. If that province-wide appeal committee agreed, then it's tantamount to saying to the Children's Aid Society: "Look, proceed with the court case at your own peril. There has been one group spoken to it."

This would be a committee to which a natural parent, as this man was, could appeal for a ruling on that judgement decision as to whether or not he was providing a good alternative home environment for his child; and foster parents could apply if they felt in their dealings with the local agency there was a decision being made relative to how much longer they could keep the child or whether they were providing good foster parenting or whether they were eligible for more children in the circumstances. There

they could have their particular case circumstances heard, free from the judgement decisions of the one worker and the one supervisor, which is usually what it boils down to in matters of this sort. Another group of people having province-wide experience in these cases could look at it and say: "Look, we don't agree with the judgement."

They would hear both sides but a group of persons not closely involved, could make a decision on that particular problem involving the foster parents or the foster child; or even adoptive parents could bring some problem which had arisen vis-à-vis the agency before the adoption became final. It would simply be a committee, preferably province-wide, where appeals and adjudication of problem areas could be held. I think this should be very worthwhile. It needn't be a big body, and it mightn't be that busy. The very fact of its existence in the area of relations with foster parents, adoptive parents and natural parents would be progress. The actions of the Children's Aid Society could be thrashed out and justice and judgement decisions given by parties which are not so intimately involved emotionally with the problem.

The remarks, Mr. Speaker, that I have made so far would imply that perhaps I'm not too happy with some of the decisions which Children's Aid Societies have made. In a couple of the instances I have in mind, that is true; but by no means do I want to leave the impression they are not a hard-working agency, that they don't in most instances make the right decisions and that they are not very helpful in support of the children. They are; but inevitably when one is dealing with children, sometimes very strongly-felt emotions are involved, and situations arise which a committee of this sort can straighten out. In an emotional situation one doesn't always get the right decisions. Sometimes situations harden. Positions get taken and positions harden.

A province-wide committee to which disputes of this kind can be taken, I think would be a very helpful body. I don't mean to imply at all that the Children's Aid Society is very often in the wrong and that it doesn't on the main do good work most of the time. But one inevitably will run into cases in which there is a lot of emotion involved. Under emotional stress, the wrong decisions can sometimes be made by a society which has a lot of the power behind it. There should be a way in which, easily and without much cost to the system of

Ontario, these situations can be taken into account.

One other area I would have hoped would have come into the Act is the area of subsidized adoption. This is as equally important as support to parents. I know again of one instance where a family was given, I believe two foster children, if I recall. At the time, they said: "We cannot afford to adopt." Although I can't remember the details for sure, I think the worker in this case was urging them to adopt and let the two particular children go into this foster home with the hope that, after they had been there for a while, the parents would get so emotionally involved with the children that when they announced that they were going to be eligible for adoption elsewhere the foster parents wouldn't want to see them go and would be forced into adopting them.

This is a hell of a way to operate in any event—a sort of blackmail of the foster parents into adopting the foster children which they had in their home. That situation should never have arisen. It should have clearly put children in there on a short-term basis, understanding that that home could never be forced into an adoptive situation. If you like, Mr. Speaker, that's a mistake in the way in which the worker operated in that particular placement. It arose again after the children had been there a couple of years. It was a case of: "We know you love the children very much and they are very settled here and getting along very well but we can no longer let this foster child arrangement pertain. You must adopt or out the children go."

The family came to me. They laid out their budget to me. They showed to me—they had two children of their own—that they could not afford to provide wholly for four children. They laid out to me their likely financial situation over the course of the next two years. At this point, they could predict that in two years time they would well be able to adopt, but at the moment they could not afford to do so. They didn't need all of the funding which they were getting as foster parents. What seemed very clear to me would be to have an arrangement evolve in which they adopted the children now, which they would like to do, except they couldn't afford to, and over the period of the next two years have a subsidy on that adoption. It worked out, looking at their budgets, that the persons could agree with me that if they got about one-third the current foster rate, they could get along on

that. By the time two years had gone by the contracts which the union was providing and furnishing in the past at the place at which the man worked would allow them to have caught up to the point where they could afford it. But there they were.

Subsidized adoptions are not allowed to take place except under very very special circumstances. The agency was rather loath to try it. They were rather loath to ask the ministry down here or even to ask a question about whether it could be countenanced in that particular case. There the situation rested. They adopt now or they give the children up now and financially they simply couldn't afford to. And yet they didn't need two-thirds of the money which the Children's Aid was providing to keep them as foster parents. About one-third of it would have been enough but the system did not easily allow for that one-third rate to come forward for a couple of years, particularly if those children were adopted on the spot which would have been the best solution for all concerned.

I don't know how we would word it to prevent every foster child in the country from being on subsidized adoption but I'm sure we could devise a way, and build more clearly into this Act subsidized adoption as a recognized way of dealing with the situation. As I say, there are various ways of subsidizing other than by direct money payments. Subsidized adoption really would come under the category I've already spoken of—that in terms of keeping families together support should be given to the natural parents. I would expect the amount of support needed to subsidize an adoption to be not very much different from the type of support and the amount of support needed by some families to keep those families together with their natural parents.

The last area I'd like to speak on—and I can well understand the minister's reluctance to get into this area—is the information available to adopted children when they become adult. We can all have our own views on this. I can see this not being a matter of party policy whatsoever but one of personal belief and personal policy; not party policy.

It is whether or not a child who has been adopted, even at birth, should, at the time of becoming an adult, have available to it the total information concerning its birth and the circumstances surrounding it. I feel that upon becoming adult, adopted children should have that right.

We live in an age in which, when March 17 comes around, everybody's Irish and all

the Irish have a great celebration. Some people in this province who are adopted and don't know who their natural parents are because they were adopted at birth might like to know whether one of their two parents was Irish. Do they have an Irish background or tradition? Then they could feel, when everyone else is celebrating on March 17, that they're part of the whole thing, too, even though their adoptive parents aren't, for example. Some very basic, life-enjoying points like that would be very useful for the child to know.

It is more basic than that. I don't feel we have a right to deny an adopted child information concerning his or her origins. I think they have a right to know it. There's a bit of concern in this area and some of it is justified. Any child who's adopted has been told by the parents who adopted him that he is adopted, so there's very little problem in that area. The child is told at some point that he is a child who has been picked out from all the rest available; that the two parents particularly wanted him and there he is happily living with the family.

No matter if he finds out his origins, that child is always, well on into his adulthood, going to look at his adoptive parents as his parents; there's no question about that. One can't live most of one's childhood with people one has called mom and dad and not feel that to be the circumstances. It's been covered, anyway. There's no threat to the relationship between the child and the adoptive parents by that child—now an adult—knowing what his origins were.

There is a problem, perhaps, in an adult turning up on the doorstep of someone 20 or 30 years older than he and saying, "Hi, Mom." But I think if this society is going to be worth anything in terms of explaining to people how one should behave, what's the best way to behave, what is psychologically right and wrong, at the time that information is requested and given, the entire area can be covered with the adopted child by a competent worker in a Children's Aid Society. They can cover the disadvantages of doing that, should the reason for doing it be to turn up and meet the natural parent at some point, and how it should be handled.

There may well be a letter or a phone call, saying, "The child you gave for adoption some 20 or 25 years ago is now requesting your identity. We don't have the right to withhold that; therefore, some time over the next two or three months we are going to tell him who his parents are. Therefore, there may well be some contact in the

future. As well, they would state what they were going to tell that person, what they were going to advise him to do and how to behave under those circumstances so that person wouldn't be turning up on the doorstep and perhaps causing a problem in terms of the changed family circumstances in which the mother or father, or both, are now immersed. But that can be handled in a way that minimizes any of those problems and fears that someone might have about passing on that information.

I feel it is a very basic right of any person, having been adopted, to know his or her origins. That should be in this amendment Act and in any Act which in this day and age changes the Child Welfare Act. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to be lengthy in talking on Bill 4, but I would like to recommend strongly to the minister that he attempt to keep our parliamentary system viable and that he likewise keep our committee system operative. By not referring this bill to the social development committee he is doing an injustice to everyone in this House. I hope he doesn't have intentions of not doing that.

We had extremely good experience last year, Mr. Speaker, when the education bill, Bill 72, was referred to the social development committee. We had input from all sides of the House and from all types of organizations; as a result, the Education Act was substantially improved. When the social development committee had the Health Disciplines Act, likewise there was substantial and constructive input from all of the disciplines.

I strongly suggest to the minister that he has an obligation and a duty to maintain the committee system and to have this bill referred to the committee so we can get input from anyone who wishes to provide input to improve the legislation.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that the private bills committee does sit. We don't have those private bills right in the House for consideration in the committee of the whole; they are always referred to a private bills committee so that we can get input from others, rather than simply the member who may be introducing the bill, even though he may be extremely knowledgeable concerning the bill.

This bill being so important and so vital in terms of dealing with child welfare, I think there is an obligation on the part of the

minister to see that it be referred to the private bills committee.

That is the extent of my comments, Mr. Speaker. I hope that the minister will take heed of the various other comments of the members here and send this bill to the social development committee so that we can get full discussion on every section of the bill. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the suggestions will all be constructive; they will be for the betterment of the children of the province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any other hon. members who wish to speak to this bill? If not, the hon. minister.

Mr. Stokes: Just say yes.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): On a point of privilege—

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the various comments—

Mr. Foulds: Surely the minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Oh, I am sorry.

Mr. Foulds: On a point of privilege, surely the minister, as a member and as a minister, is entitled to more than four supporters from his caucus to hear his important rebuttal in this debate.

Mr. Speaker: That is not really a point of privilege. Will the minister carry on with his reply?

Mr. Stokes: If it weren't for the people on this side, we wouldn't have a quorum.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mr. Foulds: A fox among the hens there, eh?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the various comments by the members on this very important piece of legislation.

I would say first, Mr. Speaker, that the Child Welfare Act—and I am told this by knowledgeable people—is one of the best Acts on the North American continent as far as services to children are concerned—

Mr. B. Newman: Then it won't have any problem in the bills committee.

Mr. R. S. Smith: It's not the best in the world?

Mr. Martel: That doesn't mean to say the others are very good though. They could be lousy.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: As I indicated, however, there is room for improvement, and this is why we are proposing these various amendments.

An hon. member: There's still room for more.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: As I mentioned in my opening remarks, Mr. Speaker, these changes have been asked by members in this House, by judges, by the children's aid societies, by various representatives—and these are intra-measures.

As the hon. members know, we are implementing some of the recommendations of the report on family law from the Ontario Law Reform Commission. There are many recommendations that require further study. Some of them are being reviewed by the Ministry of the Attorney General at present and will be implemented. So this amendment, Mr. Speaker, is strictly an intra-measure—

Mr. B. Newman: It's not good enough.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —to provide improvements where it is felt they should be made at this time. I think, listening to the various members, a great majority agree with many of the things that we are doing. We're providing homemaker services, non-ward agreements and so forth. Those are two of the main things.

Mr. Martel: That's the only thing that they are doing.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: There is also the one about the funding. I think the hon. members realize this is an area where many of the municipalities have made representations to us as well as several of the children's aid societies. Our formula, which was established about seven years ago, is working inversely due to changes in the social trends. In other words, the municipalities are paying a higher proportion of costs for children's services than the Ontario government.

Mr. R. S. Smith: What about regional governments? What do they pay?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This is also beneficial to regional governments.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Nipissing started off by saying "on very short notice."

As the hon. member knows, this has been on the order paper now for over a week. I do not believe this is really valid criticism that not sufficient notice was given.

Mr. R. S. Smith: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I was not criticizing the minister or the bill itself. I was criticizing the House leader who implied to us last Wednesday, on a list provided to our House leader, that it was not one of the bills that would be called before Easter.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, I take exception to that, because I knew very well that the minister wanted the bill through before the end of the month. And I said so to both parties. So don't come in here with that kind of allegation.

Mr. R. S. Smith: It was not on the list. There were two bills provided on the list by the House leader, and this was neither of them. The NDP critic will tell the minister the same thing.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: In the question of timing, I won't put my finger on what day it was, but the member can be sure that he was notified; and don't let him tell me he wasn't.

Mrs. Campbell: On Friday.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, of course we found out yesterday that the bill was going to be debated today, but we're supposed to get that on Thursdays, according to the regulations.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Martel: We're supposed to get it on Thursdays.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister will please carry on.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I will try and not be too provocative. The hon. member referred to the definition of director. Mr. Speaker, the definition of director conforms to our existing legislation. This is consistent with our existing legislation and it's consistent with our policy of decentralization; so the minister has the authority to appoint a director. It doesn't specifically have to be the director of the children's services bureau.

The hon. member referred to the funding formula. I sincerely say, Mr. Speaker, that by changing the formula to the regulations, it certainly makes it much more flexible than having it in the Act. The procedures of amending an Act are complex, so it's much faster and more flexible to have the funding formula in the regulations.

Mr. Martel: Now it's based on trust. At least I would know if it's in the Act. I never know what the government is pulling.

Mr. R. S. Smith: How do we know it is 50-50 when it comes into the regulations?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I stated it publicly, Mr. Speaker, that the formula was being increased from 60 per cent to 80 per cent.

Mrs. Campbell: What about those who get 100 per cent?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Everyone has had an opportunity to speak. Will the minister continue his reply?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member also referred to the responsibility of regional governments and this is covered in the respective regional Acts.

The hon. member referred to disturbed children and the treatment of these children in their own homes, and said that they should be provided with facilities, psychiatric care and so forth. We agree entirely that more of this should be done and more will be done.

Although it's not mentioned in the Act, the Children's Aid Society does have authority to purchase these services at the present time and it is doing this.

The hon. member for Sudbury East referred to a very important area, and we agree, the area of prevention. The hon. member knows that the Hanson task force referred to this considerably—more services to families, more daycare services, more homemaker services, vocational training and so forth.

I'd like to mention, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the Hanson task force report, that there is a working committee presently sitting. They had a meeting today, and they met about a month ago. This is a committee comprised of representatives of the children's aid societies, the provincial-municipal liaison committee and our senior staff and its purpose is to implement the recommendations of that task force. The whole emphasis is on prevention and on keeping families together, keeping the children in their own homes. This is the whole emphasis, this is the direction in

which we are moving, and we've made some concrete, positive steps in that area.

Mr. Martel: Not very many. All they have done is introduced a homemaker.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Maybe not as many as we would all like, but we have to be guided by our financial resources as well as our human resources.

Mr. Martel: It would be cheaper.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In the long run, we agree. The same applies, of course, in the health area and it applies everywhere; preventive services.

The hon. member referred to accountability. The director is accountable to the minister, so there is definitely an accountability policy.

Mr. Roy: We are not talking about the same thing there.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: He referred to insufficient assistance to natural parents, and that higher allowances should be given to the natural parents as we are now giving them to foster parents. I do not believe that we should be giving the same allowances to natural parents as we are giving to foster parents. The cost would be extremely high.

Mr. Martel: Nobody said the same. Let's not run a red herring across the stage. Nobody said the same.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The hon. member said we are spending much more money in placing children in institutions and that, therefore, it would be best for the children and best for everyone concerned if they were kept in their own homes or in group homes; and with this we agree.

Mr. Martel: But they are not doing anything.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes we are. We are definitely doing this in this area.

Mr. Martel: This Act sure doesn't do it.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The member referred to foster parents. May I remind him that section 18, subsection 2, provides for regular visits to a foster home by a social worker from the Children's Aid Society. It says in the regulation that there must be a visit within the first seven days; and secondly, that there must be at least one other visit within 30 days from the first visit, and then

subsequently there should be a visit every three months. This is in the regulations.

Mr. Martel: Yes, sure; they run in and out.

Mrs. Campbell: It is not adequate.

Mr. Martel: Take a look at the caseloads.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The hon. member referred again to—

Mr. Martel: They might have to spend a week right in the house, not two hours.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: He referred to keeping the children with their natural parents. Again, we agree entirely with those views. This is the area we are trying to improve, to keep the children with their natural parents.

Mr. Martel: They aren't doing a thing about it.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We are. In the last year we have increased our budget substantially for homemaker services, we have implemented a special programme for daycare services and this whole area of services to families has been greatly increased.

Mr. Martel: How can the minister confuse them?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I'd like to mention also that the Children's Aid Society removes children from their natural parents only as a last resort—

Mr. Martel: The policy minister wants to help the minister. Let her get into the act. That will really muddy the water.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle:—only when it is felt that the children are in need of protection. The hon. member referred to grievance procedures. There is an appeal to the courts; it's available now to natural parents when the child is removed from them.

Mr. Martel: Nobody is talking about when the child is removed from the parents.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The member referred to the Child Welfare Act. He doesn't like the name. Again, we're open for suggestions but at the same time I think the connotation of welfare doesn't necessarily denote social assistance. Welfare can denote assistance in a variety of ways.

Mr. Martel: But it does.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Again, we have an open mind on this. The hon. member and

several other members mentioned that this bill should go to the standing committee instead of the committee of the whole House.

Mr. Martel: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am reluctant to do this for various reasons, Mr. Speaker. One is that the standing committees have not yet been appointed to my knowledge.

Mr. Martel: Sure they have been appointed.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: If they have been appointed, they will not be in operation until after—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): They can sit tomorrow.

Mr. Stokes: Later tonight, if the minister wants.

Mr. Deans: They can sit tomorrow.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Otherwise, if it goes until after the budget and the budget is on April 7, this is quite a delay. It means we will get considerable criticism from the municipalities which were looking forward to the implementation of this Act in order that they can receive the increased funding under the revised formula.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Let the opposition members accept their responsibilities.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, it can be back-dated as the government has done with the Election Act. It back-dated a certain portion of it to take effect as of Feb. 13, so the minister shouldn't play games.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Also, Mr. Speaker, this was mentioned by other members and as I mentioned earlier, these are interim measures—

Mr. Martel: Let's deal with them now.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We agreed that more should be done to reinforce and strengthen this Act and that is why the working committee I outlined a little while ago is presently making recommendations to us. Again there is the Ontario Law Reform Commission. The federal Juvenile Delinquency Act is also another Act by the federal government which certainly has relevance to various matters relating to Children's Act services.

Mr. Martel: What is the minister so horrified about? Why doesn't he allow the public to have an input for a change?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The hon. member for St. George, Mr. Speaker, also made some very constructive comments. She supported the more preventive services to families. She referred to homemakers' services. She was in agreement with the provision in the amendment to the Act. Then she inquired about the funding, what funding would be available.

Mr. Speaker, there is funding available under the existing budget and there could be a saving because I think providing a homemaker in the home is usually for a short period. If it's for more than five days we need an order from a judge, but on the average it could be, maybe, for two or three weeks or a month at the most. Once the children are removed from the home as they are now and placed either in a foster home or wherever the case may be it's much lengthier and therefore much costlier. We do believe the children's aid societies will have adequate funds to look after homemakers' services.

She referred to facilities for delinquent children and said they are presently not sufficiently available. We agree that the children, instead of being placed in institutions, should be placed in group homes or other types of homes within their own communities. We entirely agree and steps are being taken to bring this about.

Mrs. Campbell: The government doesn't have them.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: She also referred to the reasonable notice to a society under section 26 subsection (3)—section 18 in the new bill—and it's to give the society an opportunity to appear before a court before disposition of a case. Society representatives can then inform the court of available facilities.

Mr. P. Taylor: Does the minister remember what he said?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The hon. member for Windsor West approved of the homemakers' services to the families. He referred to an appeal committee of interested citizens whereby grievances and disputes could be brought to them; I think there is considerable merit in that suggestion. I think it is one that I and the officials will consider. I also will refer this to the working committee comprising the one I just referred to,

the municipal liaison committee, the Children's Aid, and our senior staff.

He also felt it was a basic right that adopted children, once they became adults should—

Mr. Martel: Changing coats again?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: —be told, or should be able to have the information on their natural parents. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is a very difficult question. I am sure there are many views on this, or different schools of thought. I have read considerable information about the subject matter. It is one, I believe, on which we would have to have input from the children's aid societies, from the Ministry of the Attorney General and others.

There are very good reasons why this should be done, I believe; at the same time, there are probably very good reasons why it should not be done. I think in all these matters we should consider what is best for the child—what is in the child's interest. However, Mr. Speaker, it is the one matter I will be pleased to give further consideration to, because it is very complex matter.

Mr. Speaker, again I wish to thank the hon. members for their various comments. I do feel, as I said, that this is strictly an interim bill. The main provisions are the increase in funding and the provision of homemaker services. There is also the provision about the non-ward grievance and also the various recommendations for clarification procedures requested by provincial judges and by the Children's Aid Society. Now, I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that this bill could go to the committee of the whole House.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is for—

Mr. Martel: Could I ask the minister, Mr. Speaker, why he will not send it to a committee? He's given three reasons and he's bombed on all three as to why he didn't want it to go to a committee of the House. He first said it was because the committees weren't as yet fixed.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): This is out of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Martel: I asked if I could ask the—

Mr. Speaker: If you wish to ask for clarification, it must not have been asked before and answered. But I distinctly heard that matter discussed.

Mr. Martel: But, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The motion is for second reading of Bill 4.

Shall the motion carry?

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Those in favour of Bill 4 being read a second time will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "ayes" have it.

Call in the members.

Mr. Speaker: It has been agreed to dispense with the recorded vote on second read-

ing of this bill. Is there unanimous agreement?

Motion agreed to, second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, in a spirit of co-operation, I move that this be sent to the standing committee tomorrow morning.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

ERRATUM

No.	Page	Col.	Lines	Should read:
8	309	2	39-41	back in 1966. Last year the ministry's appraisers were in the vicinity and, according to the information I received from the

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 25, 1975

Algonquin College, statement by Mr. Auld	408
Housing programmes, statement by Mr. Irvine	409
Asbestos problem, statement by Mr. MacBeth	410
Burlington Bay sewage treatment facility, questions of Mr. Irvine and Mr. W. Newman: Mr. R. F. Nixon	410
Housing Action Programme policy, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Ferrier	411
Tay township development freeze, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. R. F. Nixon	412
CO-Urban system, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Roy	413
Housing programmes, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Deans, Mr. Cassidy	414
Asbestos problem, questions of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Deans, Mr. Shulman	415
Lead pollution, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Riddell	416
Ontario Humane Society grants, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Ferrier	417
Algonquin College, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. P. Taylor, Mr. Roy, Mr. Cassidy	417
Thunder Bay government complex, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Foulds	418
Raspberry case appeal, questions of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Gaunt	418
OHC bribery charges, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Young, Mr. Roy	419
Catalytic converters, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Ruston	419
Preliminary court hearings, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Roy	419
Infiltration allegation, question of Mr. Clement: Mr. Laughren	420
Non-returnable containers, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Haggerty	420
Antibiotics in animal feed, questions of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Burr	421
Report, standing procedural affairs committee, Mr. Morrow	421
Dryden municipal services, statement by Mr. McKeough	422
Masora University Act, Mr. J. R. Smith, first reading	423
Judicature Amendment Act, Mr. Roy, first reading	423
Town of Seaforth Act, Mr. Riddell, first reading	423
Ontario Human Rights Code Amendment Act, 1974, Mr. B. Newman, first reading	423
Ontario Energy Board Amendment Act, Mr. Young, first reading	423
Quinn Lumber and Builders' Supply Co. Ltd. Act, 1975, Mr. Walker, first reading	423

Borough of Etobicoke Act, (1), Mr. Leluk, first reading	423
Borough of Etobicoke Act, (2), Mr. Leluk, first reading	423
Retail Sales Tax Amendment Act, Mr. Edighoffer, first reading	423
City of Kingston Act, Mr. Apps, first reading	423
Borough of Scarborough Act, Mr. Drea, first reading	424
Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 1975, Mr. Rhodes, second reading	424
Pollution Abatement Incentive Amendment Act, 1975, Mr. W. Newman, second reading	424
Third readings	425
Child Welfare Amendment Act, 1975, Mr. Brunelle, second reading	425
Recess, 6 o'clock	446



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, March 25, 1975

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 25, 1975

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Carleton East.

Mr. P. Taylor (Carleton East): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Come on, let's hear it from the Chairman of the Management Board.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Members opposite only have four members here.

Mr. Roy: That's more than the minister has back there.

Mr. P. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The opposition has two supporters.

Mr. Roy: The government has three bodies there but—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Carleton East has the floor. Will he commence, please?

Mr. P. Taylor: I will if I am allowed to, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your concern but the Chairman of the Management Board or the government House leader, however he wishes to be known, is obviously having difficulty controlling his side of the House, which means himself—because there aren't very many others there and those who—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Will the member say that again, please?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order!

Mr. P. Taylor: It's okay, the minister will get it in Hansard.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It's the member in front of him who is giving the member difficulties.

Mr. P. Taylor: Yes.

Mr. Roy: The Chairman of Management Board should hold himself together.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I would say the same to the member for Ottawa East.

Mr. P. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to support the motion moved by my leader, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. R. F. Nixon), and seconded by the deputy leader of our party, the member for York Centre (Mr. Deacon).

Mr. J. H. Jessiman (Fort William): Who are not here!

Mr. P. Taylor: Listen, if my friend wants to get into the business of attendance in the House, we can look at the vacant benches on his side, so I wouldn't start into that.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Oh, cut that out.

Mr. P. Taylor: For the last two days in a row in this House, the government has respectively—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member couldn't call a vote if he wanted to, and he only needs five members; so cut that out.

Mr. P. Taylor: —has had respectively 11 and 12 ministers in the question period. They are making a mockery of that, so I wouldn't get into that business, my friend.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member couldn't call a vote, he doesn't have enough people.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. member continue?

Mr. P. Taylor: Yes, I would like to, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Roy: Will you bring the House leader under control, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. P. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I felt a certain degree of empathy for Her Excellency, the Lieutenant Governor. It was apparently her first experience reading a Speech from the Throne, and it certainly was my first time hearing one in this House. For her sake I hope it wasn't too great a disappointment that she had to read as her first Speech from the Throne one of such little substance.

For the people of Ontario it was another indication that the Conservative Party has lost both the will and the ability to provide this province with leadership. This Speech from the Throne was devoid of any programme. In fact, in my opinion, it made a mockery of the tradition of the Speech from the Throne, a tradition which says that such speeches are to indicate to the Legislature—and, by extension, the people of Ontario—the programme the government intends to bring forward in the ensuing session.

This speech, in my opinion, heralds a new era of arrogance in which the government of Ontario says to the people, "We believe more in the public relations approach than in telling you what we intend to do for you in the ensuing session."

An hon. member: Right on.

Mr. P. Taylor: Since that speech on March 11 we've learned that the Tory government will bring in a goody or goodies each day up to and including April 7, when we will receive the budget, which of course will be a bushel of goodies designed to win over the electorate.

Mr. Roy: What's on tap for tomorrow?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Carleton East has the floor.

Mr. Roy: The House leader should give us a schedule.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. P. Taylor: They missed bringing in a goody today because, as I said earlier in response to an interjection from my friend over there, they had less than half the cabinet here today. They only had 11 ministers, which of course is another issue, and which makes a mockery of the question period—a time when the majority of ministers should be here to respond to questions from the opposition parties.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Not the kind of questions the member would ask.

Mr. P. Taylor: The tactics I just mentioned a moment ago are well known, but just to give them a little more credence I would quote from the Toronto Star of Monday, March 24, and an article by Charlotte Montgomery. She says in about the fifth paragraph: "The government was expected to follow the Throne Speech with a daily parade of announcements designed to catch sustained publicity as it heads towards an election." Don't take my word for it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Roy: How cynical can the House leader be?

Mr. Jessiman: The member is lucky—here comes the member for Welland South (Mr. Haggerty).

Mr. P. Taylor: M. l'Orateur, pour quelques instants je veux m'adresser au sujet du bilinguisme dans la province d'Ontario.

This is a government, Mr. Speaker, that professes to believe in official bilingualism. This is a government that consistently fails to allocate its full share of federal bilingualism grants. This is also a government that consistently fails to put bilingual people into jobs in areas of the province where they are badly needed.

M. l'Orateur, je reçois quotidiennement des lettres de mes électeurs et des électeurs dans d'autres comtés dans l'est de l'Ontario indiquant qu'ils sont frustrés d'un jour à l'autre à cause de l'absence de fonctionnaires bilingues.

These are not, by and large, educated people who are complaining of the lack of bilingualism. These are pensioners, people on low and fixed incomes, people of less advantage than you and me. These are the people who are confronting the bureaucracy and the system, largely unilingual, French-language people who have been told that the Ontario government will render its services in bilingual areas of the province bilingually, and it hasn't done it. There is widespread disappointment in eastern Ontario, where I come from.

However, I want to commend one high official of the provincial bureaucracy who has done something. I speak of the chief electoral officer and the Clerk of this House, and I say that perhaps after hearing my comments in this House last fall about the lack of bilingualism in the polling places of this province, he has taken action. He has ordered that the printed materials in the polling places in Ontario be bilingual. He has done this because he is independent of the rest of the bureaucracy in the Ontario govern-

ment, but more so because he cares and he responds to a need when he sees it; and I commend him for that.

Mr. Roy: Right on.

Mr. P. Taylor: I am sure a lot of people, a lot of the older members around here, the ones who have been around here a long time, are getting pretty sick and tired of hearing about eastern Ontario and neglect.

Mr. G. Samis (Stormont): Why should they get sick and tired of hearing it? They haven't heard it from their back-benchers.

Mr. P. Taylor: I am going to get to that. My hon. friend from Stormont—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It will be from northern Ontario, I know.

Mr. P. Taylor: —makes that point, and I am going to get to that because—

Mr. Samis: It's time the government heard from the east.

Mr. P. Taylor: —if they are getting sick and tired of it, they can be very certain the people of eastern Ontario are sick and tired of it. They are saying why is nothing ever done to bring the economy of eastern Ontario even up to a semblance of the economy of the part of the province where this Legislature is situated. The fact that so little has been done in eastern Ontario must have something to do with the representation from that part of the province on the government side of the House.

Mr. Samis: Where are they tonight?

Mr. P. Taylor: I mean, what else? They obviously haven't articulated the case and the cabinet obviously hasn't listened to them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think they better get ready over there. They are getting another member, it seems to me. He is coming across there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Carleton East has the floor.

Mr. P. Taylor: If the government House leader can just contain himself; and if my friend over here could just get me a glass of water, I would be very happy. Thanks very much.

Mr. Speaker: let me give you two examples of what I am talking about. This gov-

ernment belatedly ordered the construction of Highway 417, many years after it was needed in the first instance.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): It was 15 years too late.

Mr. P. Taylor: This government ordered the construction of that highway—I am not certain just how many years ago, but it sure took a long time to build—and it isn't, even yet, fully connected to the city of Ottawa. We are fighting through the mud on that one.

Mr. Haggerty: In the fullness of time.

Mr. P. Taylor: In the fullness of time, it will be connected to Ottawa. This government, knowing of the need for Highway 417, took all those years to make that decision. Then once the decision was implemented and the highway was under construction, it knew full well the impact that highway would have on the economy of the Highway 17 area, the scenic route.

Once the people of the Highway 17 area became exercised over their plight as a result of the impending existence of Highway 417, the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett) said this Ontario government will make sure the Highway 17 area is promoted and assisted as a tourism region. That was fine and dandy as far as it went. Subsequently, we find out that various property owners and tourism developers along the Highway 17 route have made applications to agencies like the Eastern Ontario Development Corp., after making substantial investments in their own areas. They are being told—now get this—by agencies like the EODC that the Highway 17 area is not a viable tourist region.

Mr. Haggerty: Shame, shame.

Mr. P. Taylor: Let's make up our minds, fellows. The minister says it is going to be promoted as a tourist region by this government and there are going to be economic incentives to produce job-creating projects and to entice tourists off 417 and back on to 17 as the scenic route. And the agencies of this government are contradicting that by declaring the region not viable for tourism, and thereby not coming up with the kinds of loans and grants the businessmen need to turn it into a decent tourist region.

Mr. Roy: Shame.

Mr. P. Taylor: Let's look at the other example in eastern Ontario, the purchase of

100,000 acres near Prescott in Edwardsburgh township.

Mr. Roy: That was a farce.

Mr. P. Taylor: Now we all know the sad story of how the eastern Ontario ministers, all three of them, were not consulted in this acquisition, and in fact got themselves into an incredibly embarrassing situation by criticizing the purchase as they were being made, unbeknownst to them, by the government.

Mr. Samis: So they say.

Mr. P. Taylor: Here we have, in one fell swoop, the former Treasurer (Mr. White) ordering the acquisition of 10,000 acres of land in an area of the province where existing industrial park lands and existing urbanized area need industrial incentives. They need help to bring—

Mr. Samis: That's what we have been saying.

Mr. P. Taylor: —industry into their areas. I think of Cornwall and I think of Kingston—

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): We've got an agreement on that. What is the member talking about?

Mr. P. Taylor: —and Brockville and so on. I know it is hard for the member for Renfrew South to understand. He doesn't know anything about eastern Ontario. Don't interrupt me.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Is the member saying that the other member knows nothing about eastern Ontario?

Mr. P. Taylor: No, he doesn't. He doesn't know anything about it.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Come around. Both members should grow up.

Mr. P. Taylor: If that member knew anything about—he doesn't know anything.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Mr. Roy: That member doesn't know anything about anything.

Mr. P. Taylor: If the member who is interjecting—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Schoolboy Roy was no trouble.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Carleton East has the floor and I would ask him to continue.

Mr. P. Taylor: Is that the member for Renfrew South? Is that who it is?

Mr. Samis: Rep by pop.

Mr. P. Taylor: Rep by pop, right. There's the man who's interjecting, the member for Renfrew South.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: And don't forget to say baby.

Mr. P. Taylor: Okay, Eric baby! Right on.

I don't know how long the member for Renfrew South has been in this House, but he's been in this House for an awfully long time.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That makes me feel much better.

Mr. P. Taylor: He is one of the members who has failed to inject the opinions—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has a point of order he would like to raise.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I wish you would enforce the rules of the House. You know very well that members of the House are not supposed to refer to other members by their names; and Eric baby is even a misnomer.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I agree with that. Make him withdraw.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member doesn't have a point of order. I'll ask the hon. member for Carleton East to continue.

Mr. P. Taylor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I really appreciate the point made by my friend from Port Arthur because the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) never refers to any members in this House by their ridings or by their portfolios, so what's new?

Mr. Samis: Come, come now.

Mr. P. Taylor: My friend from Renfrew South is being represented—

Mr. Foulds: That's an argumentum ad hominum if I ever heard one.

Mr. P. Taylor: —by the government House leader as someone who knows a great deal about eastern Ontario.

Mr. Roy: He knows himself.

Mr. P. Taylor: If he knew half as much as the other members from that part of the province know, this government would be doing something for eastern Ontario.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): They just made him chairman of ONR.

Mr. P. Taylor: The member for Renfrew South obviously hasn't had the kind of influence and input into cabinet decisions of his government that he should have had as a member representing a distinctly identifiable region of this province.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I would still rather listen to him than to this member.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Is that member in the cabinet?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, I am.

Mr. Laughren: Don't try it.

Mr. P. Taylor: I want to talk about land use planning and housing.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Is the member against that? Let him say so.

Mr. P. Taylor: This government doesn't understand those two terms. This government doesn't understand that we have to talk about housing and land use planning virtually in the same breath. They are not unrelated. We've been promised a plan for Ontario. I don't want members to take my word for it; I refer to the *Globe and Mail*, page 8, Sat., March 22, a piece by Robert Williamson. He says as follows:

Ambitious plans for a future studded with new cities and a provincial growth plan to assemble a clear picture from the jigsaw of local planning initiatives have been put on a back-burner at Queen's Park. Put it down to three things; a reluctance by the government to turn unnecessary stones in an election year; acceptance of more conservative growth projections; and the return of Darcy McKeough as Treasurer and chief planner. There will be no showing of the promised rudimentary provincial plan before May or June and it will be next year before anything is finalized. It was first mentioned last October when then-Treasurer John White indicated it would be unveiled within a month.

He goes on to talk about this business about a provincial plan, something we've been promised for a long time. He says:

There have been subtle changes in the government's attitude to the provincial plan now waiting in Mr. McKeough's desk drawer until after the April 7 budget. It is now referred to as a strategy rather than a plan. Whatever emphasis the government does finally put on the document, it will go to considerable lengths in this election year to avoid criticism that it is imposing its heavy-handed design on the province from an ivory tower in Toronto. Comments by Premier William Davis at the release of the Throne Speech last week gave some hints of government thinking.

Mr. Laughren: The blind leading the blind.

Mr. P. Taylor: To continue:

Mr. Davis sensed a mood in the electorate that people are being over-governed and he said he will respond by bringing in a more restrained legislative programme.

Mr. Foulds: The member for Timiskaming (Mr. Havrot) shouldn't buy it.

Mr. P. Taylor: That is very revealing, Mr. Speaker, because this party has been saying for a very long time that this government doesn't even begin to understand—

Mr. Laughren: Is the member for Timiskaming replacing ONR with Krauss-Maffei?

Mr. P. Taylor: —the business of centralized bureaucracy influencing local events. It would seem that something is getting through to the Premier but it may be too late.

Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks my leader has asked me to assume the responsibilities as official opposition critic on communications policy and I'm deeply honoured to do that. As a broadcast journalist, film-maker, public relations practitioner and someone with an intimate knowledge of communications hardware, I feel the past dozen years have given me an adequate base from which to do this job.

My first day on the job, the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Rhodes) made a statement on federal-provincial relations as they pertained to cable television. That statement was just another drop in the bucket of the anti-federal government diatribe that we have been fed for the last few weeks.

An hon. member: Most of it is accurate.

Mr. P. Taylor: My question to him revealed that Ontario does indeed want jurisdiction over cable television. The federal position is clear. The federal minister responsible for communications has told the provinces that if they want to negotiate jurisdiction over cable it is a constitutional matter, and therefore should be discussed at the first ministers' level. This government refuses to acknowledge that fact and instead chooses to make silly attacks on the federal bureaucracy and the federal government.

My suggestion to the government is: Why not look for an area of agreement on this subject? Why not probe the business that Ottawa has said is open for probing, and that is the sharing of the jurisdiction and the sharing of the administrative control over cable television? I should add, Mr. Speaker, that we in the Liberal caucus are somewhat sympathetic with the minister's objectives regarding cable television. We just wish he would go about it in a much more constructive manner.

I would like to deal now for a few minutes on the question of the conduct of the business of the House and the conditions I feel that affect my performance as a private member. I hope that some of my colleagues in the House will agree with some of the things I intend to say on this.

I feel at a time when both political institutions and politicians in general are under more scrutiny and attack than in recent history. The level of public cynicism about us and the parliaments we serve is very high. There are more politicians and near politicians in prison today in North America than ever before.

Mr. Foulds: Some of them are even in asylums like this.

Mr. P. Taylor: I believe the public's understanding of the role of Legislature and of the role of us, as members, is very low. I also believe that we are doing extremely little to help them understand better what this Legislature is trying to do.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): I don't agree with that.

Mr. P. Taylor: We are doing little, I feel, to make this House more productive and less susceptible to bedlam.

Mr. Deans: Most members do a pretty good job in trying to stand up and speak.

Mr. P. Taylor: And I believe one way to improve the public's understanding of what

we are doing, and certainly another way to render our collective behaviour more constructive, would be to render the debates of this House open to broadcast coverage.

Mr. Foulds: Conflict of interest.

Mr. P. Taylor: And again I don't speak alone.

An hon. member: We hope not.

Mr. P. Taylor: Canadian Press reported, as reprinted in the Toronto Star, Monday, March 24, 1975:

House of Commons Speaker James Jerome says he is convinced televising the Commons debates is a good idea. Jerome, Speaker since last August, said televising debates might help make parliament real to more Canadians.

But I think, perhaps, the most important factor influencing how we conduct the government's business is the cost to us individually of being members of this House; both the cost in dollars and the cost in human terms. I would like to read an excerpt from Norman Webster's column in the Globe and Mail recently, in which he said:

Pauline McGibbon had some interesting observations in an interview the other day. I asked the Lieutenant Governor whether she had ever considered channelling her formidable talent into politics. She replied: "I don't think I have the ability to stand the slings and arrows that one has to take in politics. You have got to have the hide of a rhinoceros to survive."

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Ask the member for Timiskaming.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): I haven't got the face of one like the member for Sudbury.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Havrot: When did he come out of the woodwork?

Mr. P. Taylor: Mr. Webster went on to say:

Politics is a rough game and always will be and, indeed, probably should be. The question is: Is it becoming unnecessarily so? It is a serious question, because if the answer is yes, then we're destined to get only politicians with rhino hides, and such hides unfortunately often cover rhino minds, with all the insight and flexibility that that implies.

There are two disturbing trends. The first is a loading up of our political system's tendencies to look to the politicians for a solution to every problem.

Later he added:

A second allied trend is to believe the worst of public figures. Not only should they tackle every problem, but if they come up with a solution that displeases, then it must have been for corrupt or cynical motives. The response then is not to criticize the politician's reasoning, but to attack him personally.

Mr. Deans: And Norman Webster wouldn't do that.

Mr. P. Taylor: The member for Wentworth—

Mr. Deans: Norman Webster wouldn't do a thing like that.

Mr. Foulds: He is speaking from personal knowledge.

Mr. P. Taylor: I'd like to go on record as saying that I think Mr. Webster and the Globe and Mail, by virtue of the existence of this column, are rendering a great service to this House.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Did the member for Carleton East file his speech tonight?

Mr. Roy: He doesn't have to, they will pick it up. They will pick up anything intelligent said in this place.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: What about that then?

Mr. Roy: We'll worry about that when it happens.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. P. Taylor: The Globe and Mail, by virtue of the space they make available and the choice they've made in the columnist to deal with this subject—

An hon. member: What is this?

Mr. P. Taylor: —has made this Legislature more meaningful to more people and that should be extended, I believe, to broadcast coverage in this House.

Mr. Foulds: The member for Carleton East is not going to make the column with that speech.

An hon. member: His own men can't take it.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Doesn't the member think that the day they put the Senate on television it will be the end?

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes. It will do away with every soap opera in Canada.

Mr. Lawlor: Thank God.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Carleton East has the floor.

Mr. Lawlor: He is doing very well today.

Mr. Bullbrook: The Senate will be known as "The Edge of Night."

Mr. P. Taylor: "As the Legislature Turns."

Mr. Foulds: I thought it would be "The Days of Our Lives."

Mr. P. Taylor: Dealing with this matter of cost to us, as individuals, in dollar terms, I would like to put a few facts before the House.

In 1894, the year after this building was opened, there were 91 members.

Mr. Foulds: Some of them are still here, aren't they?

Mr. P. Taylor: There were 91 members representing a total population of 2.1 million, or one member for every 23,000 Ontarians. Later this year, this House will accommodate 125 members, representing an estimated population of 8.1 million, or one for every 64,000 population.

Had Ontario retained the concept of representation on the basis of one member for every 23,000 of population, there would, later this year, be 352 members of this House. If 352 MPPs were earning \$22,500, that would cost \$7.9 million, rounded off to \$8 million. Later this year there will be 125 members and they will be earning \$22,500 and they will be costing the public treasury \$2.8 million.

Now, 125 members today, representing more than three times the number of people that our predecessors represented, in my opinion are working much harder and longer, and yet the conditions, both practical and financial, under which we work perpetuate this job as a part-time rich man's preserve.

An hon. member: Is the member kidding?

Mr. P. Taylor: If you don't want to believe me, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Havrot: The member's leader wants to cut the cabinet by 40 per cent.

Mr. P. Taylor: —would like to quote Mr. Mike Martin, the leader of the New Labrador Party—

An hon. member: A good man.

Mr. P. Taylor: —who announced that he will resign from politics at the end of the current Legislature in Newfoundland-Labrador and move to Calgary, of all places.

Mr. Roy: That's where the money is.

Mr. P. Taylor: I quote: "Quoting Mr. Martin, 36 years old, he says: 'It's a rich man's game.' He said his resignation will leave two vacancies—and so forth. Now, here's a fellow who is calling a spade a spade, in my opinion.

I would like to deal very quickly with my own situation.

Mr. Samis: Look at the size of Mr. Martin's riding.

Mr. P. Taylor: Very big. It's enormous.

The reality of my own situation is that I'm a man of modest means and when I was elected in November I had a modest bank account of just over \$2,000 and I have depleted that. It's now gone in the course of five months of service to the Legislature.

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): The member is living too high off the hog.

Mr. P. Taylor: I've been depleting my own savings at the rate of \$400 a month. Morally, I think that it is wrong for the system to perpetuate that situation.

I believe that one's personal commitment to this type of work should be enough. I ask what other occupational group in this country or this province takes a job that costs them money?

Mr. Lawlor: Listen, we are within the top 10 per cent bracket of the whole population.

Mr. P. Taylor: I'm sorry, my hon. friend, the member for wherever it is—

Mr. Foulds: Lakeshore.

An hon. member: A great riding.

Mr. P. Taylor: Lakeshore—says I'm in one of the top 10 brackets. That's fine, but it's irrelevant. Who takes a job that costs them money, tell me that? I don't mind investing my time.

Mr. Deans: How is it costing him money?

Mr. P. Taylor: It is costing me money because I have to retain a residence in Ottawa.

Mr. Deans: Right, which he would have had anyway.

Mr. P. Taylor: Yes. It is costing me money because—

Mr. Deans: And he gets an allowance for a residence here; okay.

Mr. P. Taylor: Yes. I'm not complaining about the flights, about the accommodation allowance, about the mileage on the car.

Mr. Deans: How is it costing him money?

Mr. P. Taylor: It is costing me money because I buy three meals a day while I'm in Toronto.

Mr. Deans: Wouldn't he eat three meals anyway?

Mr. P. Taylor: No, the member knows the difference between buying meals in a city away from home and eating at home. If he doesn't know that, he shouldn't be here.

Mr. Deans: Didn't he buy meals when he was in broadcasting?

Mr. P. Taylor: They were all paid for out of an expense account.

Mr. Deans: Oh, I see.

Mr. Germa: Shame, shame. Most people buy their own meals.

Mr. P. Taylor: Yes. Now I'd like to make a suggestion—and I'm sorry I wasn't here when the Camp commission was doing its thing.

Mr. Germa: Is he going to recommend a raise in pay?

Mr. P. Taylor: I'm recommending that we be paid a decent executive salary—

An hon. member: Holy smoke!

Mr. P. Taylor: —that is entirely taxable, and that we be given a limited expense account which is—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Did he talk about that during the election campaign?

Mr. P. Taylor: Yes, I did. I said that very thing on the—

Mr. Roy: What difference does that make?

Mr. P. Taylor: —I'm trying to think of the date. I did at the Blackburn hamlet all-candidates meeting in my riding. I recall it was November, 1974, and I ask the member to consult the record.

I believe we should have a limited expense account, which is only payable by supporting it with vouchers. I think that we could write language that would cover the types of expenditures that should be included under such an arrangement. Again, I say, why should we be treated differently than any other groups in the business community? I believe this Legislature has gone a long way in the severance pay arrangements they have. I think the pension arrangements are very good.

Mr. Germa: I guess so.

Mr. P. Taylor: But you know, we are paid 15 cents a mile on our cars. Now why are we being treated differently? The government House leader—who has fled the place now—made this statement in the House:

Members will recall that effective April 1, 1974, the government revised the mileage rates paid to an employee who uses his automobile on government business.

And to cut it down short, I'll tell you that Ontario public servants are now being paid 18 cents a mile for the use of their cars, and people who work in the north are getting another cent on top of that. And so they should—they deserve it.

Mr. Laughren: That's not the whole story; that's only for the first 5,000 miles.

Mr. McNeil: He won't need to worry after the next election.

Mr. P. Taylor: Yes, right—and I appreciate that—it's for the first 5,000 miles.

Mr. Samis: Who is running for the Tories in Carleton East?

Mr. Roy: Whoever it is, the member for Stormont won't have to worry about him.

Mr. P. Taylor: The government House leader then went on to say rates for mileage in excess of 5,000 were not changed. I'm not sure what they were at that time. But the point here is that we have no mechanism in this Legislature—there is no independent, standing mechanism—to deal with these problems as they arise.

In the time that I've been a member of this House, the bill at the hotel that I stay at has gone up twice. There is no mechanism in the Legislative Assembly Act for dealing with increases like that.

This \$3,000 accommodation allowance very soon will be totally meaningless in terms of an apartment. I believe that the whole question of legislative indemnities should be independently decided upon and regularly regulated or regularly increased to deal with

the cost of living. Again, why should we be treated differently from everyone else?

Mr. Lawlor: As long as it is not compulsory arbitration.

Mr. P. Taylor: I also intend to bring in a private member's bill in the next few days that will deal with the whole concept of a constituency office and staff.

Mr. Germa: Now he is talking.

Mr. P. Taylor: I believe that we should be creating a system in this House that encourages people of all walks of life to seek office in this House, and we should be creating a system which sustains them in office without personal and financial hardship to the extent that it is possible.

And I go back—I want to re-emphasize the point I made—had our predecessors opted for the concept of one member for every 23,000 of population, there would be 352 members of this House. We would probably have to have a new building and we would be spending \$8 or \$9 million a year. So why don't we spend \$5 or \$6 million and really do the job properly?

What about the business of out-of-town members? I'm sure my hon. friends from Ottawa East, and Stormont, and Ottawa West (Mr. Morrow) and so on will appreciate the fact that because this House chooses not to sit on Wednesdays it makes it extremely difficult for out-of-town members to conduct both constituency and legislative business in an efficient fashion.

Mr. Samis: There are ways.

Mr. P. Taylor: Well, I'll get together with my friend and talk to him about that later.

Mr. Roy: Why don't they make it a Monday or a Friday?

Mr. P. Taylor: What I'm saying is that most of my hon. friends in this House have another source of income. They are lawyers, farmers, small businessmen or whatever — most of them; not all of them. I am one of those who has no other form of income other than what I earn in this Legislature, and what I'm also trying to say is that the system as it is presently constituted militates against me being a full-time member. I am now actively seeking other sources of income that don't constitute some form of conflict of interest, which is very difficult for me because my entire training in life has been as a journalist and, of course, to continue in political reporting would be an obvious conflict of in-

terest for me. And no one would hire me on that basis.

An hon. member: He should have thought of that before he ran.

Mr. P. Taylor: Very quickly, I want to deal with the conduct of the House. My hon. friend from Ottawa East made some comments about the conduct of the question period. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I respect you, sir, very highly, and the office you hold, and I want you to know that I think you have one of the most difficult jobs that could possibly be handed out in this environment. But I also agree with my colleague from Ottawa East when he says we have to have a system which does not amount to different criteria for each side of the House.

The rules and the conditions that govern the asking of a question in this House are far too restrictive and confining, and rules don't even exist with respect to the answering of that question. The conduct of this House is such that ministers have an entirely free rein in answering the questions. This is not good. If this continues, under the kind of political atmosphere that prevails in the province at this time, we in the opposition are going to be forced into an ever more combative and, if you like, disruptive type of tactic.

The ministers must be controlled in the way they answer the questions and in the length of time they take to answer the questions. They must be kept to the subject matter of the question; the answers must be relevant. They mustn't be allowed to run off and make irrelevant political speeches in response to a specific question.

The standing committees of this House—well, just before 6 o'clock this evening we went through what I think is an incredible exercise. My hon. friends from the New Democratic Party deluded themselves into thinking that the opposition parties had won a major victory in getting the standing committee to look at the Child Welfare Act tomorrow morning.

Mr. Lawlor: No, just a minor victory.

Mr. P. Taylor: At this point we don't even know what room it is going to be in or what time it is going to be.

Mr. Germa: Ten o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. P. Taylor: Well, thank you. I didn't know that. I'm glad the member knows that. But the important thing here is that we had a debate, the preceding debate on the Child Welfare Act, which was very constructive.

It was a debate that I would be proud to send out to my constituents in a mailer form. All members of the House who participated in that debate did a great job. I was really interested in hearing the views of my friends to the extreme left, as well as my own colleagues and the minister.

Mr. Lawlor: Physically we are to the member's extreme right.

Mr. P. Taylor: Thank you. It's too bad that the government couldn't have responded to this situation in a much more constructive way. It's too bad the government took a year to bring forth this bill, which those who know it well and have looked at it and are experts in this field say really doesn't represent very much. It took them a year to bring forward that bill that doesn't represent very much and they bring it forward at the last moment, because municipalities have to set their budgets and everything else, and they are trying to manoeuvre the opposition parties into looking like the villains to the municipalities because we want to hold up the bill and we want to improve it. We want to get a good close look at it clause by clause and we also want the vested interests to have a look at it. We want the special interest groups, like the Children's Aid Societies, to have a close look at it. If we play the game the government wants us to play, we're going to look like villains to the cities and to the various Children's Aid Societies.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. P. Taylor: Committees are the backbone of the Legislature. But in this Legislature the committees are not allowed to fulfil their true function. In effect, by conducting business the way this House does, in referring so few bills to the committees, this government is putting this House in the position of telling the public, "We know everything and we don't need any outside consultation in terms of individual bills in this House."

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is completely wrong and the member knows it.

Mr. Roy: How many bills has the government sent to standing committee of this House? About one per cent.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Oh, come on. The member knows that is wrong.

Mr. Roy: About one per cent, less than one per cent.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is wrong. Mr. Speaker, make the member withdraw that, that is wrong. He misled the House. However, it was only an interjection.

Mr. Roy: The House leader knows I am right.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member is not right and he knows he is not right.

Mr. Roy: Does the minister want to bet on it? Let's look at the statistics. Of 201 bills only eight went to standing committee.

Mr. Speaker: Order, the member for Carleton East has the floor.

Mr. P. Taylor: I am afraid my hon. colleague from Ottawa East is correct, because we did the research on that and it is correct.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That's the prerogative of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Roy: I am sorry, it is four per cent. I apologize.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Oh, too bad. That doesn't surprise me either.

Mr. Roy: That's some record.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. P. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, the sooner I get through here, the sooner my hon. friend from Thunder Bay can get up and do his thing.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I like that.

Mr. P. Taylor: Yes, the minister had better listen to him.

In closing, I want to deal with the only substantive item in the Throne Speech which, of course, was the Liberal Party's proposition for an ombudsman. Notwithstanding the language in the Throne Speech, we still feel it's a very good proposition.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Tell me something, is the member going to vote for or against that bill on second reading?

Mr. P. Taylor: It is funny that the minister should ask that because I have here a quote from the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Parrott) who says:

He won't vote against the ombudsman bill but he doesn't like it, Harry Parrott (PC-Oxford) says of his government's proposal to appoint a provincial ombudsman. He said yesterday in his reply to the Speech

from the Throne that Legislature members have always performed the duties of an ombudsman in their ridings.

Given additional funds to rent constituency offices and hire staff, funds comparable to the \$8,400 federal parliamentarians receive for these purposes, members would be able to do an even better job, he said.

"Members are not spending as much time at Queen's Park as they should be because constituency business is keeping them tied up at home. I do not want one ombudsman with a staff for the Province of Ontario. Unless there can be an ombudsman eyeball to eyeball with the people of every riding of Ontario, then I think we should not have one."

Outside the Legislature, Mr. Parrott said he would not oppose the government by casting a vote against the Speech from the Throne which suggested that an ombudsman be appointed.

I would implore the member for Oxford to gird his loins and his guts and everything else and vote the way he feels he should on this issue. The member for Oxford and I are very like-minded on this issue, on the question of constituency offices and the whole role of individual members as perhaps miniature ombudsmen, or whatever you want to call them, Mr. Speaker.

The ombudsman for the province would fulfil a very real function. He would be dealing with major cases of injustice meted out at the hands of the bureaucracy. We deal as members with individual constituents who have relatively resolvable problems fairly quickly. They are just confused by the bureaucracy. They're not suffering real injustice.

Mr. Foulds: Maybe the member's aren't; mine are.

Mr. P. Taylor: I think there is a very real role in this province for a very properly constituted ombudsman, but I also feel there is room for improving our ability to serve our constituents. We need proper pay, with proper taxation procedures, proper expense procedures and proper benefits, such as severance pay, pensions, mileage and all those kinds of things. We also need the kind of flexibility in the legislative Act to react to rising prices. I commend these points to my hon. colleagues, and I thank them for their indulgence in listening to me tonight.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The first thing I would like to say is that I hope you will relay to the Speaker of the House my compliments for the job he has done thus far in this session and the hope that he will continue on in similar fashion.

I would also like to commend you, sir. I don't think it has ever been put on the record that the member for York North (Mr. W. Hodgson) is in fact the deputy Speaker of this House and spends many, many hours in the chair listening to a lot of boring diatribe from time to time; he also doesn't get the kind of recognition that he deserves.

I don't think it has ever been put on the record that he does spend many a long, tiresome hour listening to things that are of not any particular interest to himself, and I would like to pay a tribute to him for his patience and his understanding. I hope that he too will continue in this very difficult job under very trying circumstances, and I want to commend him for the way he has conducted himself thus far in this House.

I have very mixed feelings about entering into this debate since it is traditionally called the Throne Speech debate but, as we all know, it is an ideal opportunity for members of whatever political stripe, and from whatever geographical locality across the province, to get up and say the things that are bothering them at any particular moment.

Rather than say anything critical about what was left out of the Throne Speech, I am going to confine my remarks to some very specific items that I think are worthy of comment. The first one, Mr. Speaker, is the matter of special occasion permits and the way they are handled by the Liquor Licence Board down here in Metropolitan Toronto.

Special occasion permits are handled by a special branch of the Liquor Licence Board, and a chap by the name of Mr. Gertley, who is the director, does an excellent job under very trying circumstances to satisfy the needs of people right throughout the province.

My complaint and my criticism isn't directed to anybody in the board at the present time. I happen to think that they do an excellent job. But there have been a few instances of late that have made me realize that it's no longer necessary to get approval for whatever we want to do in any place in the province, through some agency or some central office in Toronto.

I believe we have 70,000 civil servants in the province who are being paid reasonably good money, and if this government is serious

about decentralization and about bringing services much closer to people, I think they should give the people in the regions some authority for making decisions.

Whether or not a special occasion permit is issued doesn't require somebody at the ministerial or the deputy ministerial level to make that decision. The criteria are laid down, and there's no reason in the world why we couldn't have somebody at the district or regional level to whom some applicant could go and say they are going to hold a function a week or two weeks from now. It might be the chamber of commerce, a religious group, a service club group or a fraternal organization.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, we have no end of difficulty with the mail service and breakdowns in communications in getting the kind of authority that you people down here in the urban centres take for granted, where all you have to do is pick up the phone and contact somebody down here. It isn't as simple as that in areas that I represent.

I want to give you a specific example of an instance that happened just two weeks ago. An organization in the community of Terrace Bay wanted to get a special occasion permit to hold a dance where they wanted to serve alcoholic beverages. Two days before the event they phoned down here to find out why their application hadn't been processed—it had been mailed three weeks earlier—only to find out from the special occasion permits branch that the application had not yet been received in Toronto.

They had sold several hundred tickets for this particular social event and it looked as though the whole thing was going to be a complete flop without authority to sell alcoholic beverages, which seem to be a must these days whenever people get together and socialize.

If it hadn't been for the intercession of the member and the excellent co-operation I received from a northern affairs officer, who was able to utilize the services of a direct Telex line from northern Ontario—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I went through the same thing last weekend, and I don't have that service in my riding.

Mr. Stokes: Well, the minister may be able to cut a few more corners than I can.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Not at all; they're rough on me.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): It doesn't pay to be on the government side then. Is that it?

Mr. Stokes: The point I am trying to make is that it shouldn't be necessary to go down to 55 Lakeshore Blvd. in order to get authority to carry on a little social event in some small hamlet in northern Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I agree.

Mr. Stokes: There are good people up in Thunder Bay, Timmins, Sudbury or Cornwall, and they are paid good money—

Mr. Ferrier: Owen Sound.

Mr. Stokes: And Owen Sound.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That's only been wet for three months, for goodness' sake.

Mr. Stokes: All right, but the fact remains that there are competent people who are in a position to decide whether it's a legitimate application and whether it's a legitimate organization with a good cause; and there's no reason why we have to come all the way down here to 55 Lakeshore Blvd. for authority to issue such a permit.

I want to suggest to the Chairman of Management Board that he talk to his colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman)—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I have already done that.

Mr. Stokes: Well, I'm adding my voice to his then, because I think it's time we came out of the 19th century into the 20th century and say that we have sufficient people with the expertise in the regions to make that determination as to whether or not a special occasion permit should be issued.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I'll ask the member for his support when the time comes.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): License the member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: We've been promised a new bill dealing with the activities of the Liquor Control Board and the Liquor Licence Board, but I agree with my colleague from High Park (Mr. Shulman), who mentioned last Thursday night that he thinks a new bill will never be brought in because I don't think the government has any idea about how it is even going to handle it.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That gentleman isn't always right, either.

Mr. Stokes: He's not always right, but he's been right so far. The government has

been procrastinating for the last 2½ to three years on a new Liquor Licence Act and a new Liquor Control Act, and so far he's been right.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think we had better straighten this out. Who is the member talking about?

Mr. Stokes: But in this particular instance with regard to the issuance of special occasion permits, I hope that anybody within hearing distance of my voice will get on the bandwagon and insist that authority for issuing such licences should reside with people in the regions rather than somebody down here in Metropolitan Toronto.

One of the other matters I want to talk about is consumer protection. We have people at the district level who will take into consideration what we consider to be violations of the rights of consumers, but because of the weakness in the present legislation in the Province of Ontario a good many of our consumers are being taken for a ride and are being ripped off. I want to lend credence to what I say by reading a few words from some decisions which have been handed down by the Consumer Protection Bureau associated with the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

This had to do with one of those fly-by-night organizations which go around the province saying, "We will install aluminum siding at a price which compares favourably with the price anywhere." I have to report that this particular fly-by-night outfit comes from Val Caron, in the Province of Quebec; Anden Vinyl Products Ltd.

An hon. member: Val where?

An hon. member: That's in the Sudbury area.

Mr. Stokes: I had a constituent who signed an agreement to enter into a contract for the installation of aluminum siding on his house. He made a down payment of \$300 and went to the bank to arrange for a loan to repay the balance but found out that either the money wasn't available at the bank or it was available at too high an interest rate. They felt they couldn't afford going through with it so they immediately picked up the phone, contacted Anden Vinyl Products Ltd. and said, "We want out of this contract; consider it cancelled and please refund our \$300."

Well, nothing happened. They didn't get their money back nor did Anden Vinyl come to put the aluminum siding on the home

and the upshot of it was, since they couldn't make any headway, they brought it to my attention. I, in turn, brought it to the attention of Mr. Goudy, who is the director of the consumer protection bureau associated with the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations. We both tried to prevail upon Anden Vinyl Products and, of course, they quite rightly pointed out that since the 48-hour cooling-off period applied only to those people who had indicated in writing that they wanted out, they had the protection of the Act. It wasn't good enough for anyone to phone in to the company and state he wanted to terminate the contract or didn't want to go through with the contract.

As a result of it all, my constituents lost \$300; they didn't get the job done; and there is no recourse under present legislation. Mr. Goudy is quite right and I want to read the last two paragraphs in his letter:

In any event your suggesting to have the rescission period printed on the face of executory contracts was a good one. Some firms are presently doing this, using it as a selling point to indicate to customers that they are not being high-pressured into buying.

I have also recommended that the rescission period be extended from two days to five and I thank you for your concern in this matter as your remarks are most welcome.

That is just an indication of where existing consumer protection legislation falls far short of the mark. My constituent lost \$300 and has no recourse.

I hope the four cabinet ministers over there will prevail upon the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations to bring in the kind of consumer protection legislation which, as outlined in Mr. Goudy's letter, will offer real protection to the consumers of this province rather than allowing them to be ripped off by unconscionable operators like the one I have just mentioned.

Another incident I would like to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, is yet another one that I brought to the attention of the consumer protection bureau. It has to do with a small businessman in my riding who has to buy through jobbers and distributors and when he sold two items—one was a boat compass that he had had to stock for several weeks and it was factory sealed. When he made a sale he opened it up and he inspected it before the customer; the customer having paid something like \$27.25 for it. He opened it up and inspected it, only to find out that a part of the thing was missing. It wasn't func-

tional without this part and, obviously, there had been a shortage in the factory. So he refunded the purchase price of \$27.25 to the customer and he sent the article to the jobber from whom he had purchased it. This chap who sold the article was the proprietor of the Western Tire Store in Schreiber and he sent the compass back, intact as he had found it, factory packed, to Mr. M. J. Colyer, the general manager of Timberline Saw and Marine Ltd., Trout Lake Road in North Bay, Ont., who was the distributor.

He said it was a general rule of their company that you had to notify them of any shortages within 14 days, and if you failed to do so you weren't entitled to any refund or any kind of consideration.

The proprietor of the store pointed out to Timberline Saw and Marine Ltd. and pointed out to me that in many, many instances when those things come factory packed they may sit on the shelves for three or four weeks, and sometimes two or three months, and you don't know what's inside these factory-packed articles until you make the sale. In fact, quite often the customer won't even question it if it comes in a factory-packed box, sealed with plastic. He would probably take it home and wouldn't question whether or not it's in order or if anything is missing until he goes to install it on his boat or whatever.

Anyway, this company said: "No. Since you didn't register a complaint within 14 days you have no recourse under our present policy."

The proprietor of the Western Tire Store also encountered another problem with the same distributor, Timberline Saw and Marine Ltd. of North Bay. It was with a firm that Mr. Goudy tried to contact and it was called Anglo Traders Ltd., which is now out of business. An order was placed for duck canvas covers for snowmobiles, but the covers received were made of plastic. When he tried to return them for replacement it was turned down because he hadn't done so within a matter of 14 days and, of course, it was never brought to his attention until he went to sell one of them and he said: "I have a duck canvas snowmobile cover that sells for something like \$14." When he went to take them out of the case and look at them he found out that they weren't duck at all; they were made of plastic, and because of the statute of limitations of 14 days, according to the operation of this particular distributor or jobber, he was again turned down.

Mr. Goudy and I are trying to prevail upon Timberline to refund and make good these two articles—one was because they were improperly packed and there were shortages at the factory and the other one was misrepre-

sensation—but there is nothing in the Consumer Protection Act in the Province of Ontario that protects a customer, or even a small retailer, under such circumstances.

There again, through you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to prevail upon the four cabinet ministers to bring this to the attention of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

The final item on consumer protection that I would like to bring up is contained in a letter that I received from the director of the Lake Superior Board of Education, which is the one along the north shore of Lake Superior and covers Manitowadge. He wrote this letter to me and he says:

Re pricing inflation:

In early November, the Manitowadge high school ordered from Moyer's School Supplies Ltd. two main drive belts as needed parts to repair a Graflex 16 mm movie projector used in the school for audio-visual purposes and manufactured by Singer Ltd.

After a wait of nine to 10 weeks and without receipt of the required parts the school contacted Moyer's by telephone to determine that the order had been delayed, as it was not high priority on their list.

The school then determined to contact one of the service outlets provided by Singer to service equipment sold by other agencies, such as Moyer's. The service outlet advised that although they did not sell directly to the public, but did so only through a middle agency such as Moyer's Ltd., they could provide service and, in some instances, parts.

Subsequently, by telephone order the two required drive belts were finally received at Manitowadge high school in early February. Finally, in late February, the two belts originally ordered from Moyer's in November arrived complete with invoice.

This brings me to the point of this letter.

As you will notice on the attached photocopies of the invoices provided by each of the respective companies, Moyer's has charged the Lake Superior Board of Education \$10.50 per drive belt, while the manufacturing firm, through its service outlet, has provided the same two drive belts for the price of \$3.60 per unit.

This would indicate to me that the markup between the original manufacturer, that is Singer, and the sales outlet to normal school purchasing agents, which is Moyer's

for Singer products, is somewhere in the vicinity of 300 per cent.

This is an astounding markup and perhaps points out an unfortunate fact. Boards of education are not only fighting general inflationary increases, as is every other corporation in this province, but are perhaps being ripped off by some sales and distributing agencies at least.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: They should know if the marketplace in which they are buying that product is competitive. They should know.

Mr. Laughren: Name the marketplace that's competitive.

Mr. Stokes: Perhaps the minister didn't—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Unlike the other situation—which I didn't hear the conclusion of—I would have sued them.

Mr. Stokes: Perhaps the minister didn't get the import. If you buy directly from the manufacturer, which is Singer, you can get it for \$3.60. But if you have to go through the distributor or the jobber, as was the case here, they paid \$10.50; so there is a markup of 300 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: But if the member knows that, surely they know it.

Mr. Stokes: Who?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The purchasing agent of the board, or whoever the member is talking about.

Mr. Stokes: They didn't know until after they paid for it. That is why he brought it to my attention. He says he is being ripped off. Now what is the minister suggesting; that they go to court to recover the difference between \$10.50 and \$3.60?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, I am not talking about that case. I am talking about the compass, the first one the member quoted.

Mr. P. Taylor: On your feet, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Don't worry, the member for Thunder Bay and I get along.

Mr. Stokes: All right, the letter continues:

The individuals in this board of education responsible for purchasing have been instructed to compare prices carefully between firms when buying for school divi-

sion needs. Now they do that wherever possible.

It might be appropriate, however, for the government of Ontario to look more seriously into the matter. It's pretty obvious to me that this province and, in fact, this nation cannot stand that kind of inflated pricing. I shall leave the matter in your hands to do with as you decide.

Of course I've taken the liberty, Mr. Speaker, of bringing up that and the other two items just to highlight the need for stricter enforcement of consumer protection laws and, where necessary, to shore them up by bringing in the kind of consumer protection laws that in some realistic fashion do, in fact, protect the consumers of this province.

Another area that I want to get into, Mr. Speaker, is the high cost of gasoline and other petroleum products. I've had considerable dialogue with the former Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, (Mr. Clement) who has gone on to bigger and better things. I detailed what I thought was an unfair practice by oil companies and oil distributors in that many areas of the province are being charged 10 to 15 cents more per gallon of gasoline than are people in other areas of the province. I've asked him to look into it and to see that the purchasers of gasoline and home heating oil were given the kind of protection that I thought they deserved and needed. He has procrastinated and hasn't done a thing about it.

Now the recent announcements by Esso and the other major oil producers and distributors have only tended to aggravate it. It's extremely difficult to get the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations to do anything at all about it. It's impossible to get the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in Ottawa to do anything about it. Where do we turn? Where do people in northern Ontario turn when almost every time we go to the gas pumps they've increased the price by a cent or two? There just doesn't seem to be any end to it.

I've made some comparisons for my own satisfaction and for the benefit of the House in this debate this evening. I find that the cost of gasoline—that is regular gasoline or what we refer to as No. 2 gasoline—varies anywhere from 60 cents to 72 cents right within Metropolitan Toronto. Of course, if one wants unleaded one pays three cents extra.

When leaded gas came in it was supposed to provide much less wear and tear on the

inner parts and the moving parts of the motors. They used to say, "We are coming out with a new kind of gasoline. We'll put some lead in it. It has an anti-knock effect and we'll charge three cents extra for putting the lead in the gasoline which will make automobiles run more efficiently. Then for a number of years they had a new kind of carburetor on cars which was causing a lot of pollution and so the environmentalists took over.

They said, "We are going to impose some constraints on the kinds of carburetors and the kinds of exhaust systems and everything else you have on your cars. We are going to make you install pollution abatement equipment on your cars. We are going to install catalytic converters on your cars. And you are going to have to use unleaded gasoline in those cars which are equipped with catalytic converters. And for the privilege of using a catalytic converter-equipped automobile we are going to charge you three cents extra to take the lead out of your gasoline."

There is the situation in Toronto at the present time. One can pay anywhere from 60 cents to 72 cents for a gallon of No. 2 gasoline and if one wants the lead out, one pays three cents extra for them to take it out. Ten years ago it used to cost one something to put it in. I think we are getting ripped off; 60 to 72 cents for a gallon of No. 2 gasoline in Metropolitan Toronto.

In Sudbury it's anywhere from 63 to 67 cents a gallon. At all the stations along Highway 401, where they consider they have a captive driving public, it's up to 73 cents a gallon. Some members who are paying 60 or 62 cents say they are getting ripped off on Highway 401. I can't get too excited about the people who are being charged 73 cents a gallon on Highway 401 because I found that if one buys from Beaver in Windsor one pays 58 cents a gallon for regular. Of course, if one goes to the name brands, one can pay as high as 63 cents for No. 2 gasoline in Windsor. I asked a friend of mine the cost of a gallon of gasoline in Cornwall, which is as far east as one can go in Ontario and far away from the western Canada refineries and the refineries in Sarnia. I asked, "How much do you pay for a gallon of gasoline in Cornwall which is east of that imaginary line supposedly serviced by the oil producers and the refineries in central and western Canada?" Lo and behold, I find out that one can pay as low as 61 cents a gallon by buying No. 2 gas from an independent or 63 cents a gallon for the name brands such as Esso, Texaco, Gulf and Shell.

The curious part of all this, Mr. Speaker, is that all of the oil sold east of that line, the Ottawa Valley line, doesn't come from Canada at all. It's offshore; it comes from either Venezuela or the Middle East. And that is the oil that is subsidized—not only subsidized directly by the federal government because it is more expensive offshore oil; it is subsidized by everybody in Canada, including Ontario.

So if anyone thinks the people in Metropolitan Toronto are getting ripped off if they have to pay up to 67 cents a gallon or up to 70 cents a gallon, or if anyone thinks the people on 401 are being ripped off when they have to pay 73 cents, or if anyone thinks the people in Sudbury who have to pay 67 cents are being ripped off, I want to advise him that the price of No. 2 gasoline in my home town and in most communities along the north shore of Lake Superior is 77 cents a gallon. It is we who are living in northern Ontario who are subsidizing those users east of that Ottawa line of the so-called more expensive offshore oil from Venezuela and the Middle East.

Not only are we being ripped off, but we're really being shafted. We're really being shafted. We are so much closer to the sources of our traditional oil. We live in mid-Canada. The district of Thunder Bay is the linchpin for the whole country. We live in mid-Canada, we're anywhere up to 1,500 miles closer to the source of the traditional oil in western Canada, and we pay the highest price anywhere in Canada.

Mr. Foulds: Where is the government's consumer protection?

Mr. Ferrier: What is the minister going to do about it?

Mr. Stokes: When you can buy offshore oil from Venezuela and from the Middle East in Cornwall for 63 cents a gallon, and us poor suckers living in mid-Canada, in Thunder Bay, are paying 77 cents, there's a discrepancy of 14 cents on every gallon we buy.

Mr. Ferrier: A royal ripoff.

Mr. Stokes: I have brought it to the attention of successions of ministers of this government over here, and there's no way that they are disposed to do anything about it and come to our defence.

Mr. Foulds: Right on.

Mr. Stokes: I want to ask both the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development and the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch) whether they see any justice in a situation like that?

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): We know the problem. What is the solution?

Mr. Stokes: The solution is that the government look at the oil companies and say, "Change your pricing practices."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Or?

Mr. Stokes: "Or we'll take them over."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We will take them over in the province? Does the member really think that will work?

Mr. Foulds: Sure.

Mr. Stokes: Why not? Is there any justification for us paying—

Mr. Foulds: If the government can equalize beer prices it can equalize oil and gas prices. It is the same thing.

Mr. Stokes: They're doing it in Nova Scotia. They're doing it on the sales tax on gasoline.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It's not the same thing.

Mr. Stokes: They're doing it on the sales tax on gasoline right in Nova Scotia.

Mr. Ferrier: They're doing it in British Columbia, aren't they?

Mr. Stokes: There are many alternatives that the government has at its disposal. All I'm saying is that since the members opposite are the government of the Province of Ontario, they do have the responsibility to come to the assistance and to the aid of consumers in northern Ontario. Any time that the government sees a discrepancy of 14 cents per gallon on a gallon of gasoline, there's got to be something wrong.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We agree with the member in principle. We would like to have a solution which is equitable.

Mr. Stokes: The government did it with beer. It did it with beer.

Mr. Ferrier: It does it with liquor.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: With great respect, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wouldn't mind, the hon. member is trying to equate

petroleum with beer. Really, he knows that it's not an equation which can stand up to scrutiny at all. There's no international cartel in beer; I have no hesitation in saying, and everybody knows, that there is international control of petroleum which is difficult for any nation, let alone a province, to resolve. Certainly, that has become apparent in the last year or so.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is very difficult.

Mr. Foulds: He is saying they are bigger than he is.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have no hesitation in saying that anyone who knows anything about the situation will say that it's very difficult, if not impossible, with the controls that are available to nations today, to control the price of petroleum in the way nations would like to control it, let alone provinces, because of the international aspect of the power of the petroleum producers and the petroleum people. The member knows that.

Mr. Ferrier: That's exactly why we need Petrocan to try to get some control.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, what the minister seems to be saying is that he fully appreciates and realizes that we are being ripped off by the pricing policies and the distribution policies of the major oil producers in this country and that he is either unwilling or unable to do anything about it.

An hon. member: Not yet.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: With great respect, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is being quite unfair. I didn't agree that they are being ripped off. I didn't say that we weren't prepared to do something. We say we appreciate the problem; we don't have the solution. If the hon. member has a solution that is practical we would be very glad to consider it, because we have struggled with this problem for a long period of time.

It has been discussed at great length at various levels in the government. We do not have a solution which is practical. The hon. member's proposed solution just isn't practical and if he can tell us one that is, we would be very glad to consider it.

Mr. Stokes: The first thing we could do is lower the 19 cents a gallon that the govern-

ment is getting on every gallon that is sold in the province. Lower that by four or five cents a gallon in northern Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: This is getting into a debate now.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I don't know that this isn't supposed to be a debate, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: There is no debate.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member wants a debate, that is supposed to be the name of the game.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I'll debate it, but if the hon. member doesn't want to—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. If the member for Thunder Bay wants to give the floor up to the minister, why it's okay with the Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member knows perfectly well—

Mr. Speaker: —but I can't allow—

Mr. Bullbrook: On a point of order if I may, I think this is very interesting and I invite this type of yielding back and forth. It's debate if you permit it, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's what it is supposed to be. Otherwise it becomes almost meaningless long speeches without any possibility of an exchange of ideas. Quite frankly, the hon. member knows that so far we haven't been able to find a way by which we could reduce the tax and make sure that it isn't merely a means of the local distributor merely adding that onto the cost. There is just no way of doing that practically.

Mr. Stokes: We can surely monitor that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: One can't just say, with great respect, that we can monitor that. Suppose we monitored it and we said, "Now that we have reduced your gasoline tax by five cents a gallon, or 10 cents a gallon, we expect you to reduce your price by 10 cents a gallon," and suppose the service station just doesn't do it. How would the hon. member suggest we control that?

Mr. Stokes: What would I do to control it? Take it over, if I had to.

Hon. W. Newman (Minister of the Environment): Now he is telling us.

Mr. Stokes: Take it over. The government took over the distribution system for Ontario Hydro.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Would the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick take his seat? Would the hon. minister take his seat at the present time and let—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is suggesting that the solution to that is the nationalization of the means of distribution of petroleum then—

Mr. Stokes: As a last resort.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If that's what he is suggesting, then let him suggest that. It may very well be that may be a means of controlling it. On the other hand, it may be just getting ourselves into a trap, because we really don't have control of the international distribution of petroleum by the producers to make sure the distribution of petroleum goes into other provinces and to other jurisdictions, because they are just big enough to do that. I am not suggesting that I agree they should be that big or that they should be that powerful. I have my own ideas about the control they have over the international distribution of petroleum, but at this moment we are not in a position as a province to control that, and I don't like—

Mr. Samis: Who runs Ontario?

Mr. Roy: Gerry Regan is controlling gas.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Would the hon. minister take his seat, please?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member wants to listen—

Mr. Speaker: I don't care what the hon. member wants.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right:

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member wants to ask the minister these questions, there is a question period tomorrow afternoon from 2 to 3.

Mr. Roy: Gerry Regan is controlling gas in Nova Scotia.

Mr. Stokes: I want to thank the minister for at least being interested enough to get involved.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: It's nice to know that somebody's listening, and I want to thank him.

Mr. Foulds: He's not going to take any action but he's listening.

Mr. Stokes: But there are a good many alternatives that are open to the government, particularly to the minister as the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. And there are a good many initiatives the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) could take. The provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) could take many initiatives and the Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell) could. As the provincial secretary is talking to them on a daily basis—

Mr. Roy: And the Minister of the Environment.

Mr. Stokes: —why doesn't he use a little ingenuity on behalf of the people that sent me here to speak for them? Any time that we're paying 14 cents a gallon more—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Speaker says the member will have to ask that tomorrow.

Mr. Foulds: Well, take the question as notice.

Mr. Stokes: Yes, let him take the question as notice and maybe he'll have an answer for me tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Minister of Energy will have to answer that one.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: This is just one of the many complaints that we in the north have that are most legitimate. The distances that we have to travel are so much greater. I could have made the same argument with regard to home-heating oil. I think I recall the hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) complaining about the discrepancy in the cost of home-heating oil right down here in the area that he knows better than I do.

Mr. Roy: And in eastern Ontario.

Mr. Stokes: It's even more acute in the north where climatic conditions are much more severe, and where winters are much longer. People opposite don't seem to be too concerned about it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think it costs too much in the south too.

Mr. Stokes: If it's too much in the south we're really getting ripped off in the north. Since people opposite are the government, we think in the north that they have a re-

sponsibility to come to grips with that problem.

An hon. member: What are they doing over there?

Mr. Ferrier: Why do they want to sit over there if they don't want to govern rightly?

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, I'm going on a little longer than I had anticipated, but the hon. minister got involved and he has pre-empted some of my time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: At the member's invitation.

Mr. Stokes: Fair enough. You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that there was a conference held out in western Canada somewhat over a year ago at the request of the Premiers of the four western provinces, where they had Hon. Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Hon. Jean Marchand and all of those people sitting down and talking about the prices in transportation costs as they affected and pertained to the western provinces. As a result of that dialogue and a commitment made during the last federal election campaign out there, the feds agreed to sit down and talk to the Premiers and the ministers in those four western provinces. On Feb. 25 of this year there was an announcement:

An agreement in principle toward eliminating basic transportation inequities against western Canada was announced Monday by Transport Minister Jean Marchand and ministers responsible for transportation of the western provinces.

In a joint communique, the four western provinces described the agreement as a major breakthrough. The ministers reached agreement specifically on five principles, including rate groupings to include small communities in western Canada in the same rate group as the nearest large cities.

For instance, the town of Olds, 50 miles north of Calgary, would be in the same rate group as Calgary and no extra charge would be levied for hauling the goods to Olds from Calgary. Another was that Ottawa, through the Canadian Transport Commission, would reject future applications for across-the-board rate increases, and all future railway applications to increase their rates must be accompanied by full-cost disclosure.

There is to be a change in the formula of maximum rate restrictions so that more favourable rates, when applicable, would be applied to shippers. There is to be an elimination of long-haul, short-haul anomalies, so

that intermediate rates will not exceed long-haul rates on shipments destined to or originating from the western region, except where particular competitive circumstances justified special rates to long-haul destinations.

In addition to that there were commitments by Mr. Marchand and other federal ministers. A joint federal-provincial programme at a cost of \$157 million is under way to upgrade major east-west highways in the Prairie provinces to standards similar to those in British Columbia, as well as a joint federal-provincial programme, at a cost of \$400 million, to provide access roads into the provincial northlands of western Canada to help develop natural resources and eliminate isolation of northern communities. There were several other commitments.

I want to know why this government hasn't made representations—or if it has, why haven't we seen some results—representations to the federal cabinet, to the Prime Minister of this country and to the Hon. Mr. Marchand, on behalf of residents of Ontario, particularly northwestern Ontario, because we are discriminated against by those inequitable freight rates in northwestern Ontario in the same way the Prairie provinces are.

We have four members of Parliament, all on the side of government, all Liberals, and they presumably got a commitment from their government when they were discussing the freight rate anomalies with the provinces in western Canada, that we in northwestern Ontario would be given similar consideration.

Now, there isn't any mention or indication that the freight rate anomalies that exist in northern Ontario, particularly in northwestern Ontario, are going to be taken into consideration in any restructuring of freight rate policies or programmes in this province.

I want to know why the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, which is responsible for transportation in this province, hasn't made the kind of representations we think should have been made on behalf of people living in northwestern Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I want to give you two or three examples of how we are getting it in the neck. For instance, I took a minimum shipment of 70,000 lb—that is one boxcar load—of mill products and proceeded to find out what the date would be from the BC interior to Dartmouth, NS, to Fredericton, and to all of those cities down on the eastern seaboard. I asked one of our major carriers to give me a pricing per hundredweight on that minimum shipment of 70,000 lb from the BC interior to the Atlantic seaboard. They

quoted a price of \$2.58 per hundredweight for that 70,000-lb shipment.

"Fair enough," I said. "Now give me the price of the same shipment from the BC interior to the city of Thunder Bay." Thunder Bay is in mid-Canada, 1,500 miles closer to the source than the Atlantic seaboard. The price they quoted me on that same shipment was \$2.56 per hundredweight—two cents per hundredweight difference if you ship from the BC interior to the city of Thunder Bay, or from the BC interior to the Atlantic seaboard—and we are 1,500 miles closer!

I wrote to the Minister of Transport, Mr. Speaker. Do you know what he said? He said we have to deal with the theoretical cost of moving that same shipment through the Panama Canal by boat. So theoretically if somebody was taking that shipment from British Columbia, through the Panama and up the eastern coast to seaboard cities such as Dartmouth and Halifax, conceivably that would be the rate they would charge. The two major carriers meet that theoretical price but who is subsidizing that shipment all the way from British Columbia down to the Maritimes? I will tell member who is subsidizing them. We are, in mid-Canada. We're the guys who are getting it in the neck, in the same way as we're getting it in the neck for every gallon of gas we buy and for every gallon of home heating oil we buy. We get it in the neck every time.

Let me carry it a little bit further, Mr. Speaker. I took the same shipment—70,000 lb—from a town in my riding, Longlac, which produces plywood, lumber and a waferboard product. I said to the common carrier, "Give me a price for a minimum shipment of 70,000 lb from Longlac to the city of Thunder Bay." It's roughly 200 miles. They quoted me a price of 56 cents per hundredweight from Longlac to Tunder Bay, right within the region. I said, "Fine and dandy. Give me the price for that same shipment from Longlac to Ottawa and Toronto." It was 58 cents per hundredweight; two cents difference. It's about three times the distance and it only cost two cents more to ship 100 lb of lumber, plywood and other mill products all the way down to Ottawa than it did to ship it within the region.

I don't know whether members realize the significance of that but we're getting it in the neck in northwestern Ontario, in mid-Canada, with regard to the items we would like to import from BC. If somebody's going to establish a business in mid-Canada, in the district of Thunder Bay, and has to bring in that material he has to pay the same

charges to bring it in that someone would pay if he were shipping it all the way to the east coast. If somebody is looking for somewhere to establish a business there are no advantages for us in mid-Canada with regard to transportation costs. They'd say, "We could establish in Toronto, Ottawa or Dartmouth or any place." That's the thing.

Mr. Foulds: They can't even ship within the region.

Mr. Stokes: Somebody might say "We would like to establish a plant somewhere in Ontario; does there seem to be any obvious or apparent advantage in building our plant closer to the supply?" If they were using the lumber we produce in northwestern Ontario, if they were using the plywood we produce in northwestern Ontario or the waferboard we produce in northwestern Ontario, normally, under normal events when one pays transportation costs on a ton-mile, they would say, "Let's construct closer to the source of the material." That isn't the way the free enterprise system works at all. With stuff we try to ship out, we get it in the neck.

Mr. Foulds: It isn't free enterprise.

Mr. Stokes: With stuff we have to bring in, we get it in the neck. There is no advantage to living in central Canada. These are the kinds of things the government must do on our behalf because our federal representatives aren't saying anything in Ottawa on our behalf. We've got four of them up there, wall-to-wall Liberals. The Tories must go down and tell Ottawa that we want the same kind of deal in northwestern Ontario that the feds gave the western provinces.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I'm sure the Minister of Transportation and Communications has done that.

Mr. Foulds: Is the provincial secretary sure?

Mr. Stokes: That's what I want the government to do. Let the provincial secretary show me he's done that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the Speaker would allow it, I'd like to add something, but I'm not sure he would.

Mr. Stokes: When the provincial secretary gets his facts straight, the next time I'm up on my feet I'll concede the floor to him.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let the member ask the Speaker if he may do that now.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, I've gone on much longer than I should have because of the interjections. I had two or three more topics that I wanted to get into. I wanted to speak on the Ministry of Natural Resources. I wanted to be able to tell the House that I think the reforestation programme is in a sad state of affairs in this province. I wanted to tell members that the reorganization within the ministry is highly suspect even by people and from people within the ministry.

I wanted to talk about the acute alcoholism in many areas of this province. I wanted to say something constructive about how I think we could come to grips with some of those problems. But I want to quote from a current "News for Friends," that comes out of Quetico. It was written by John W. Newburn and it says:

People can be divided into three groups—Those who make things happen; those who watch things happen; and those who wonder what has happened.

I don't know whether this government falls into the first, the second or the third category.

Hon. W. Newman: I will tell the member we are the first and he is the third.

Mr. Stokes: I want to tell the minister that the people that I represent in northwestern Ontario in the riding of Thunder Bay want to know what is happening. I think this government had better come clean and justify its 32 years of control and rule in this province. If it doesn't heed many of the things that I've brought to its attention—hopefully in a reasonable, positive and responsible way—then come the next provincial election the present members of this government are going to be wondering what has happened. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kent.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to take part in this Throne debate. I first wish to congratulate you on the way you are carrying out your duties as Speaker of this honourable assembly.

You have proved to me that you are fair and impartial in your decisions and I wish you well in that honourable position.

I also wish to congratulate the chairman of the committee of the whole House on their appointments—the hon. member for York North and the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. G. E. Smith). I also wish them well in their honourable positions.

Mr. Speaker, on June 9 I will have been

a member of this Legislature for 20 years. So I think that you will agree with me that I've heard my share of Speeches from the Throne. Now I'm just a simple farmer, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not given to talking in extreme terms. But it is without question that this is the most disappointing, uninspiring, downright vague Throne Speech I have heard in those years.

The government tells me our prosperity has been challenged because of unprecedented inflation abroad, because of the world recession. We would have met that challenge, Mr. Speaker, and come through this with flying colours if Ontario finances had been handled with any degree of wisdom and any degree of responsibility.

The situation calls for a strong and decisive response from the people. This government says that it will get that strong and decisive response from the people on election day. They'll get exactly what I think they are asking for, Mr. Speaker. Moderation and restraint in pricing of goods and services sounds like an excellent idea, and I'm sure every taxpayer in Ontario would be pleased to see moderation and restraint in almost any area of this government's activities.

I must say it is a pity the government hasn't shown a little more moderation and restraint in the past when they were fooling around with the expensive magnetic levitation transit system, before finally abandoning it. They were also forcing costs of regional government plans on our communities.

The people would accept regional government, surely, if regional government is such a wonderful idea. It should not be necessary to use any lever to persuade communities to accept it. In every case where regional government has been put into effect, administration costs have increased alarmingly.

The government has given adjustment grants to tide the communities over in this initial period. However, I understand that adjustment grants will terminate within five years. What happens then? Will the people be faced with coping with staggering costs? Will the government bring in some other measures to make the Ontario taxpayers subsidize these grandiose schemes.

At a recent meeting in Toronto, an electrical convention, the Premier of the Province of Ontario was loudly applauded when he said there would be no further regional governments. In fact, the applause was so loud that the people did not, at first hand, hear the end of his statement when he added "at this time." As usual, Mr. Speaker,

with so many of the government's statements, the sting is in the tail.

On regional government expenditures, Mr. Speaker, I've gathered as much information as possible. The Ottawa-Carleton regional government in the year 1969 had \$22,985,000 in adjustment grants devoted to it; in 1970 there was \$27,084,000 which the government gave as adjustment grants; in 1972, \$37,749,000 in adjustment grants; in 1973, \$43,308,000. The Niagara regional government received \$22,252,000 in the year 1970; in 1971, \$28,119,000; in 1972, it received \$35,867,000, and in 1973, \$41,240,000.

M. Bullbrook: Staggering amount.

Mr. Spence: The regional government of York in 1970 received \$14,750,000; in 1971, \$18,114,000; in 1972, \$20,445,000, and in 1973, \$26,527,000.

The time has come when this government, Mr. Speaker, must seriously reconsider its position in regard to regional government. These sums are staggering to a layman in finance.

The government promises it will maintain Ontario's leadership in the field of education. What leadership, Mr. Speaker? I understand the Premier said not long ago that one of his government's problems was communication. Obviously there will be a bigger problem in communication than he ever realized, because students, teachers and parents throughout the province are seriously concerned about our education system at the present time.

Standards of learning and discipline in our schools have deteriorated badly. University professors have stated on many occasions that a large number of their new entrants cannot read or write English properly. And these are presumably among the best products of our secondary schools. What about the rest of our young people, those who weren't advanced enough or interested enough to apply for university entrance? Is their ability to read and write English properly even more limited?

The government promises to further encourage home ownership so that Ontario families may continue to be the best housed in Canada. Mr. Speaker, housing shortages are reaching crisis proportions in our cities of the Province of Ontario. Since the new housing ministry was established in 1973 we have had three different housing ministers. All of them have promised miracles and delivered—what?

We were told that in 1974 the provincial housing programmes would produce 31,100 housing starts. They produced less than half that amount—15,000 houses. The province signed an agreement with Central Mortgage

and Housing for the neighbourhood improvement programme with a provincial commitment of \$8.5 million for 1974. Actually only \$3 million had been allocated to the programme when the estimates were presented to the Legislature. The Ontario home renewal plan was supposed to provide low-interest loans for home repairs to the extent of \$10 million for the year 1974. Less than \$1.5 million was actually made available.

On the subject of agriculture, Mr. Speaker, the government promised, "measures will be introduced to provide Ontario farmers with reasonable assurances of the profitable continuing operation of their vital enterprise." I would strongly urge the government to take action in this connection as soon as possible. Our cash crop farmers enjoyed a moderately prosperous year in 1974, but unfortunately the indications are that 1975 will be a very different story indeed.

Inflation continues unchecked. The returns to producers are declining. For many years, our markets and prices have been largely dependent on crops and conditions in the US and in Canada only. But today developments in markets throughout the world have an effect on the situation in Canada.

Recently, the general public and the urban politicians have become increasingly concerned about the rising price of food. The people in the non-farming communities are taking an interest in food production and marketing practices. It is generally realized that farmers in Ontario are not responsible for this tremendous increase in the prices of food. Although high prices are being received for agriculture products, the costs of input for farmers are increasing at an alarming rate. Farm machinery has tripled in price; gasoline, hydro and other fuels have become very expensive. In fact, almost all farm supplies have greatly increased in price.

For example, urea fertilizer which was selling for \$95 a ton in the spring of 1973 is now \$240 a ton. Bulk ammonium nitrate was selling in 1973 at \$69 a ton and at the present time is at \$174 a ton, while diamonium phosphate, a common nitrogen fertilizer, climbed from \$108 a ton to \$240 a ton. A couple of seasons ago, twine was \$5.95 a bale and is now \$28 a bale.

During 1974, net farm income actually decreased by 23 per cent and a further decrease is anticipated in 1975. Many people consider that agriculture has never been more insecure or unstable than it is today because of the rising input costs and falling farm prices. It has been suggested that there is a great need for some kind of farm income protection plan.

Modern farming involves a very large

amount of capital investment. In fact, it has been estimated that Ontario farm capital today is 42 per cent greater in constant dollar terms than in 1961, because this total capital investment is distributed among fewer farms. Investment per farm has increased by approximately 95 per cent and outstanding debts on commercial farms have almost doubled since 1961. Consequently, farmers have much higher overhead costs, including regular mortgage and loan repayments. In 1966 about 35 per cent of Ontario farmers were classed as part-time. In 1951 only about 27 per cent of Ontario farmers reported off-farm work. In 1966 the figure was 41 per cent. In 1971 the figure was 43 per cent. For most farmers the reason for off-farm work is economics—a question, Mr. Speaker, of survival.

Many dairy farmers in Ontario are being forced out of business because of highly expensive labour and supplies. Our population is increasing while our dairy cattle are decreasing in numbers, with the inevitable effect on the price of milk. Hog farmers are finding that increased feed costs are causing them to go out of production, which will lead to a shortage of pork in a few years and subsequent increased prices to the consumer. Cow-calf operators are facing imminent financial disaster because of the low prices paid by the feeder operators and very strong pressures are being felt as a result of soaring prices of feed grain and other feeds.

Inflation is affecting food prices to a frightening degree. Many families are experiencing a very real hardship as a result. The housewife is worried about the future for her family. Every time she buys groceries she finds new price increases on basic necessities. Husbands who have to produce the funds to provide the food and the shelter are under increasing pressures daily and are worried about rising prices combined with rising unemployment.

Recently in the *Globe and Mail*, in an article of March 19, people read that a drop in beef prices to the farmers does not necessarily alter prices of beef to the consumer. Yet one year ago, when beef prices went up to an all-time high to the farmer, consumer prices soared as a result. Surely if the increase in prices to the farmers affects the consumer prices, a decrease should also result in a decrease to the consumer? I am acquainted with one farmer who is fattening over 600 steers at the present time. He tells me that with this tremendous increase in the cost of feeds, if the price of beef doesn't increase considerably he will lose \$50,000 this spring.

Two weeks ago I attended a meeting where

the farmers discussed with the principal, vice-principal and the teachers of a district secondary school the possibilities of a delay in the opening of the secondary school until Sept. 15 next, so that the students could harvest the cash crops in the area, because the farmers have found that students are excellent helpers for harvesting. I understand the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) has been contacted on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, this is a concern to the farmers across the Province of Ontario, to get experienced labour in order to harvest their crops. For some years now a number of farmers have been bringing in Mexican farm labour, but this year government officials have informed farmers that although previously Mexican workers were allowed to bring their families here, this year they can bring in only those who are 16 years old and over. Many people who have come here to work for a number of years on a regular basis are refusing to do so if they cannot bring all their family with them.

I would ask the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) if he would look into this situation and see what assistance can be given so that these Mexican workers will be able to work on our Ontario farms on a seasonal basis. It is to be hoped that the rather depressing prospects for Ontario agriculture will improve very soon.

There is a tremendous shortage of food throughout the world. Ontario farmers could make an important contribution to solving this very serious problem. However, their first-class farming abilities, combined with advanced technology, improved farm machinery and knowledge of the new fertilizers and pesticides, is not sufficient. There must be a strong and dynamic government measure to assist the agriculture industry to preserve our class 1 and class 2 farm land for agricultural purposes.

Low prices for farm products and increased costs of production provide little incentive for farmers to increase crop potential, no matter how great the need for food may be. On the other hand, very high prices for farm products obviously would stimulate much larger production per acre. The cost of land also influences production. Land valued at \$2,000 to \$3,000 per acre, or even more, is unlikely to be used for agriculture. Some people maintain there is little profit in growing field crops on land with a value greater than \$500 an acre.

Marketing board figures for the tender fruit industry show the number of fruit growers selling through boards dropped to 1,498 last

year from 1,596 the year before and more than 2,100 in 1969. More than two million acres were retired from farms in southwestern Ontario between the years 1951 and 1966, and it appears that the rate of loss has doubled from 1966 to the present day.

One of the greatest pressures on the fruit farmers in Niagara fruit land is the increasing price of land. The secretary-manager of the provincial marketing boards for grapes, asparagus and tender fruit has said that an acre of land worth between \$3,000 and \$4,000 to the fruit farmers is worth anywhere from \$15,000 to \$30,000 to other land buyers.

In all Ontario there are only 115.5 million arable acres. As a matter of interest, in the entire world there are only 7.86 billion acres potentially suitable for agriculture. According to the experts, for the first time surplus arable land is close to an end, especially with the population rising at a rate which would double in 30 years. This means productivity must be doubled in the same period if our present nutritional standards are to be maintained.

Dr. Norman Borlaug, an agronomist who received the Nobel Peace Prize for his contribution to the green revolution, has stated that although the contributions of the green revolution to increased food production are considerable and highly significant, they are nonetheless modest in comparison with the magnitude of present global needs.

For generations farmers have had a selfish interest in preserving land—without it they would go out of business. The time has come when urban and suburban people everywhere must have a selfish interest in preserving land—without it they would face a serious food shortage and their children and their children's children would face a very real possibility of starvation.

The government must give top priority to establishing a land reserve for future generations by prohibiting premature and poorly planned development. We simply cannot afford to sit idly by, doing nothing, while our prime land continues to be consumed for other than agricultural purposes. It is a fact of life and economics that agriculture is limited to the use of the prime agricultural lands. Today, farmers cannot use marginal land economically and once our best agricultural land is paved over it cannot be reclaimed as farm land.

Land is our most valuable non-renewable commodity. We must husband our resources. They are not inexhaustible. Certainly, property owners have rights and they must be

protected. However, our rights should be related to a type of stewardship which is in the interests of the community at large, both now and in the future. The province has plenty of room for houses, commerce, urban industry, recreation and agriculture. However, the people who will live here, say, 50 years from now will be happier, healthier and more prosperous if we give more thought than we have been giving to the question of which land should be used for which purposes.

In his status report on the Toronto-centred region in August, 1972, the Treasurer said:

Land prices are escalating so rapidly that an increasing number of people are facing great difficulty in financing a home of their own. Alternatively, they are having to live a long distance away from their place of work and commute for several hours of the day.

However, the government of which he is a member has made a practice in their so-called land planning of merely identifying land which is to be used, making that land more valuable to land speculators whose risks are reduced to a minimum. All they have to do is to hold on to the land and wait their opportunity when planning permission is given.

The Hellyer task force on housing and urban development in 1969 said, in relation to land speculation:

There are several areas where the price of land has jumped up by 100 per cent in a relatively short space of time, and with no apparent change in the physical appearance the owners of the land reap gigantic financial benefits, not from improving or working it, merely by allowing it to lie fallow or in admitted under-use while the efforts of the community around it make such land an ever-increasing valuable asset.

Far from attempting to prevent the destruction of our prime agricultural land, this government has contributed to the problem.

Land has been assembled for industrial parks; superhighways and hydro lines have slashed through valuable farm land. As my colleague, the member for Huron-Bruce, pointed out recently the government plans to expand facilities at the Bruce nuclear power plant. To provide hydro-electric power to the Toronto market will incur capital costs of millions of dollars and, worse, necessitate numerous and heavy transmission lines across prime agricultural land and scenic areas of southwestern Ontario. The so-called

hearings merely went through the motions of obtaining public participation and discussion of these matters. Hydro had already made the decision on which route was to be taken, and proceeded accordingly. The Bradley-Georgetown transmission route was more appropriate, and it would have been much more sensible to take any back-up line for Toronto via the Owen Sound-Collingwood area, linked with the already established Essa-Kleinburg corridor, would be served along that route.

Present Hydro plans would seem designed to cause the maximum damage to ecology and to destroy vital agricultural land, as well as upsetting property owners all along the line who are fighting desperately to prevent the line from going through.

In Kent county, Mr. Speaker, a special committee of property owners is fighting the proposed Hydro right of way takeover. The committee claims it has been pressured from the local Progressive Conservative Party to lay off the provincial Treasurer, according to a recent article in the Windsor Star.

This committee has called upon the Treasurer to explain why property owners are subjected to the agony and frustration, time and expense of an inquiry if elected MPPs and appointed ministers can, with their signatures, overrule all legal democratic procedures. The committee has also asked the Treasurer if all public hearings held in Ontario for government projects are "just a farce." They asked: "Should not the general public object to this type of mock democracy?"

They also questioned the right of elected officials to be more powerful than the judicial system and questioned why property owners have been denied the right to appeal in government decisions approving the Hydro right of way.

The committee, composed of concerned property owners in Harwich, Raleigh and Tilbury townships, is organizing a public meeting at which the provincial government ministers will be asked to answer these and many other questions on Hydro's plans for the future.

A spokesman for this committee stated that paramount on the agenda will be the Ontario Hydro report noting the proposed location of a nuclear power plant in the Kent county area in the year of 1990.

There is growing concern today that the government is not working in the best interests of the general public. The public wants to know why this is so. Incidentally, members of the opposition in the Legislature

have been waiting to know the answer to this particular question for some time.

The decision of the minister to override the decision of the inquiry board held under the Fair Expropriations Act was described as a blow struck against the democratic system. This inquiry was held at a considerable expense to the taxpayers in general. It has been one of the longest inquiries held in Ontario, with all the cost being paid by the taxpayers.

The committee is asking if the public at large is aware of the chicanery that has taken place in Hydro's southern Ontario region.

Inquiry officers were appointed by the provincial government to note whether the proposed expropriation of the Hydro right of way was sound, fair and reasonably necessary. The officers reported that Hydro's taking of the land did not meet any of the requirements and, therefore, Hydro should not be permitted to construct a power line where it requested. In effect, he ruled that Hydro had not done its homework or studied the proper alternatives and therefore should not proceed to build this transmission line. On Sept. 10, 1974, the Treasurer gave the property owners affected 24 hours notice to attend a general meeting at a place called Merlin to hear the report of the inquiry. The report was in Hydro's favour and it was at this time that the government overruled the decision of the inquiry officer. Mr. Speaker, is this the action of a democratic government?

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): No way.

Mr. Spence: Not only is the method of operation of the government in connection with these proposed Hydro corridors open to the gravest criticism, even those loyal supporters of the Conservative Party who may feel their actions can be defended because the end justifies the means, must be assailed by doubt when they hear that the Ontario Energy Board had called for a slowdown in the Ontario Hydro rush to build nuclear power stations.

Ontario Hydro owns fixed assets worth about \$6 billion and proposed spending for the period from 1974 to 1986 is \$30.9 billion. I understand the total proposed for the years 1977 to 1982 is \$8.7 billion, of which only \$1.3 billion is for transmission and distribution facilities. The balance of \$7.4 billion is scheduled to be spent to expand Hydro's operating capacity. The overall needs for the entire province today are between 12,000 and 13,000 megawatts and the government-plan-

ned hydro corridors have a potential of 60,000 to 80,000 megawatts.

On the other hand Hydro chairman Robert Taylor has warned that the rate increase for hydro will be considerably higher in 1976 than that put into effect in January of this year. It has been strongly rumoured that the rates will go up 100 per cent in the next five years alone.

Mr. Speaker, in these days of recession and inflation is it fair and reasonable for Ontario Hydro to charge unwarranted high rates to pay for the vast expansion of facilities when the former Minister of Energy (Mr. McKeough) has indicated that the short-term security of the system is more than adequate?

The government promised in its Speech from the Throne that as a safeguard against the growing complexity of government and its relationship with the individual citizens the government will establish the office of a provincial ombudsman, or an ombudsperson, to ensure the protection of our citizens against arbitrary judgements or practices. What could be more arbitrary than overruling the decision of an inquiry officer on the Hydro corridor? What could be more arbitrary and autocratic than this government's whole attitude, and that of Hydro, in connection with their hydro lines?

As to the proposal to establish the office of a provincial ombudsman, my colleague the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) has been prodding the government to take this action for years. In every session for the past nine or 10 years he has presented a private member's bill to this effect. Now, finally, the government is prepared to do something about his proposal; finally, when on every side the evidence is building up to show it that its days are coming close to an end.

Mr. Speaker, if this Throne Speech is any indication of the kind of legislation, the kind of action in the face of adversity, we are to witness from this government in the difficult days ahead which it has promised us, obviously this government is going to go out with a bang. An hon. member of the government recently chose to liken a member of the Liberal caucus to some form of an Australian lizard. Mr. Speaker, I would have thought such childish talk was beneath the dignity of a minister of the Crown but doubtless my standards are a little old-fashioned. If I were the kind of person to descend to his level I would say this government would soon go out, not like a lion but like a whipped dog, with its tail between its legs; but I shall not make such a comparison.

Mr. Speaker, that winds up my speech. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought the previous speaker's remarks contained some wisdom—particularly his closing words—and I would like to associate myself with them. Strangely enough, the previous member from the Liberal Party who spoke also said some things that made sense and it is clear to me—

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): It's getting better.

Mr. Laughren: Did I say "strangely"?

Mr. Breithaupt: It's getting better

Mr. Laughren: No, it's not getting better. Since I've been down here, Mr. Speaker, in 3½ years I've noticed that the members from beyond Metropolitan Toronto play a major role in the debates of this Legislature. I know they constitute only whatever 117 minus 26 is; I'm always struck by the number of out-of-town members who are in this chamber during the evening sittings. I think the people of Ontario are well served by the members who are spread far and wide across this province.

Mr. Speaker, in your position as Speaker of this chamber, I hope you will address yourself to some of the problems of the members of this Legislature in the session to come. The Camp commission recommendations not only will not solve all the problems but the way they will be implemented will not solve all the problems either.

I know, for example, for the members who represent very large ridings—such as I and the member for Thunder Bay; and members of the government as well—it is much more difficult for us to represent our constituents than it is for someone in Metropolitan Toronto whose constituents can pick up the phone and phone directly to Queen's Park. That is not possible for us.

Mr. Roy: It's not possible from Ottawa either.

Mr. Laughren: I know, as a member who drives in the neighbourhood of 40,000 miles a year, if one puts that in terms of hours on the road and translates those hours into weeks, one can see the kind of time some of us spend in our automobiles. That is not very productive time.

I think there is a great need for constituency offices, particularly in ridings outside

Metropolitan Toronto. I do not believe our constituents are best served by the paltry saving effected by our not having constituency offices. I believe if we had constituency offices we would be able to deal more effectively more often and in more depth with the issues of the day as opposed to individual constituents' problems.

That is where some of us spend an inordinate amount of time but I think members would agree that we cannot ignore the constituents who are having problems. On the other hand, I don't believe our constituencies as a whole are best served by members spending their time doing that. As a member who represents a highly industrialized area, mainly consisting of mining and lumbering, there is an extremely high number of compensation and unemployment insurance problems which I have to handle occasionally, as well as a large number of problems associated with seasonal employment and with the high rate of injuries. I think that there is a great need for constituency offices and I hope that the government will address itself to that problem in the coming session.

While I'm talking about other members' contributions to the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, I was here when the member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Lane) spoke, and I was struck by how terribly defensive he was about what had happened in Elliot Lake, about his role in what had happened in Elliot Lake and about the fact that the workers in Elliot Lake looked not toward their sitting member for assistance or for a voice here at Queen's Park but to members of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, that kind of recognition did not come easily to members of the NDP. It came because of our concern about the kind of workmen's compensation system we've got in this province and because of our identification with the trade union movement in this province. That is something that we work very hard at, and there is nothing wrong with the workers at Elliot Lake realizing that if they are going to have a voice here at Queen's Park, they must turn to the NDP. After all, it is the government that is the architect of their misfortune—and no one else. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I invite the member to come and spend a weekend with me.

Mr. P. Taylor: That would be a lost weekend.

Mr. Laughren: Well, perhaps the minister could ask the member for Algoma-Manitoulin to spend a weekend in Elliot Lake—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Why not? I'd be delighted.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, when those terrifying statistics were coming to light in Elliot Lake and when they were being debated in the standing committee on resource development, the member for Algoma-Manitoulin never showed his face in the committee and never spoke during the debate here in the Legislature either. That is not showing concern for his constituents, and the people in Elliot Lake are very cognizant about that.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member for Algoma-Manitoulin is a high-class member. Don't deny it.

Mr. Laughren: Yes, well—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: A very hard-working member.

Mr. Laughren: Why is it then that the workers in Elliot Lake still have not received justice for what's been done to them? And why is it that the Minister of Natural Resources continues to look the other way when the health of the working people of this province is jeopardized?

Mr. J. Lane (Algoma-Manitoulin): The member knows darn well that things are happening in Elliot Lake.

Mr. Laughren: Yes, and I know why they are happening too; no thanks to the member for Algoma-Manitoulin and no thanks to the Minister of Natural Resources.

Mr. Lane: No thanks to the member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, if there is one minister of the Crown who has not earned the right to continue to be a minister, it's the Minister of Natural Resources—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is very unfair; a real unfair and unjust remark.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Besides, it is political.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): He is trying to make a little political hay.

Mr. Laughren: I am glad that the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development is here, because, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Havrot: The member is in trouble in his own riding.

Mr. Roy: The House leader should look at himself closer in the mirror tomorrow morning when he is shaving.

Mr. Laughren: The Minister of Natural Resources regards the working people in the mining community—the workers in the mines, as he does the resource; something that's to be exploited. That is the reason I say—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is a very unfair statement. He is one of them and the member knows it.

Mr. Laughren: He is one of the miners?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes.

Mr. Jessiman: Is that the same as school teachers from Nickel Belt being on leave of absence?

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, if I could correct the member for Fort William, the member for Nickel Belt does not have a leave of absence from his job. As a matter of fact, maybe that is something I should talk to you about, Mr. Speaker. Did you know that of the different levels of education in this province—elementary, secondary, the community college system, the university system—of those four, only one group of teachers does not have an automatic leave of absence when its members serve in this Legislature and that is the community college teachers. There's the man I should be talking to, the government House leader.

Mr. Roy: Don't talk to him about that; that is policy.

Mr. Laughren: That is discrimination against the people in our community colleges.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, I wonder if there—

Mr. Stokes: What is the member for Fort William on leave from?

Mr. Roy: He is on leave from the ONR.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In view of the hour, would the member like to move the adjournment of the debate?

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, if I could just make one concluding remark, I would say that it is nice to see the member for Fort William on leave from his usual activities, whatever they might be in this province.

Mr. Laughren moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the House sit tomorrow at 10 a.m. to continue the debate on the Speech from the Throne and that the standing social development committee be authorized to sit concurrently with the House for its consideration of Bill 4, An Act to amend the Child Welfare Act.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, before you call the motion, we have agreement on the point, but I think it should be on the record, that in the course of the debate tomorrow morning certain rules of the House will be suspended. There will be no quorum calls or divisions. The House will rise at 12:30 for lunch and resume for ordinary business at 2 o'clock.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: It is my understanding, and I have been asked to announce to the House, that the social development committee will meet in committee room 1 at 10:30 tomorrow morning to consider Bill 4.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 25, 1975

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. P. Taylor, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Spence, Mr. Laughren	451
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Laughren, agreed to	479
Motion re sittings of House and social development committee, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	479
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	479



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Wednesday, March 26, 1975

Morning Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26, 1975

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(continued)

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): The Liberals have no leader, you know, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, I was just starting my remarks last night at adjournment and I didn't get into much of what I really intended to say—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): Where are the member's supporters?

Mr. Laughren: —because of interjections from the government; they diverted me from my purpose. I will not be so diverted today, Mr. Speaker. There are a couple of issues I want to talk about, one being the problems of the smaller communities in northern Ontario and the other being the whole question of sex discrimination in the Province of Ontario and what this government is doing, or not doing, about it.

Those may seem like divergent topics, Mr. Speaker, but I assure you they are of concern to a great many people in this province. One of the things about northern Ontario, and my colleague, the member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes) has spoken often about it, is the whole question of the lack of economic development and what that means in terms of the quality of life for people who live in those communities.

It's not some kind of academic term. The lack of economic development can be translated very clearly into the kind of life that those people live in those small communities. We know, for example, that not having medical services means a great deal to the people in a community, and we know that the lack of recreational facilities can affect the kind of life that people lead for the rest of their lives.

For example, if the young people in a community have no recreational facilities at all it can lead to all sorts of problems in that community in terms of what those young people do with their time. There are many small communities that just don't have any facilities such as these at all.

The lack of job opportunities in the small communities means that the young people, the better educated people, women in particular, have a lack of job opportunities in those small communities. And it's not just the small communities, it's even places as large as Sudbury and, I suspect, Thunder Bay, the Soo and North Bay as well. But certainly in the smaller communities, there is a real problem in terms of job opportunities for young people.

The poor roads and poor communications feed the kind of alienation that people feel in northern Ontario. Of course, problems such as polluted water supply and lack of sewage facilities mean these people are being denied the kind of quality of life of people in southern Ontario, and these people would not stand for it for a moment. Small communities in the south, even of equal population, I suspect would not live under the same conditions that citizens in northern Ontario have to live under.

The government, as a response to these complaints about lack of services in northern Ontario, points to the increased municipal grants for northern Ontario and the resource equalization grants, and builds the odd new road or promises the odd new road or the odd new passing lane as though that was the answer to the problems. Municipal politicians across northern Ontario—

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Where are the member's alternatives?

Mr. Laughren: If the member will just listen I'll tell him what the alternatives are.

Mr. Speaker, municipal politicians in northern Ontario—

Mr. Gilbertson: They don't believe the member anyway.

Mr. Laughren: Municipal politicians in northern Ontario have traditionally responded by demanding more grants from Queen's Park. When I think of the kind of wealth we in northern Ontario are sitting upon, and yet we come to Queen's Park with our cap in our hand—in a kind of world where resources are declining, where there's going to be a tremendous shortage of these natural resources in the years to come—our municipal politicians in the north come down here with their hands out and say, "Give us more grants. That's the answer." I think that's insanity.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): We wouldn't have Ontario without the north.

Mr. Henderson: The member for Nickel Belt won't live long enough to see that.

Mr. Laughren: That is not the answer. It will not be, until the people of northern Ontario realize, in the first place—the member for Algoma said, "What's your solution?" I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker—that the solution to the problems in northern Ontario is not simply a matter of more grants to those communities in northern Ontario.

Mr. Reid: It would help.

Mr. Gilbertson: I just had a letter from a constituent who wants us to leave it the way it is.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member for Nickel Belt has the floor.

Mr. Gilbertson: I have a letter.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, I didn't really want to get into this topic now. I wanted to wait until the budget debate to talk about what the long-term economic solution is for northern Ontario. But really, the long-term solution to the problems of northern Ontario will never be achieved until the people in Ontario own their own resources, because that's the lever for unlocking the development of northern Ontario.

Until we own our own resources, until we determine to what extent those resources are going to be processed into finished products, then we shall never control the development of northern Ontario. If you or I, Mr. Speaker,

owned those resources, we would do the same as the multinational corporations are doing, and that is, exploit them in order to maximize the profits. That's the name of the game. We should have no misunderstanding about that.

What I am saying is that if the people of Ontario owned those resources, it would be an entirely different story.

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): The member means the people of northern Ontario, doesn't he?

Mr. Laughren: The people in Ontario, not the people in northern Ontario.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The member is talking about state ownership.

Mr. Laughren: I am talking about public ownership of our natural resources. That's exactly what I am talking about. Until the day comes that that is achieved, and it will never be achieved until we have an NDP government in this province, then we'll never maximize the benefits to the people of Ontario of that enormous supply of resources.

Mr. Speaker, there is another solution, of course, that people in northern Ontario talk about. We have the Ed Diebel solution; he is a disenchanted Tory from North Bay, who claims that northern Ontario should be a separate province.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): He had a lot of support, didn't he? He had a tremendous amount of support, didn't he?

Mr. Laughren: No, he has virtually no support and he certainly doesn't have mine either.

Mr. Havrot: He had no people show up in Kirkland Lake.

Mr. Laughren: That's correct, and I don't support him either, because that's a simplistic solution to a complicated problem. He gets the kind of support that he deserves for that kind of scheme.

The complaints about northern Ontario continue. We hear them over and over again in this Legislature from members from northern Ontario. But at the same time, in southern Ontario we are continuing to see good farm land go out of production at—well, there are different figures, but 26 acres an hour, 365 days a year, farm land is going out of production; I've heard estimates as high as 50 acres an hour. While this is occurring, there is land in northern Ontario sitting idle and no development at all occurring.

There is a strange kind of contradiction in this whole process of paving over southern Ontario, because while this farm land is going out of production, a farmer some place else in this country kills his calves because he is not getting the proper price for his calves.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It's a world-wide problem.

Mr. Laughren: Public wrath descends upon him while we continue to pave over southern Ontario, which has good farm land and in the future will be required for farm products. There is a contradiction there that this government hasn't dealt with.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They have farming problems in the communist countries too.

Mr. Laughren: Oh, I am not expounding the virtues of communist countries—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It is a world-wide problem.

Mr. Laughren: I am just telling the member that this government has still not come up with any kind of overall plan to develop the province in a rational way.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): A five-year plan.

Mr. Laughren: No, it needs to be longer than that. It takes five years to—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Listen, my friend, five years ago in this province planning was a dirty word.

Mr. Yakabuski: Just as far as the member's party was concerned.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order please.

Mr. Laughren: Despite all the promises, we still don't have an overall plan for the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Henderson: We've had one for the life of this government.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Laughren: Tell the present Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) that we don't need planning in the Province of Ontario and see what he says. It is because of a lack of planning that the Tories still don't know how to govern properly for all the people in Ontario.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): The member's type of planning won't help the issue.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Planning is a four-letter word.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Planning has all kinds of connotations.

Mr. Laughren: Well, let the member tell me what kind of planning it is when we have possibly four million people in a 130-mile stretch from Niagara-on-the-Lake to Oshawa, with projections that there is going to be as many as eight million people by the end of the century, while at the same time we have underdevelopment in northern Ontario? What kind of sanity is that?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The member is talking about regimentation.

Mr. Yakabuski: Under our system we can't send them to Siberia.

Mr. Havrot: We'll call in the troops and force them up there.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Laughren: Well, let me tell my friend something—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Laughren: The Tories claim that if we direct growth, we are telling people where to live and work. Well let me tell them that the people who graduate from our high schools, colleges and universities in northern Ontario are being told that they must go to southern Ontario to work because that's where the jobs are.

Mr. Havrot: Bull! The member will find out when his kids grow up. I have found out already. My kids had jobs in northern Ontario and didn't have to go south.

Mr. Laughren: The Tories are doing their own kind of direction.

Mr. Havrot: The member will find out when his kids grow up.

Mr. Laughren: I will find out that my kids would probably prefer to live in northern Ontario but the job opportunities will not be there for them—

Mr. Havrot: My kids had jobs in northern Ontario without going south.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): What's wrong with southern Ontario? It's a great place to live.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, I might say that with a new chairman of the Ontario

Northland, there is very little indication that anything will change in northern Ontario.

Mr. Havrot: The member must have fallen out of bed this morning, on his head.

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): I heard that the member grew up in southern Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I wonder if the hon. member would direct his remarks through the Chair and ignore some of the interjections.

Mr. Laughren: I thought I was talking through the Chair.

Mr. Stokes: I thought he was, Mr. Speaker, despite all the interjections over there.

Mr. Havrot: Did the member for Nickel Belt fall out of bed this morning on his head?

An hon. member: Throw him out.

Mr. Laughren: Well, Mr. Speaker, all I am saying is that the government in the Province of Ontario must begin to direct the kind of growth we have, because at the present time it is being directed without their guidance into southern Ontario.

We need only look at developments such as Metro Centre, the York region sewer line, Pickering, Cayuga, Nanticoke—where is the sanity of that kind of planning, while in northern Ontario we have an out-migration of people to southern Ontario? There is no sanity in that at all.

There are significant growth centres in northern Ontario, Mr. Speaker. There is North Bay, Sudbury, Sault Ste. Marie, Timmins, Thunder Bay—but it is no thanks to the government of Ontario that the potential is there for development, because this government is not doing anything to direct growth. How else could we be sitting here in 1975 with still no overall provincial plan—none whatsoever? That truly is deplorable. As a province, Mr. Speaker, we surely have enormous potential, more potential than any other jurisdiction in this country.

Mr. Havrot: How long has the member lived in the north?

Mr. Laughren: I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that as long as this government sits in power the people in northern Ontario are not going to receive the kind of benefits to which they

are entitled. How else, Mr. Speaker, could we have a report on a small community by the name of Gogama—I would like to talk about Gogama for a moment—

Mr. Yakabuski: I wish he would. I wish he would.

Mr. Laughren: —because it is indicative of the kind of neglect that other people in northern Ontario receive from this government. I would like to quote from a report—

Mr. Yakabuski: That's where the member abandoned the little fellow and went with the establishment.

Mr. Laughren: I am trying not to be provocative this morning, Mr. Speaker. I am talking directly to you.

Mr. Speaker: Just talk to me.

Mr. Laughren: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I notice you always listen to me.

Mr. Havrot: It's not because he wants to.

An hon. member: He's doing a great job.

Mr. Laughren: I'd like to quote from a special report on water quality and supply problems in Gogama, prepared by the—

Mr. Stokes: Just listen carefully.

Mr. Laughren: —Ministry of the Environment in 1973.

Mr. Henderson: He understands the problem in the Nickel Belt.

Mr. Stokes: He doesn't want to flood the north like the government does. The government would like to make all of northern Ontario a huge reservoir for the south.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, we have a combination of the member for Lambton who wants to flood northern Ontario and the member for Timiskaming who wants to sell it to the highest bidder for the sake of a few jobs at the minimum wage. That is the story of the member for Timiskaming.

Mr. Havrot: Boy, the member can twist facts around. He is a master at it.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, if I could go back directly to the problems of Gogama, it is a community of 600 people, where they have two sources of drinking water. They have the Ministry of Natural Resources communal water supply, the Canadian National

Railways communal supply, and there is a private-well source of supply. I would like to quote from the report of 1973. First of all, they are talking about the CNR waterworks:

This system was installed subsequent to an accidental spill of a noxious chemical, methyl isobutyl ketone, from a railway tank car in 1962. The chemical seeped into the ground and a number of private wells became contaminated. The CNR acknowledged its responsibility for any damages it caused and extended its waterworks system to those whose wells were affected. The extensions to the system do not meet the minimum standards required by the Ministry of the Environment.

Initially, 19 homes were connected to the CNR system and during the years since the chemical spill, an additional 11 connections were made when the area of contamination increased.

The extensions made to permit these connections were also without the required approval.

Due to the extra demand associated with the increasing number of connections, and an 800-gal. pressure tank which is barely adequate to maintain pressure throughout the system, the homes have experienced inadequate pressure. Also due to the fact that standby power facilities or standby chlorination facilities are not provided, there has been an instance when the system could not pump water for a two-day period due to an electrical failure, and other instances where unchlorinated water was pumped into the system due to chlorinator breakdown.

And then further on:

Adverse samples containing coliform bacteria were collected from the distribution system by the Ministry of the Environment staff on May 29, 1973, during a period in which the chlorinator was out of order and untreated water was being pumped into the distribution system. The operating authority had not notified the consumers that their water was unsafe for consumption.

In general, this system is over-extended in its ability to supply water to the consumer and the quality of the water supply has been questionable at times.

That is the CNR water supply.

Let me talk to you for a moment, Mr. Speaker, about the private water supply, which is from ground wells. I am quoting from the report again:

A complaint from the residents of Gogama whose wells were affected had been received by the Ministry of the Environment and Texaco Canada Ltd. had acknowledged that there had been a product loss of 800 to 1,000 gal. at their local service station.

Samples collected from the well supplies of R. Gravelle, E. Tourgeon, and C. Simoneau of the Texaco service station all showed significant levels of gasoline contamination.

And then further:

Samples collected from other well supplies show high concentrations of phenols. Gasoline, which is characteristically high in phenolic compounds, may be responsible for the phenols found in these well supplies.

And then they talk further about the private water supply:

Tests performed on some samples for nitrogen compounds revealed significant nitrate levels. Nitrate levels ranged from one part per million as N to 20 parts per million as N. The accepted safe limit for nitrate in a potable water supply has been determined to be 10 parts per million as N. Levels of nitrate in water supplies above this limit have been associated with the cause of methemoglobinemia, a disease affecting infant children.

Subsequently, a follow-up survey was conducted Nov. 23, 1973, at which time a representative 35 wells were sampled throughout the community. Again, significant levels of nitrates were found in all samples, with over 50 per cent of these containing nitrates in excess of the accepted level of 10 parts per million as N.

It is felt that the probable source of these nitrate levels is the biological degradation of sewage waste. Nitrogen compounds are an end product of this process. With sewage waste water being in many instances discharged directly into the ground water-table in the cesspool disposal systems and with the potable water supply being this same ground water, it is not surprising that nitrogen compounds associated with the decomposition of sewage are finding their way into water supplies.

Then they did some other tests, Mr. Speaker.

Laboratory tests have also determined that water supplies collected from private wells contain a number of chemical constituents in excess of recognized acceptable levels. Sodium was found to be present in

concentrations as high as 169 parts per million. Patients on salt-free diets are advised to avoid consumption of water containing more than 50 parts per million sodium. Of 35 samples tested for sodium, 13 had concentrations of 50 parts per million or higher. Phenols were found to be present in concentrations as high as 14 ppb, excluding wells contaminated with gasoline. Phenolic compounds are often responsible for taste and odour problems in water levels as low as one to two ppb.

This ministry suggests a maximum limit of phenolic compounds in a potable water supply is set at 1.0 ppb. Of the 12 samples tested for phenols, 11 exceeded this limit.

Then, in conclusion, this is what the Ministry of the Environment report had to say, Mr. Speaker:

The sampling of the ground water in the Gogama area has revealed chemical constituents present which could be a direct health hazard to the people and other chemicals have been found in the ground water which produced taste and odours in the water. High nitrate concentrations in the ground water appear to pose the most serious health hazard, and this was shown to be widespread throughout the community. For these reasons, there appears to be a very definite need for a communal water supply system in Gogama, which would supply water from a source of acceptable quality to those residents who now use the ground water supply. In view of the questionable quality of the ground water, further development should not be allowed to take place utilizing the ground water supply.

Mr. Speaker, before I list the recommendations of this report, let me comment on that last statement: "Further development should not be allowed to take place utilizing the ground water supply." Before this report came out, the Ministry of Housing—I am not too sure whether the Ministry of Housing was actually created at that point or not—but the Ministry of Housing had agreed to build some rent-geared-to-income units in the town of Gogama. When this report came out, that, of course, negated the possibility of those units being built. So here we have a contaminated water supply stopping the Ministry of Housing from approving the building of public housing units in the town of Gogama, despite the fact that the Ministry of the Environment has recommended there should be a communal water supply. Quoting again:

The CNR system is overextended and should be brought up to acceptable stand-

ards, if it is to continue to supply potable water to some residents of Gogama.

Then they made five specific recommendations, Mr. Speaker:

The ground water-table should be abandoned as a source of water supply in Gogama.

A communal water supply system should be constructed to serve those residents presently utilizing ground water for a potable supply.

The CNR water supply system should be upgraded to meet recognized acceptable standards for such a water supply system.

No further development should take place in Gogama, utilizing private individual ground water supplies.

The Ministry of Natural Resources and the CNR should be approached by the community to establish that they would be agreeable to incorporating portions of their individual communal waterworks systems into a single system which would provide a basis for supplying the entire community of Gogama.

Mr. Speaker, that was in November, 1973. We are now in March, almost in April, 1975, and despite repeated pleas to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. W. Newman) to introduce a communal water supply system for all the people in Gogama, nothing is done. There are a number of homes in the town that have a communal water supply besides the CNR one which is adequate. Those are for Ministry of Natural Resources personnel. They have a communal water supply, but it is accepted that the facilities cannot be expanded sufficiently to supply the whole town. The response of the Minister of the Environment, when I wrote to him about a communal water supply was as follows. I don't know whether you are familiar with Bill 102 or not, Mr. Speaker. That's the bill that would provide some kind of recognition to community councils in small communities in northern Ontario without having them obtain full municipal status. Quoting from the minister's letter:

When Bill 102 receives third reading, the citizens of Gogama will be able to obtain equivalent status and be eligible to apply to the province to have a provincial waterworks project developed to overcome the inadequacies of the present various water supply arrangements.

That's dated October 11, 1974.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on that letter, because Bill 102, as you may or may not know, will be permissive legislation.

It will not require every community to create a community council. And, indeed, there are people in some communities who feel that it's just a back door way of increasing taxation for people who receive very little for the taxes they presently pay.

Mr. Stokes: Very little service.

Mr. Laughren: I've supported the concept of Bill 102 as long as it provides a minimum level of services to those communities. Bill 102, in its initial draft, promised not a single thing to the people of the unorganized communities, except that they would have a voice to which the government could listen. But it guaranteed no minimum level of services to those communities.

Here we have the Minister of the Environment saying that if there is going to be any assistance provided in the way of a communal water supply, it will only be if those citizens form a community council under Bill 102.

I don't call that permissive legislation. That's holding a gun to the head of the people in Gogama and telling them they must form a community council. They probably will anyway, Mr. Speaker, because they've provided some real leadership among the unorganized communities in northeastern Ontario. But that's not the principle. The principle is that they're being told they must form a community council if they're going to solve the water supply problems.

I don't know how the ministry can sit there with the 1973 report telling it that the levels of contamination are dangerous to the health of the people, and not do anything about it. My leader, when he was talking in this debate, talked about the failure of leadership. Mr. Speaker, who is providing the leadership in this government for the people in the small communities in northern Ontario? There is not a single ministry that seems to give a damn.

We had the Treasurer standing up yesterday in this House talking about a scheme for improvements in Dryden. Mr. Speaker, it is not enough to take one community, such as Dryden, and stand up here and talk about financial aid to the communities. How does the government justify a single community in northern Ontario having that kind of water supply? It is insanity, and nothing is done.

Mr. Speaker, it's fine for this government to talk about Ontario being a place to stand, but I can tell you, with the kind of sewage disposal systems and the number of outdoor privies in northern Ontario, it's a cold place

to sit at 30 below. This government is very good on catchy phrases, like "a place to stand," but I'd like to send some of those members opposite up there at 30 below and have them sit outside for a few minutes.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Thirty minutes. He's got problems.

Mr. Laughren: I'm telling you, Mr. Speaker, that some of the lots on which those people live are about 5,000 sq ft, and those lots were purchased from the town many years ago. Since then, of course, legislation has been introduced which makes it a requirement that a lot for a septic system be 15,000 sq ft. I don't quarrel with that. Of course it should be 15,000 sq ft, particularly in a place like Gogama where there is a very sandy soil. And as a matter of fact, that's one of the problems. The sewage system has polluted the very high water-table.

But at the same time, the same government which sold them the lots of 5,000 sq ft is telling them they can't put in a septic system; that they will not provide a communal water supply; and that they are condemned to outdoor privies in 1975. How is that any kind of justice and how is that redressing the imbalances between northern and southern Ontario? Of course it's not; and we get a little tired of the kind of hollow promises that come forth.

I must say, though, Mr. Speaker, that in the Throne Speech there were no promises for northern Ontario. There was nothing in there that would indicate anything is going to change for the people in northern Ontario who have problems. I can only assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the day is coming when the people in northern Ontario are going to get even with this government.

I've talked a little bit about the water supply problems but that's only one of them. It's like the other communities in northern Ontario which have no medical services, not even a visiting clinic; not even a railroad car that comes through with a preventive kind of programme to look after the teeth of the children in those schools; there are no periodic visits by a doctor or a nurse practitioner.

There is no reason why clinics could not be established in those communities with a nurse practitioner in residence and with a doctor making periodic visits to that community on a regular basis; no reason at all. Yet nothing seems to happen. In the summertime there are very large numbers of tourists who flock into those areas and there is no

service in case of emergency for those people either.

There is ample justification for providing medical services to those communities. I've mentioned one town, Gogama, but I could talk about any number of them. There is another small community up there, named Foleyet, that has similar problems. Not the same severity of problems in terms of pollution of the drinking water but equal problems in terms of health care, recreation, no ambulance service at all, inadequate sewage disposal and water supply.

An hon. member: What about fire protection?

Mr. Laughren: There is virtually no fire protection at all. It's legendary in northern Ontario that in those communities where the Ministry of Natural Resources has an office they provide water or fire protection. Of course, if fire breaks out the Ministry of Natural Resources wheels out its equipment and immediately pours water on all the surrounding trees so that they don't catch fire. That's just not good enough but at the present time there is absolutely no money available to unorganized communities for fire protection; none at all, not a penny. The former Solicitor General (Mr. Kerr) has promised there will be funds available but I don't know how long we are going to be given these kinds of promises. So far there is nothing and that is reprehensible.

I do hope that in the years to come, hopefully not too many years the roads system in northern Ontario will be improved. I don't believe that in many areas the potential for development has even been tapped. As my friend from Timiskaming would know there is a road which goes from Elk Lake to Highway 144, which runs between Sudbury and Timmins. Then that road stops but there is a tremendous potential for a road to be continued toward Chapleau, running through a private forest preserve of the Eddy Forest Products, which would provide enormous potential for development in that area.

The Ministry of Transportation and Communications is already working on a programme to see what would be the best route for a highway through there. I would urge it to get on with it but the vibrations throughout the ministry are that it's a 15-year programme. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that could be a four- or five-year programme and not a 15-year programme.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to you that you should use whatever influence you have with

this government to ensure that when Bill 102 is introduced later—hopefully this spring—there be in it a guarantee of a minimum level of municipal services for those small communities. At the present time it promises nothing and it will not be successful unless the people in those communities see there is a benefit to them in organizing a community council. At the present time, they look at that bill and say, "Where is the benefit to us in this bill?"

It's a little annoying, Mr. Speaker, to talk during the Throne debate and realize that there are no cabinet ministers in the Legislature at all when these are very serious problems. They are not problems that are entirely parochial in nature. I'm speaking and using examples of specific communities but you need only ask other members of this Legislature who represent northern ridings to be told that they are common throughout northern Ontario. I hope you will pass on our concern to the appropriate cabinet ministers, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to talk about one other issue that has bothered me for some time. I've spoken about it at other times in this chamber, and that's the whole question of sex discrimination in Ontario. This is International Women's Year and I think we have a right to expect that Ontario would do something in a legislative way, because it is International Women's Year as declared by the United Nations. But nothing is happening legislatively.

There are some programmes the government has undertaken. I would like to leave that for a moment, though, before I review just what the government is doing and tell the House what I think it should be doing, besides offering women more jobs in liquor stores and striking plaques and putting out glossy pamphlets and opening information booths.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that the whole question of sex discrimination is not a simple problem. It's one that occurs for a large number of reasons, and it is not solely because there is a Conservative government sitting there that there is sex discrimination in Ontario. We know that it is an economic necessity. Many of my friends in the chamber will disagree with this, but it really is an economic necessity under a capitalist system to have that pool of real or potentially low-paid or unemployed labour in our system.

I realize that the power structure in this province, as in other jurisdictions, is male-dominated, as are the three political parties

in this chamber, and as is the civil service as well as the private sector. I realize that society doesn't move overnight from a male-dominated society to one that recognizes equal rights for everyone. So I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that there are simple solutions or that the government in itself can solve the problem overnight. Of course that is not so.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The member would have to destroy the capitalist system.

Mr. Laughren: Well, that's really what it comes down to.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That is what he would have to do.

Mr. Havrot: That is his next step.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): We don't have to destroy it. It's going to destroy itself.

Mr. Laughren: Yes.

Mr. Deans: It is going to destroy itself because of the greed of people like those two members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Havrot: Bring out the hammer and sickle.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will continue.

Mr. Laughren: Thank you for that interlude, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deans: What is the member for Timiskaming going to do? Use his doughnuts for wheels on the Ontario Northland?

Mr. Havrot: We'll stick a doughnut on the member's nose—

Mr. Deans: Is he going to get the help of his friend here?

Mr. Havrot: —and stuff a few in his mouth too.

Mr. Deans: That's the best defence. Is the member for Timiskaming going to respond?

Mr. Havrot: I wouldn't waste the time of the House with the type of trash we're listening to.

Mr. Deans: I wouldn't doubt that it would be a waste of time if he tried.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will not be provoked. Would he continue his remarks?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: The member for Timiskaming hasn't said a word in four years.

Mr. Havrot: But I've done a lot more than the member has in four years.

Mr. Deans: All he is is a political hack.

Mr. Havrot: I do more than the member does any day of the week.

Mr. Deans: All he is is a political hack—an appointment to try to hold power for the Tories.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Nickel Belt has the floor. Will the others desist from their remarks, please?

Mr. Laughren: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I needed a drink of water. I will try not to be provocative, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Havrot: He was born that way.

Mr. Deans: Is he still here? Nothing has gone right in Timiskaming since he was elected.

Mr. Havrot: Just go and check the record there.

Mr. Deans: Maple Mountain has gone and the hospital board has resigned just because of him—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. McIlveen: Which one of the NDP has the Toni?

Mr. Deans: —because he can't represent them adequately.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Will the hon. member continue?

Mr. Deans: Keep him in order.

Mr. Laughren: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I didn't want you to name the member for Timiskaming because he is a useful diversion occasionally.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that under our present economic system there never can be economic equality. I accept that and that's one reason I'm working to change the economic system. Let the member for Prince Edward-Lennox have no illusions. That is what it is all about. I'm very happy to say that that is exactly what I am working toward—that is, changing our economic system.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: We can see that. That's obvious.

Mr. Laughren: Despite the fact we may not be able to achieve equality, improvements can be made. There can be improvements in the delivery of child care facilities in this province and there can be legislation introduced which would, for the first time, provide equal pay for work of equal value. I would ask that you pay particular note to exactly what I am saying, Mr. Speaker: not equal pay for equal work but equal pay for work of equal value, because equal pay for equal work allows employers to set up a system of classification of jobs which negates the whole intent of the legislation of equal pay for equal work.

It can be done; it is difficult to monitor in the beginning, but it can be done. If it's done carefully at the beginning, it will discourage employers from classifying differently in order to pay differently. There can be incentives built into the legislation to encourage employers to pay equally for work of equal value.

There can be changes in our educational system to remove the kind of sex stereotyping that I want to talk about in some detail.

I'd like to talk about it at some length because I think most people are not aware of how pervasive it is.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to define exactly what I mean by sex stereotyping. The best definition I've heard of it comes from a study by Margaret Evans of the language study centre of the Toronto Board of Education. She says:

Sexism refers to all those attitudes and actions which relegate women to a secondary and inferior status in society. Textbooks are sexist if they omit the actions and achievements of women, if they demean women by using patronizing language, or if they show women only in stereotyped roles and with less than the full range of human interests, traits and capabilities.

While there is an awareness of what sex stereotyping is, Mr. Speaker, there is very little being done in a comprehensive way. With an assistant, I did considerable research to find out what had been done; and the only comprehensive studies appear to have been done in the United States—and certainly not Ontario, although there are a number of studies under way.

I contacted a number of people—and I don't mean to put down these people who are working on these studies, because they're working very hard and they are all legi-

timately concerned about it. We contacted the following groups: The Ministry of Education publications section, Women's Place; the OISE media group; Canadian Women's Education Press; the editor of Community Schools; the editor of the Status of Women Newsletter; the librarian at Seneca College; Fiona Nelson, chairperson of the Toronto Board of Education; the president of the Federation of Women Teachers; Margaret Evans, who I mentioned, at the language study centre of the Toronto board; Audrey Hadfield of Surfacing: A Colloquium for Women; Ellen Campbell of OISE; the ad hoc committee respecting the status of women in the north York system; and the curriculum development branch of the Ministry of Education.

All of these people expressed a very legitimate concern—and I mean that—but none of these groups was approaching it in a comprehensive kind of way.

To show you the kind of studies that are being done, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give you some examples. In July, 1973, Margaret Evans of the language study centre analysed two Ontario Reader Series; "Integrated Language Programmes," by Ginn and Co., and "Language Experience Reading Programme," by Gage. In those two studies there are 13 textbooks in all, and all of them are listed on the Ministry of Education's circular 14, which is the approved list of textbooks. Audrey Hadfield of Surfacing: A Colloquium for Women, surveyed primary school readers used in grades 1 to 4 in Halton county schools and there was also a study on Action English II by Gage.

All three studies showed that the stories and pictures in these textbooks helped to socialize children into conventionally-accepted sex roles. The general conclusion and recommendations arising from these studies are, in Audrey Hadfield's words:

While we are aware that many factors must be considered in the selection of school readers, the data obtained from our survey causes us to draw the conclusion that some change must be initiated in the type of literature to which our children are being exposed.

Mr. Speaker, these people made a careful scrutiny and, indeed, I would say an extensive study of all the elementary school readers. They found, among other pertinent conclusions, that men and women play a far wider role in modern society than the regimented lifestyle pictures of the primary readers would have us believe. That will become clear as I further document the kind of sex discrimination I am talking about.

The solution is not complicated: It is to recommend books on Circular 14 that are non-sexist. It is not a complicated solution. It can be done. There are lists of books now which are not sexist and which could be implemented into the elementary school programme.

(There was a comprehensive survey done by the text book survey group of the regional municipality of York in September, 1972, and the survey, which was named "A Brief on Sex Role Stereotyping in Ontario Primary Readers," was submitted to the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) in 1972. This was a study of all the elementary school readers and they found, if I can quote their conclusion:

We realize that textbooks are constantly being re-evaluated and revised and that efforts are being made to make them more relevant and up to date. But we have found no revisions to date concerning the issues mentioned above.

That's talking about sex discrimination. To date, Mr. Speaker, nothing seems to have been done by the Minister of Education.

I would like to give you an example of just how extensive sex stereotyping is. There was a research project undertaken by Surfacing, a Colloquium for Women at Oakville, Ont., where they did a survey of the primary school readers as well. I would like to quote from that brief:

While we are aware that many factors must be considered in the selection of school readers, the data obtained from our survey causes us to draw the conclusion that some change must be initiated in the type of literature to which our children are being exposed. All primary school pupils come into daily contact with school readers, thus a study of the content of these books is considered essential. The early school years represent a crucial stage in the development of attitudes and personality characteristics in the context of the educational process. We therefore consider it imperative that the psychological implications as well as the academic value of school texts be closely scrutinized.

For the purpose of this survey, every story in the readers listed was read and a brief summary made of the story content describing activities involving males and activities involving females.

Analysis of the survey clearly shows definite male and female role expectations.

Boys are portrayed as acting with ingenuity, creativity, resourcefulness, bravery, perseverance, curiosity, adventurousness and autonomy. Their achievements are multi-dimensional.

Girls react with passivity, docility, dependency, incompetence, fear, aimlessness, emotion, kindness, thoughtfulness and altruism. Their achievements are rare and uni-dimensional.

The psychological effects of this stereotyping requires much consideration to evaluate its possible effect on both boys and girls. We are particularly concerned regarding its effect on girls since we consider it to be more damaging to their developing self-concept. The implications of this sex-role stereotyping are far-reaching in their influence on male-female interaction. However, this study does not attempt to explore these implications, rather it is intended to provide specific documented evidence that sex-role stereotyping exists in our school system.

We have compiled a reference list including articles and books which have thoroughly researched and analyzed the effect of male-female role stereotyping in our society.

We hope that this survey will lead its reader towards further exploration of this vital issue, with the expectation that collectively we can work towards the elimination of negative and damaging stereotyping as it exists in our school texts.

Mr. Speaker, those are hopeful conclusions and we have very little reason to believe that the Minister of Education is going to do very much about making that a reality.

I note that we have a substitute Speaker (Mr. McIlveen) in the Chair right now. He's particularly interested in this problem because he was the chairman of the committee on which I served. I'd like to give members some specific examples of activities that were referred to in that brief. This is in a survey of those elementary readers, and this is an analysis sheet a research project undertaken by Surfacing: A Colloquium for Women, at Oakville.

These are some of the activities of boys in a book called "Listening Letters," by Holt, Rinehart and Winston—Tim and Sam playing baseball; Tim and Sam eating sandwiches on a homemade raft; Ron playing with a spinning top; Tom riding a horse; and Bob playing with a pet pig.

These are the activities of the girls, Mr. Speaker. Pam has a disaster in the kitchen and

the dog spills the jam; Babs, playing with a cat in a pram, threatened by a dog, saved by a man; Ann and Jan playing with a cat on a pillow.

In another book called "Laughing Letters" by Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Ed and Don are fishing; Don catches a fish; Bud goes off to play ice hockey; Ted is sick in bed; Ken is playing with frogs; Bill collects interesting things; Timmy, at camp; meets and helps a dragon; Andy is the best shot in the west; Chuck is visiting at the ranch and riding a horse.

As for the girls in that book Mom was sitting watching Dad and Tom fish; Kim falls through the ice and is saved by a dog—these are the girls—Ann is gathering nuts for granddad; Brenda is sitting waiting for the bus and forgets her money, and her mother arrives with the money; Linda is lost and crying; Big Ed, the policeman, helps her; Jill goes to the circus, and the things she sees are portrayed; Velda swings on a swing in a velvet dress.

In that same book there are several animal stories. To give you an example of how pervasive this thing is, Mr. Speaker, all but three of the animals have male names. There are Ron Rabbit, Rick Rat, Tad Frog, Gus Squirrel, Fred Frog, Nick Skunk, Wilf Bug, Desmond Dragon, Billy Bunny, Robbie Robin, Zak Zebra, Champ the Horse, and Rusty the Fox. The girl names are Thelma the Camel, Wilma the Bug, and Beth the Moth.

Mr. Speaker, there was another book called—

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Does the member mean there are more Ron the rabbits than there are Thelma the camels?

Mr. Laughren: No. The point, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of pervasiveness of it, the consistency of it. I hope you will pay attention to this as I go on, Mr. Speaker.

There's another book called, "Adventures with Mac," by Holt, Rinehart and Winston. "This book contains only animal stories. There are no females in any of the stories, human or animal." There is another book, by Holt, Rinehart and Winston again—and I'm not picking on Holt, Rinehart and Winston, there are other texts as well here—called "Golden Trails." We have a boy asking how the world began; a boy practising whistling; Little Brave Heart, the mighty hunter; a boy flying a kite on a high mountain; Johnny falling in the snow and playing with animals in the field. For girls, we have a girl listening to grandmother's stories, and we have Hilda helping with the household chores, reinforcing the stereotypes again and again.

Another book by Copp Clark is called "Stories Old and New." We have Peter saves the day by climbing through the window of the locked house; Ronny and Wiggles play in the tree house; Rim gets a dog; Bob shovels snow; Paddy has his three pets; George helps Mom shop; Nick and Donny lose their mittens. There's a story about Andy and his pets; Zachary and his funny name; George sees spacemen and goes on an adventure; Ronny gets a ride in a helicopter; John makes friends with Mr. Pelgrew, a neighbour.

As for the girls, Janet is scared of a cow; Ann watches fireflies at night; Margaret paints a picture; Miranda plays with kittens; Jean helps Mom shop; and Noisy Nora, no one wanted her.

Here is another book by Copp Clark called, "Stories of Fun and Adventure." For the boys, Bob and Joe learning about fishing, and they go on a whaling boat; Bill and Juanito hunting coyotes; Ivar finds a moose; Mike, Bill and David find a sick man and get a doctor just in time; Stuey has adventures with invisible ink; Kevin has adventures with Masai in Africa; Danny is at the ranch at branding time; Jeffery saves a little fawn who has got on to the airport runway.

In the case of the girls in "Stories of Fun and Adventure," Shirley and Alice hold an injured bird for Bill and Juanito while they hunt coyotes; Kirsten adjusting to her new language and school; Helen—a Scandinavian fairly tale about how she saved the family; and the story of Yvonne, who helps the mayor.

And a couple of final examples by Thomas Nelson and Sons; a book called "Mr. Whiskers":

This book features Jack and Jill in various activities up to page 22. Page 22 to 140 deals with Jack's visit to grandmother. Jill is not mentioned at all.

Finally, a book by Thomas Nelson and Sons called "Streets and Treasures":

Bobby and Billy—playing in their tree-house.

Bobby—a mystery story.

Bobby—story about a helicopter ride.

Tommy—story of Tommy at the Double B ranch.

Paul—at the circus.

Jeffie—and the frogs.

Peter—a story about Peter who lives in a big city.

Pierre—learns how to put a ship in a bottle.

The girls:

Penny—finds a friend.

Girls—skipping, choosing shoes.

Ann—fun at the circus.

Those are some of the specific examples of books which reinforce sex stereotyping.

I went from there, Mr. Speaker, to the study done by Margaret Evans at the language study centre at the Toronto Board of Education. They analysed two Ontario reader series—the Integrated Language Programme, by Ginn and Co., and Language Experience Reading Programme, by Gage, both listed on Circular 14 and containing 13 textbooks in all.

In those series the ratio of boy-centred stories to girl-centred stories was 145 to 42; with an adult main male character versus an adult female main character, 78 to 30; male folk/fantasy stories versus female folk/fantasy stories, 31 to four; male animal stories versus female animal stories, 27 to five; male story titles versus female story titles, 65 to 26; and male illustrations—get this, Mr. Speaker—male illustrations versus female illustrations, 369 to 137.

Now here is one that I find really disturbing, and that's male occupation categories versus female occupation categories. Do you have the time, Mr. Speaker, for me to read this list to you? Thank you.

There were 41 male occupational categories, and I would like to name them to you: Ambulance attendant, automaker, baker, bus driver, butcher, car mechanic, clerk, cobbler, construction worker, cowboy, dairyman, diver, TV cameraman, doctor, electrician, fireman, frogman, fisherman, grocer, helicopter pilot, hockey player, hunter, mayor, miller, Mountie, TV producer, veterinarian, park warden, parson, pilot, policeman, postman, professor, ranch cook, sailor, scientist, sheriff, space pilot, teacher and trapper.

Female occupational categories—only 11 as opposed to 41 for male—were artist, ballerina, dressmaker, elevator girl, hairdresser, housewife, maid, nurse, stewardess, store clerk and teacher.

Mr. Speaker, that is really sick. At a time when we are supposed to be removing sex discrimination, doing something about the sex stereotyping in our schools, we have that kind of thing perpetuating the very system that we pretend to be changing. There are other examples too, but that study offers ways that can be removed from our school system as well.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, if I could talk for a moment about another study called "Sex Role

Stereotyping in Ontario Primary Readers." This was submitted to the Minister of Education by the textbook study group of the regional municipality of York in September of 1972. That group discovered basically what other groups who had done research had discovered, and they came to the following conclusions:

1. The majority of stories and poems have males as their main characters, both human and animal. The more advanced readers in particular have a very high proportion of male-oriented stories. In some stories females are totally absent. In others their appearance is brief and unimportant.

2. In these books boys lead very active lives, making rockets, going on exploration trips and participating in sports. Girls are passive, watching the boys or playing with dolls, if they are not baking cookies.

3. Suggestions for career possibilities for boys are numerous, ranging from policeman and ambulance driver to doctor, professor and scientist. Career possibilities suggested for girls are precious few, mainly teacher and nurse.

4. Women are, in these readers, almost entirely depicted as housewives and mothers, cooking, baking and housecleaning. Men are depicted in a variety of stereotyped roles and these roles are never interchanged.

5. Working women appearing are, in most cases, single girls. Rarely is the teacher or nurse a married woman. The working mother is totally absent from these books, a very serious omission indeed.

6. Many stories, especially the more advanced readers, are about animals who show the same stereotyped characteristics and behaviour as humans. [So you can see how that is even reinforced in animal stories, Mr. Speaker.]

7. The illustrations in these books further emphasize the lack of balance in the presentation of male and female characters. Stories and poems which concern boys and girls alike are often illustrations of boys and boys only.

That study made the following very specific recommendations:

1. The number of male- and female-oriented stories should be properly balanced.

2. Girls and women should appear in more active, positive roles.

3. The books should give a greater variety of career possibilities for girls, including

professional careers now depicted solely as careers for boys.

4. The different roles today's women play in society should be properly reflected in the texts.

5. The place of the working mother in contemporary life should be portrayed.

6. The primary division readers form but a small part of the amount of educational material to which our children are exposed at such an impressionable age. We have good reason to suspect that the situation in regard to this material, be it visual or audio, is much the same as in the readers. We therefore request that all other educational material will be checked and, where necessary, revised in accordance with the principles outlined above.

Those are some examples, Mr. Speaker, that I hope will be helpful to the government in terms of removing this kind of stereotyping from our schools. It's time that the Minister of Education regarded the problem in a serious way. There is no indication that he has to date.

I have only talked so far about one aspect of sex discrimination, Mr. Speaker, but, of course, you and I know that there are many more aspects to the problem. In the schools there are the hiring and promotional practices of the school boards. There is also the kind of career counselling that goes on in our school system; in particular, I'm concerned about the kind of career counselling that occurs in the high schools, which needs to be changed dramatically. What better time to implement those kinds of changes, a new change in direction, than in 1975, which, after all, is International Women's Year?

It's difficult to talk about International Women's Year and what the Province of Ontario is doing in the same breath, because they're almost contradictory. I made some inquiries as to what Ontario is doing in the way of legislation, and it is very disappointing. The government has promised nothing.

Let me suggest very briefly, Mr. Speaker, what the government should be doing. They should be moving aggressively into the provision of childcare centres in Ontario. They should be implementing legislation to guarantee equal pay for work of equal value. There should be a concerted effort to remove sex stereotyping from our elementary school reader texts and to improve the kind of counselling that occurs in our high schools. There should be the banning of advertisements that demean women. There should be an improvement in family property law, as recommended

by the Ontario Law Reform Commission over a year ago. There should be legislation to provide collective bargaining and fringe benefits for domestic and part-time workers, the majority of whom tend to be women.

You know, Mr. Speaker, of those six recommendations, the only one that would really cost the government any money is the provision of childcare services. Those of us who have studied the whole question of child care know that it is not a drain on the public purse, that it's an investment for the future because child care has tremendous benefits as a preventive measure, whether you're talking about health care or socializing children so that they can better work with peer groups. Child care is a preventive programme and a very positive one, not to be regarded, Mr. Speaker, as a substitute for family care but rather as a supplement to it.

This government tends to regard child care as a custodial programme, primarily for low-income families. I think that's a mistake. I think child care should be provided for all families and it should be looked on as part of the whole delivery system of educational and social services not as a welfare programme at all. It should be viewed the way we view elementary education, as a right for children. I think there is an opportunity for this government to provide that kind of service.

We know that the first five years in the development of a child are the critical years. What better time to share the accumulated wisdom and wealth of our society than during those five years so that we can give those children the kind of benefits to which I believe they are entitled?

We know that at the present time there is an increasing number of children living in highrise who need the kind of recreational facilities in childcare centres. We know there are children who are insecure for a number of reasons who could use the socializing influence of a childcare centre. We know there are children from deprived families in an economic sense who could use a childcare centre very positively. For example the only child in a family could use a childcare centre.

At the present time probably 10 to 15 per cent of the real need is being met by the Province of Ontario and only five per cent of that is subsidized. Those are round figures, of course. Even now, for parents who can afford child care there is no range of alternatives, there is no choice.

Mr. Speaker, I thought carefully before I decided to say this, but it's really ironic that Ontario's first woman cabinet minister would

end up being a millstone around the necks of women in this province. I find that very sad. She has almost single-handedly managed to sabotage the day nurseries branch of the Ministry of Community and Social Services.

I assure you, Mr. Speaker, we in the New Democratic Party would place a great deal of emphasis on child care because we recognize it as a social need and we recognize it as being essential as a preventive measure for emotional problems, for health problems and for social problems. We believe it would be an investment that would pay enormous dividends in our elementary, our secondary and even our post-secondary educational system.

I think that tends to be overlooked very often. We recognize that if we are going to improve the quality of education and the quality of the graduates in our educational system, we have to start at the beginning or close to the beginning.

It's not good enough to say "bring in the three Rs," or the strap. That's a mindless kind of debate, because what people really mean are four Rs, Mr. Speaker. They mean reading, writing, arithmetic and rote. They are really talking about memorization and discipline, and I think that's not the answer.

I believe we must start at the childcare level at the pre-school age and make improvements from the bottom up. Only then will we end the problems of alienation in the classroom which I believe are occurring now. I left the secondary school system as a teacher because I encountered that. I believe it is occurring increasingly and that's the real problem in our educational system.

Only when this problem of alienation is ended will the whole question of free tuition at the post-secondary level really have meaning. At the present time, the way our system works it is primarily—not entirely, but primarily—children of middle upper-income families who are able to get a post-secondary education now.

I really see the debate over the school system very often as being misdirected. Surely education must be a liberating experience, Mr. Speaker. How does imposed discipline or memorization or the strap liberate anyone—teacher or student? Self-discipline is different; I'm not talking about self-discipline, but I believe that the value of self-discipline will never be realized in our system, never even be perceived by students until the education they receive is truly a liberating experience. That's difficult to implement; I don't deny that for a moment but I think we have to start working toward that and toward a different kind of educational system.

The place to start it all, which got me off on this diversion of education, is at the childcare level. I think with proper teacher training and an emphasis on elementary education and learning as a student centre, education will be something to be shared between teacher and student. The place to begin all that is at the childcare centre, with proper staff.

If we think the dropout rate in our high schools is bad, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, it's a lot worse at the community college level. At last count there was an attrition rate of somewhat over 50 per cent. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, a New Democratic Party government would move aggressively into the provision of child care.

Before I get too carried away with that, Mr. Speaker, having now gone through what should be done to remove sex discrimination in Ontario let me tell you what the Province of Ontario is doing. These are the highlights. You can imagine what the more mundane programmes are if these are the highlights.

No. 1. A Premier's meeting with management and labour with a follow-up programme to promote and encourage equal employment opportunities for women on the move.

No. 2. The recognition of outstanding women in the province who have led the way for women on the move.

No. 3. Grants to organizations for projects designed to improve the status of women on the move.

No. 4. Information units staffed by students to provide information about Ontario government programmes which relate to the needs of women on the move.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to need very many information units to tell the people of Ontario what this government is doing.

No. 5. Government ministries and Crown agencies to develop innovative projects for women on the move.

That's what the Province of Ontario is doing. No talk about legislation. No talk about anything meaningful at all, just a bunch of glossy brochures.

Mr. Speaker, I will wind up my remarks now but I do hope you will convey my concern to your government about the lack of action particularly on the part of the Minister of Education but also the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacBeth), and the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Brunelle)—

Mr. P. Taylor (Carleton East): The Minister of Education is on a three-week vacation, is he not?

Mr. Laughren: —and their failure to take any positive action on removing the kind of discrimination that now occurs in the Province of Ontario. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Thank you Mr. Speaker. Phil Gaglardi was asked what caused the defeat of the Social Credit government in BC in 1972. Phil, members will remember, was that flamboyant and controversial Minister of Highways in W. A. C. Wacky Bennett's regime.

An hon. member: Blind Phil.

Mr. Good: In reply, he said that any government can antagonize and alienate a certain number of people and still remain in office but when it reaches the point where it has antagonized more than half the population it is obviously going to be voted out of office.

He made this reply on a morning radio programme in Toronto about a year ago last December and this statement coincided with the time when our Minister of Education in the Province of Ontario had just insulted and alienated the teachers of the province by bringing in Bill 274. In fact, the minister had, so to speak, called out the authorities when no crime had been committed. Unfortunately, we have this unfortunate attitude which now exists among the educators in this province toward the Province of Ontario and the Minister of Education. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, that was the apparent beginning of public resentment toward this government and the way it treats people. One group after another has been alienated by the actions or inaction of this government. In most instances, the problem has arisen because of lack of consultation; not communication, but consultation. What this government calls consultation is usually nothing more than the presentation of decisions already made.

This was apparent in the legislation dealing with the travel agencies. Admittedly, this was necessary and by and large good legislation, perhaps misunderstood by the industry. But the government thought that talking to one or two representatives here in Toronto would be considered as consultation by travel agencies all across the province.

The real estate industry had to appeal en masse to every member of this Legislature to have its views heard, as another example of how the Davis government operates to create a lack of confidence in government.

Coupled with these examples are the deep-rooted feelings of discontent that already ex-

isted over the Fidinam affair, the "Hydrogate" hearings, the Workmen's Compensation Board investigation, the Shouldice shenanigans, and the whole matter of contracts without tenders. It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that people are concerned about the whole concept of integrity in government. I believe they are quite prepared to believe that, in fact, a political tollgate exists in the Tory party.

Mr. Speaker, I find there is a great group of people in Ontario who have been turned off for quite another reason. I speak of the huge population of Ontario which is unhappy with the imposition of regional government and how it was done. I would like to spend a few minutes on the reasons why there is almost complete mistrust and concern about regional governments.

Mr. Speaker, the function of government in the democratic society is to serve people, and this has always been done on a tri-level basis. The lowest level, the municipal government, has been the one to which citizens can most easily relate. It is there that the people feel they have access. Thus the services which are closest to the people must be served by the lower-tiered municipal government.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to put on record some of the thoughts of Dr. Martin Dobkin, the mayor of Mississauga. He states that municipal councillors, by being required to sit on two councils, the local and the regional, are immediately put into positions of conflict. At the regional government level, the councillor is constantly being told by the regional chairman that he must think in terms of the region. Yet how can he vote on a local issue in his own municipality when the regional point of view is contrary to his local position? Indeed, it does create problems. Since no one municipality in a region has a majority vote on the regional council, it is entirely possible for decisions to be made which affect everyone in the local municipality, even though all of the council members from that municipality are in opposition to that decision.

Then it is interesting to ask what recourse the electors have at election time. They cannot vote out of office the regional officials from outside their local municipality.

I feel another major problem is that some of the regions encompass too large an area. Some parts of these regions bear no relationship either in function or form to other areas of that region. Because of this, councillors from one end of the region do not know the other areas and the issues of those area governments or the people living in the areas.

Thus, we have a situation where regional councillors are making decisions for people

whom they do not know. But they also realize that they cannot be voted out of office at election time by the people in the other areas of the region concerned. It is a serious undermining of one of the basic democratic principles—that elected people must be accountable for their decisions and directly accountable to the people for whom they are making the decisions.

Much of the misgiving and apprehension about regional government is created by the costs involved. This not only involves a startup cost but the ongoing cost. The small fraction of startup cost borne by the provincial government lays an ever-increasing burden upon the local level. We have seen over the past two years, Mr. Speaker, that increased provincial grants to the municipalities have lessened to some degree the tax burden in not only regional but other municipalities.

Fair warning has been given by the provincial Treasurer and his predecessor (Mr. White) that the province can no longer support the local tax base and we can expect drastic increases in taxes in the year 1975. From an opposition point of view, this mismanagement by government couldn't come at a more opportune time than in an election year. When local municipalities get their tax bills, they will be more determined than ever to throw this government out of office.

Mr. Gaunt: It is next to gone.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): That's not right.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): What about the subsidies we pay?

Mr. Carruthers: The member knows that isn't right.

Mr. W. Hodgson: What about the subsidies the province pays to the municipalities.

Mr. Good: There is, Mr. Speaker, another aspect of regional government which is distasteful. That is that the regional chairmen for the first term—or terms in some instances—are appointed by the provincial government as well as paid by the provincial government.

I have expressed my concern before regarding the appointed regional chairmen, being a dangerous concentration of appointed power in the hands of a small number of people. The appointed regional chairmen meet at Queen's Park and they have met privately. They are likely discussing issues and policies which affect millions of people. The press and public are not privy to these discussions.

The province, I feel, by using the regional

chairmen as a vehicle, can find it much easier to sell its policies and ideas to a large number of people at the municipal level.

These regional chairmen—or second cabinet if one wishes to speak in those terms; or an arm of Queen's Park—cannot even be directly voted out of office. I strongly recommend, Mr. Speaker, that every regional chairperson should be elected on a regional basis by the people of the region.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Right; dead on.

Mr. Good: Many feel that regional government has meant a serious loss of local autonomy for the local level of government.

Mr. Gaunt: It got to change the name of Durham, too.

Mr. Good: Particularly it has downgraded the status of the role of elected mayors. No matter how competent a regional chairman or chairperson may be, there is still the feeling among the people of the region that that person is an extension or an arm of Queen's Park. The local people just don't know what is going on between that person and Queen's Park.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): That's terrible.

Mr. Good: At a meeting at Mississauga city hall, a resolution was passed to establish a forum for the elected heads of councils in Ontario to discuss and act upon common problems, particularly those involving the erosion of powers of local governments in regional areas. This meeting concentrated on many issues reflecting the diminishing powers of local councils and strongly criticized the government-appointed chairmen of regional councils as well as the fact that mayors could not become regional chairmen without first resigning as mayors.

Mr. Lionel Feldman, a municipal affairs expert, told the meeting that the question of power within the region and the local government structure is one of great import, especially in view of the fact that public pressure for a new philosophy of involvement in the policy-making process is now prevalent all across the province.

Citizens' groups feel they have better access to governments at the lower level. If one approaches the provincial government, one has to carry an extremely big stick; if one approaches the regional government, one has to have a big stick; when one gets down to the local level, one feels he can be heard. But under our present setup so little power

is left at the local level that people find they are almost hamstrung over being able to make their voice and ideas heard effectively by the decision-makers.

I agree, Mr. Speaker, with Dr. Dobkin that certain types of services must be regional in scope but I am thoroughly convinced that masses of people feel they have lost all contact with decision-makers because very little authority is left at the local level. The government, of course, realizes that something has gone seriously wrong with its structuring of local government. It has now indicated there will be no more regional governments formed at this time. The same cry went forth before the last provincial election.

An hon. member: What about the counties?

Mr. Good: The future growth of Ontario is indeed jeopardized by the government's inability to cope with the growth, and to bring in acceptable policies.

The government, Mr. Speaker, has refused to bring in broad-brush plans for the whole of Ontario. They've undoubtedly violated the Toronto-centred region plan that was held forth to be the great be-all and end-all of planning in the Toronto area, and in the south-central part of Ontario.

They have refused or have been unable to attract growth into eastern and northern Ontario. They have procrastinated in the revision of the Planning Act. They have now allowed Hydro to bring in a plan of industrialization of all of southwestern Ontario; and, Mr. Speaker, the seriousness of this policy cannot be over-emphasized.

Southwestern Ontario is the best agricultural area in Canada. There is nothing comparable to it. There has never been a crop failure. There have never been extended drought periods. The top 6 in. of topsoil cannot be replaced, and yet we see Hydro imposing on southwestern Ontario new energy corridors which can only lead to more and more industrialization.

It has been said, Mr. Speaker, that corn and asphalt don't make very good crop rotations. I am firmly convinced, Mr. Speaker, that there is plenty of land in Ontario on which to build houses and factories, without consuming vast quantities of class 1 and class 2 farm land.

Serious attempts must be made to develop areas where agriculture is not the prime use of the land. This, of course, can only be accomplished within guidelines of a provincial plan for development. The government's failure in these areas has, of course, been a major factor in the establishment of public

opinion, which is now noticeably against the Davis government.

The beautiful part of it, Mr. Speaker—looking at it from the opposition's point of view—is that there's no one single thing you can put your finger on. It's an accumulation of many things that have been built up—lack of action and over-reaction—which has caused this discontent and created the favourable polls for the Liberal Party in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to deal with two more items, both of which are related to the Ministry of Health. They are to some extent parochial matters.

First of all, I would briefly like to refresh our minds of the fact that the nursing home situation in Ontario changed dramatically a few years ago. I'm referring to the closing of the many smaller homes, and the concentration on larger establishments. The upgrading of standards was no doubt necessary, but many of us at the time felt that small nursing homes were being closed down more because of the fact that they couldn't provide 70 sq ft per bed, rather than being accredited on the amount of care that was given patients.

The upheaval in the nursing homes at that time was quite a traumatic experience for many of the small owners. They then had to decide whether to get out of the nursing home business or continue as retirement homes, or borrow enough capital to upgrade their standards and to become large enough—if they could convince the minister they were capable of doing that.

At present there are about 25,000 nursing home beds in the Province of Ontario. The maximum allowable charge per standard ward as of April 1—these are the new rates—is \$18.50. Of this, the government, under its OHIP extended-care programme, pays \$12.60 and the patient pays \$5.90. The government, under semi-private, will continue to pay \$12.60 and the patient will pay \$9.40. For private, the government OHIP plan will still pay \$12.60 and the patient will be required to pay \$12.90.

I'd also like, Mr. Speaker, to speak about the need for more nursing home beds in the region of Waterloo. There have been applications for increases in licensing before the ministry for the past two years. On March 17 I asked the Minister of Health (Mr. Miller) the following question:

How does the minister justify his allotment of about 3.2 nursing home beds per 1,000 population, especially in an area such as the Waterloo region where there are

waiting lists at every nursing home within the region?

The minister replied:

Mr. Speaker, the provincial guideline, I think, is 3.5 beds per 1,000 [My research figures show that to be correct. There are about 25,000 beds in the province and when we divide that into roughly eight million people it works out to about 3.5 beds per thousand of population.] This was an estimation of need, not a proven indicator, because of course until it became an insured benefit no one could be certain what the real needs would be.

We have been increasing the number of nursing home beds pretty fast. We have 25,000 right now. [I checked that figure against the January, 1975, list of nursing homes in Ontario and I find that figure to be correct.] We have about 3,000 under construction right now. Apart from that, there are between 10,000 and 12,000 beds in homes for the aged in Ontario where people are receiving extended-care OHIP benefits. So in fact we have almost as many nursing home beds available for patients in Ontario today as there are active treatment beds.

Now in any given area we try to weight the number of beds against the age of the population, because after all the primary people using them are those over 65.

This isn't always an indication because in some parts of rural Ontario people tend to stay at home, tend to stay active and therefore under-utilize them; so in the final analysis we try to tailor the licences to the waiting list.

[So he is giving me both answers. First he says they weight it on the age of the people in the area; then he tells me that they try to provide the number of beds in relation to the waiting list.]

It is not always an easy thing to do and I can assure members that the demand will continue to outstrip the supply, because people are leaving homes and coming into the institutions once the facilities are made available.

I would like to speak for a moment just on the 3,000 beds that the minister says are under construction. The list of nursing home beds for the Waterloo region shows there are 3.4 beds per thousand, which is just a little under the minister's acknowledged 3.5 beds per thousand. There are also 36 new beds which have been approved for the Waterloo region. The population of the Waterloo region

is about 270,000. We have had approval for 36 or 38 new beds.

On a population basis of 270,000 we should, in fact, be getting about 101 additional nursing home beds in the Waterloo region, rather than only the 38 which are now under approval. So we are really only getting about one-third of what we should be getting of the 3,000 new beds that have been approved. This is seriously going to affect the Waterloo region in light of the fact that already there are waiting lists in almost every nursing home within the region.

I would like to refer now, Mr. Speaker, to the number of beds per thousand in the various areas across the province, and the wide discrepancy of location of nursing home beds is unbelievable. The minister's parliamentary assistant has used as his main argument for turning down additional approval the fact that the Waterloo region already has the provincial average of about 3.4 or 3.5. The argument doesn't hold water at all when we look at the list. I have figured out the number of beds per thousand in every region across the province and it varies, Mr. Speaker, from 1.4 nursing home beds per thousand in Algoma to a high of 14.9 beds per thousand in Prince Edward county. There are 13 beds per thousand in Prescott and Russell as against 3.5 in the provincial average and 3.3 in Waterloo; in Timiskaming, six beds per thousand; and in Renfrew 1.02 beds per thousand. It's hard to understand why there can be such a wide variation.

I understand the city of Sudbury region is shown as 3.9 beds per thousand, but I understand that there are ample beds in that area. I understand that some of the beds had to be filled by persons with other disabilities in order to utilize the beds of the large corporate nursing homes which had been given licences to construct them.

The need varies greatly across the province and the number of beds varies greatly across the province, all the way from 1.4 beds per thousand to 14.9 beds per thousand. I don't see how the minister can use as the excuse for a rejection of applications the fact that certain areas have more than the provincial average. I won't take the time to read it into the record, but the variation is very great. Many of them are over four beds per thousand. Lanark is 6.6; Grey county is 6.6; Halton is only 2.2; Wellington is 4.4—and so it goes from a few beds to a great many beds per thousand.

I would like to return, Mr. Speaker, and put into the record a letter received by myself from the parliamentary assistant, the

hon. member for London North (Mr. Walker) who is in charge of the matters of approval for nursing home beds. This letter happened to relate to an application by the Maryhill nursing home in the Waterloo region. He said:

Maryhill nursing home is well known to the ministry. I believe it was a convent which was converted, if I remember correctly. The matter appeared on the agenda of the nursing home review committee back in April, 1974, just after I had arrived in ministry. The request was to increase the licensed capacity from 21 beds to 53 beds with the building of an addition. The matter was very carefully considered by the nursing home review committee on April 30 and, reluctantly, a decision was arrived at which would not permit a go-ahead for this particular request.

At that time, and at this point in time as well, the current ratio of beds for population was in excess of the ministry's guidelines as to beds per thousand. In fact, compared to other counties or regions, the regional municipality of Waterloo is blessed to some extent with more beds in comparison.

That, Mr. Speaker, is just not a fact, because a wide range of beds per thousand of population has been shown all across the province, and it is just not right to say that we have more beds than other areas in the province. We may have in some instances, but others have three times as many beds per thousand as the Waterloo region has. His letter goes on:

In addition, we are bound by the financial constraints imposed upon us for overall medical care and perhaps therein lies the problem. These financial constraints are such that we only have enough money to accommodate those areas which by comparison are far less bedded in ratio to population than is Waterloo. For those reasons, the minister, on the advice of the nursing home review committee, came to the conclusion that an award of beds increasing the licence from 21 to 52 beds would not be in the public interest, given the financial constraints under which the ministry was operating at the time, and still is even to a greater extent, and given the current bed ratio of the regional municipality of Waterloo compared to other regions.

I would say that with the 36 beds presently on approval in the area once on stream, any of the apparent deficiencies

in the area will to a large extent be eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, that is not so because with the 3,000 new beds being approved in the province the Waterloo region should, in fact, get 101 of those. Instead we're getting 36.

The nursing home review committee is an inter-ministerial, inter-disciplinary committee on which I served, along with a number of ministry officials who advise the minister on any one application. Representatives of the nursing home inspection branch, institutional standards division, the financial branch and the area planning co-ordinator serve on the committee. This committee advises the minister and on the basis of that advice the minister comes to a conclusion on any individual application. He then instructs the appropriate official to communicate with the applicant as to whether approval or rejection or modification is given.

I'm sure, off the record, the ministry would simply say to the member, to me, "We can't provide you with any more hospital beds because it's going to cost the provincial government about \$4,000 per year per bed to cover those beds under extended care."

Mr. Speaker, if those beds are being filled by patients from hospitals it undoubtedly will be a great saving to the Province of Ontario. I was amazed to read in our local paper just a few weeks ago that the active bed rate in the K-W hospital was now somewhere around \$115 per day. It is unbelievable. Here we find that nursing home care can be given to patients at a cost, which is the new cost as of April 1, of about \$12.60—the total cost to the government—the rest being paid by the patient.

I think there is something amiss along the line, either in the thinking or the planning by the government when it does not give higher financial priority to the adequate provision of nursing home beds in all parts of the province. Certainly there has been something wrong in the planning when there is a surplus in some areas and a great need in other areas.

I think what has happened, in my own view, is that at the changeover the ministry was so anxious to get rid of the small operators and get the large corporate operators into being that in some areas it was over-expanded by the large corporate operators. In other areas it closed down the small ones without making adequate provision. I don't think that is any way to look after the nursing home problems in the Province of Ontario.

I trust that someone in the ministry will pay some heed to the matters I've brought up this morning. Since there is no one here, neither the minister nor his parliamentary assistant, I will forward excerpts of my remarks to fortify the cases of the several nursing home operators in my area who are having absolutely no success with their applications for increased nursing home accommodation.

There is one other matter which involves the Ministry of Health and which I'd like to make a few short remarks about. That is the need for a dialysis unit at the Kitchener-Waterloo hospital. There are quite a number of people in the Kitchener-Waterloo area who require dialysis two or three times a week. Many people have been able to make the trip to Toronto, on that basis, to have this process done. Others who can afford it have their own dialysis units.

We have been working on this problem for three or four years and now find that located in the "twin cities" are doctors or urologists who are familiar with this work and are specialists in it. The board has approved the location of a unit within the hospital and the matter is now before the Ministry of Health awaiting either approval or rejection of this plan. I understand the original cost of a dialysis unit is not all that great but the yearly maintenance of the unit is a considerable cost and, of course, would be a drain on any hospital budget unless additional financing is received from the provincial level.

I believe, in fact I know, that many within the area, those who have formed an association, who require this treatment are active in trying to explain the need. The ministry has gone on record that it is seriously looking into the matter. They envisage a dialysis unit in the "twin cities" area for serving that part of southwestern Ontario, and in their view it would be affiliated with Wellesley Hospital in Toronto.

People who require this treatment have assured me that it is most important that something be done to bring the service to a local level. It is at present not only inconvenient, but could be a serious endangerment to health. Even those who have their own equipment can have a breakdown of equipment, and the nearest place for servicing and to be dialysed is in the city of Toronto.

I would ask that the ministry give very serious consideration to this application now before them. They should accede to the

wishes of those unfortunate people in the area who require this service, the hospital board which has approved it, and Dr. Evans, the medical officer of health of the region, who has been actively engaged in pursuing this matter.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have about 17 items that I would like to deal with. However, I'll manage to restrain myself and confine it to four or five. I think that the Throne Speech is the finest piece of literary bafflebag that I have encountered in my four years in the Legislature. It is undoubtedly the weakest and most disappointing speech that we have heard.

There was absolutely no mention of northern Ontario in the speech anywhere. And there was no indication that the government recognizes the very real regional disparities that exist in Ontario. And I want to deal with that aspect of the speech very briefly, Mr. Speaker.

What could the people of northwestern Ontario have justifiably expected from the Speech from the Throne?

I feel that the government should have given some indication that it recognized the need of northern Ontario municipalities for additional revenues from the province to upgrade the services for people in our communities—services such as housing.

The government should have indicated that it had under way long-range planning, as well as some immediate action, to meet the environmental concerns of the people of Thunder Bay and northwestern Ontario; especially in view of the heavy industrial complex planned for our area and in view of the present concern over the drinking water supply in Thunder Bay. None of that was mentioned.

The government should have indicated in the speech an understanding of the need for increased medical services for our region, especially dental programmes, home care services, nursing home facilities and senior citizen housing.

Finally, with regard to the north, the government should have given an indication that it planned a real attack on the problems of mine safety in northern Ontario.

The government in the Speech from the Throne failed in all four of these very important areas, and we must now wait until

April 7 to see if the budget of the Ontario government is as shallow as was the Speech from the Throne. For the sake of the people of northern Ontario, let us hope not.

I would like to turn now specifically, Mr. Speaker—and I am glad that you yourself are in the chair—to three items I would like to raise dealing directly with your office. I do this very carefully and with some reluctance. But it is a matter I have raised to some degree in the House before, and I would like to raise again. It has to do with the page programme under the Speaker's office.

I raised two matters last fall during the supplementary estimates, and I don't know if they have been brought directly to your attention. That's why I am pleased that you are in the chair at the present time. I think that we should set an example in the Legislature and through the Legislature in your office, Mr. Speaker, with the page programme in three important areas.

Although the pages are under the official working age in the province, I think that we should set a benchmark for the province and pay them the minimum wage. I think they do a fine job for us. I think that they are entitled to it. And certainly the kind of work that they do is a valuable service to the members and that we should give that some very serious consideration.

Another area that I would like the Speaker to give attention to is—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): No discrimination.

Mr. Foulds: That is the third area I was going to get to. The second area is the area of expense allowances for the pages.

I would suggest that those pages who have to travel from more than a 150-mile radius of the city of Toronto be given additional expenses to travel back and forth from their home towns to the Legislature. As you know, Mr. Speaker, at the present time if a page comes from my riding, from the city of Thunder Bay or from Windsor or Ottawa or Sudbury or Winisk in the riding of Thunder Bay, they must pay their own travel expenses in terms of plane fare to the Legislature and back. They must do that for a uniform fitting before the session takes place, for the session itself and for any trips that they want to take home on the weekends.

I would suggest that we establish a fund for the expenses for the fitting that takes place before they do their tour of duty and for three trips—one of the actual tour and one or two during the tour of duty—back home to their home towns. I think that if we really

want to talk about accessibility of the programme and we want to make it accessible to people across the province, we should be willing to take those steps.

Mr. Speaker: May I just interrupt to say much of that has been done.

Mr. Foulds: It has been done and will be in effect? That's good news.

The final point that I want to make on this subject is that, as I understand it, there still is a discrimination against girls in the page programme in that we still maintain that the balance of the 20 pages in any tour are 12 boys and eight girls. I think that once again the Speaker's office in this Legislature should set the benchmark for the province and establish a balance of 10 and 10—10 girls and 10 boys in the programme—to demonstrate to other industries and other government departments that we believe in equality of opportunity for women, and that we can start with the page programme of the Legislature.

I would like to turn now to the thoughts of a member who has endured this place for four years now and make a few observations about the governing party of this province. For 32 years, Mr. Speaker, one party with a succession of leaders, all of them surprisingly more or less the same, has governed Ontario—Drew, Frost, Roberts, Davis. Only the names have changed to protect the guilty. Fundamentally, all four were comfortable in corporate boardrooms of the province. Fundamentally, all of them were and are, and the present premier is, uncomfortable in the democratic battleground of the Ontario Legislature.

Mr. Carruthers: All very highly respected.

Mr. Foulds: All of them, with the support of the obscure member for Durham, have tried to manipulate, muzzle, or seduce the Legislature for their own purposes. And for all their public relations, their purposes are not the purposes of the ordinary working men and women of this province. Even less has it been their purpose to serve the needs of the disabled of our society.

Mr. Carruthers: Oh, wait a moment.

Mr. Foulds: I get between 60 and 100 phone calls and/or letters from individual constituents almost every week. Every one of these people is in actual distress because of some kind of problem with the provincial government—compensation, land subdivision, OHIP, social assistance, student loans, edu-

cation taxes, bad highways, you name it, Mr. Speaker.

The ones who cause me more anguish and more heartbreak than I can adequately describe are the ones who call and say in one way or another, some times directly, sometimes indirectly, sometimes simply, sometimes angrily, "Mr. Foulds, I don't have enough to live on. I can't make ends meet." Maybe they're on compensation for an accident suffered some 15 years ago when their rates were set. Inflation has so eaten into their incomes that they can no longer support growing families. Often they are not elderly men or women. They are men and women in their 30s and early 40s with responsibilities for growing children. Some of those who call are women in their 50s, whose husbands have died and who are classified as unemployable but not disabled so they are eligible neither for GAINS benefits nor for the improved social and family services benefits.

Or maybe the people who call me are simply like the man who made an application for social and family service benefits in mid-January and almost two months later received only this computerized reply:

We wish to advise that your application for a benefit under the Family Benefits Act has been received by this branch. You will appreciate that many applications are being received and a certain amount of unavoidable delay may be experienced.

Your application will be dealt with as soon as possible and when the decision has been reached, you will be notified by mail. If there should be a change in circumstances from those reported in the application or should you change your address, leave Ontario or become a patient in a hospital, sanatorium, nursing home, etc., please notify your field worker immediately, quoting the file number shown on this card.

I am told by my colleague, the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel), the NDP spokesman on community and social services, that sometimes the average time for processing applications under the Family Benefits Act runs between three and six months. What kind of response is that by government to people who are often in dire need?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, maybe those people, those 60 to 100 people who call me or contact me every week, are like the woman whose case came to my attention about a month ago now. She doesn't speak English. Therefore she made an inquiry through Ontario 20 of the citizens' inquiry branch of the provincial government. Because she lives

in my riding, I got a copy of the report. It went like this:

She requests assistance in obtaining financial assistance for her husband and herself. She also requests that arrangements for payment be made to pay for her husband's funeral expense when he passes away. She has provided the citizens' inquiry branch with the following information:

In 1960, her husband suffered head injuries in a forest accident. In 1969, he was again involved in a forest accident and was left disabled after a tree fell on him. He has been unable to work since then. He has been receiving \$62.50 a month, presumably from the WCB. Two months ago this amount was adjusted to \$74.50 a month.

On Nov. 25, 1974, it was discovered that he had terminal cancer. The wife asked the Workmen's Compensation Board if they would pay for her husband's funeral expenses when he passes away. However, she was told that they would not. She says that the cancer is located on the side of her husband's body which received the injuries in the forest accident in 1969.

They do receive assistance from social services. Their social worker informed the woman that their benefits would be reduced because her husband was now in hospital. The woman herself suffers from rheumatism and takes large amounts of medication.

During the summer of 1974, she lost a thumb and has no feeling in her hand as the result of an operation. Previous to this, she was able to work as a domestic and cleaning lady. Now she is unable to do that.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, in my view unless there is some way on the part of the government, of meeting the human needs of these people, it is not a government worthy of the name.

The answer the Workmen's Compensation Board gave that woman—that she was not eligible for funeral benefits under the Act—is technically correct but in human terms, Mr. Speaker, what does that say about this government? What does that say to a woman who does not speak English?

What it says is that this government is unable to come to grips with problems like that in our society. Unless this government can meet that human need, it is not a government worthy of the name.

In 32 years the Conservative Party has built up an incredible network of friends to

whom it owes favours. It has built up an entrenched bureaucracy which won't listen, or can't listen, because years of political power have made it arrogant and insensitive. It is an old political cry, but it is a true one in Ontario in 1975: It is time for a change, a change to an NDP government because only an NDP government is committed to the kind of fundamental change which will provide for the solutions to the human problems of this province.

Mr. Carruthers: We have seen enough of that.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): I'm glad the member agrees.

Mr. Foulds: These human problems will certainly not be solved by either the Liberal or the Conservative parties. They will not be solved by giving low-interest government loans to impercunious multinational corporations to overexpand hotel facilities in Thunder Bay, which has been happening recently. Nor will they be solved by a few election handouts. Nor will they be solved by replacing "Bob Davis" with "Bill Nixon." Frankly, I find it very laughable that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon) and the Liberals can try to make, as their major election theme, integrity in government. Frankly, what is the use of integrity in government if we don't have humanity in government?

The hon. member for Carleton East quoted approvingly several articles by the *Globe and Mail's* resident Queen's Park columnist, Norm Webster. The Norm Webster column I like goes like this:

While the Liberals bask in their self-esteem these days, the New Democrats are carrying the fight on the issues. Most of the skirmishes are stamped with the NDP trademark—exhaustive research, devastating attack and solid follow-through. The party's leader, Stephen Lewis, is doing what an opposition leader should be doing, grabbing public wrongs and shoving them in the government's face. [And then later on in the article Mr. Webster points out a concrete example. He says:]

There was a good example yesterday. Mr. Lewis appeared before the Ham commission on health and safety in Ontario mines and presented a devastating indictment of government and industry in action. The striking thing about the document was not the Lewis rhetoric, but the detailed research.

Last Thursday, Mr. Lewis came to the House despite a severe case of the flu to deliver his windup speech of the session. He devoted it to a detailed indictment of the government's performance on occupational health. Again, it was research, attack and follow-through.

In an interview, Mr. Lewis said: "The NDP wants a focus of its own; one which contrasts with the other parties; one concentrating on human issues and illustrated in human terms with real examples. We want to get away from the vindictiveness and personal attacks. I think the Liberals are making a mistake with the line they are taking."

[Later on in the article, Mr. Webster goes on to say:] He [Mr. Lewis] would have felt good if he'd been in Windsor about 10 days ago for the Liberal policy conference. In the midst of the desultory policy session one question woke everybody up. It came from a lady who wondered why it was Mr. Lewis and the NDP who had brought up the Johns-Manville affair. "Why wasn't it the Liberals?" she asked. "Should we be taking our problems to Stephen Lewis?"

I want to tell that Liberal lady, Mr. Speaker, yes indeed, she should be taking her problems to Stephen Lewis and the New Democratic Party, because only the New Democratic Party is concerned enough to talk about the human issues in this forthcoming election campaign.

I'm sure all of us in this chamber and people across the province have noticed that the government is taking a hard line these days. But isn't it curious how the government's loud protestations about restraint in spending are confined almost exclusively to the social development field? And they are especially loud about restraint and spending on hospitals and education.

It boils down to what they consider to be their priorities. About three or four weeks ago the Conservative government of this province could suddenly find \$100 million to bail out those timid and impoverished multinational corporations, such as Gulf and Imperial Oil, in the Syncrude tar sands project. But the provincial government is either unwilling or unable to find the money, for example, to adequately finance Lakehead University. It is unable or unwilling to find the money to meet the human needs of the people whose cases I cited a few moments ago, or of many of the other 60 to 100

people who desperately tried to contact the member for Port Arthur.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, in the next few months, as the Liberals and Conservatives carry out an acrimonious mud-slinging campaign against each other throughout Ontario, we in the NDP will be laying out policy after policy in human terms to meet the human needs of the people of Ontario. New Democrats, you see, Mr. Speaker, see poverty not as a state merely to be endured or to be made endurable, as the current social programmes of both the federal Liberals and the provincial Conservatives do. We see poverty as a state to be eliminated, and we see and we firmly believe that people have to have a direct voice in determining their own destiny, not simply to serve in the cheering section.

For example, we reject utterly the view expressed by an Ontario Hydro official as reported in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of March 4. The headline of the story was this: "Hydro Official Urges Public Participation Be Limited." And the article goes on to say this:

"The public should have a voice only in Ontario Hydro work that is at least a decade away, not the projects required right now," a Hydro executive said yesterday. "The public voice in Hydro planning is delaying projects up to five years. While such causes as strikes, design changes and equipment failures delay projects, the biggest delay is listening to the public."

I want to say to that Hydro official: Tough beans, baby. If you are going to work in a public agency that requires the kind of planning that you are involved in and if you are working in that government agency when there is an NDP government, you bloody well better listen to the public.

We say that planning is essential, but we also say that public participation is essential in that planning, because that planning affects our lives, not merely economically, not merely electrically, but ecologically and socially as well.

I want to turn now, Mr. Speaker, to a brief preliminary statement in this session of some of the concerns that the NDP will be expressing over the next few months with regard to education, if you will just bear with me.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): A programme a day.

Mr. Foulds: We are unlike the Liberal Party. I have been at many meetings with the new spokesman on education for the Liberal Party, the former chairman of the Metro Toronto school board, Bruce Bone. I think we shared three of four platforms together within the last six weeks. Mr. Bone says they don't want to reveal what their policy is in case the government takes it.

I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, if the government has enough sense to adopt the NDP education policy, I would be only too glad, because it would lead to an improvement of the educational system of the province. I don't care what method is brought about if there is improvement for the human needs of the people of the province by those guys over there swiping some of our policies. I don't mind at all, because we are going to replace them anyway and we will do it properly and implement the further steps that they wouldn't have the guts to do in the first place.

Mr. Ferrier: The Liberals have nothing to offer.

Mr. Foulds: The major aim of the NDP educational policy is to rehumanize the educational system of this province. During the past 10 to 15 years, the Davis government's obsession with growth has created an educational juggernaut and dehumanized our schools.

Whether we talk about specific items like pupil-teacher ratios, educational ceilings, per-pupil grants for elementary schools, teacher-board negotiation procedures, teaching basic skills versus the teaching of inquiry skills, the three Rs, hard schools, soft schools, community schools—all that talk, Mr. Speaker, all that policy about those matters, frankly, is meaningless unless it leads to and means a reintroduction of humanity, a reintroduction of the human element into our school system.

Mr. Gilbertson: How does the member's party do that?

Mr. Foulds: Just wait for it, it is coming. Let me go back a little bit, Mr. Speaker. Responding to the demands of the corporate sector of the business and industrial interests of the province for trained technicians in the late 1950s, this government deliberately exploited the federal funds available through Michael Starr's Technical and Vocational Training Assistance Act of 1960. Ontario's educational spending was almost entirely on bricks and mortar and on the hardware.

Do you know that Ontario, the richest province in Canada, Mr. Speaker, took 65 per

cent of the money available through that federal programme, through its own greed, to meet the needs of the corporate sector? And who were the educational hardware merchants of the 1960s? Was it the man from Kelowna, Wacky Bennett? No, sir. Both John Roberts and the present Premier, as the former Minister of Education and the former Minister of Colleges and Universities, can be held directly responsible for the present high education costs. It was they who introduced costly programmes: The lavish Ontario Institute for Studies in Education; the burgeoning empire of the Ontario Educational Communications Authority; and the ministry's own bureaucracy.

There is no doubt in my mind that the government's present decision to impose restrictions on educational spending is a political decision. There is no doubt that the public has been feeling uneasy for some considerable time about the rising cost of educational spending, which the present Premier got us into in the 1960s. The Premier got us into it and he committed the province to the expenditures—and it is a matter of commitment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gilbertson: Is the member still hollering for more?

Mr. Foulds: Once the government puts the institutions and programmes in place, it cannot frivolously abandon them a few short years later. It is also a matter of priorities.

As I said, the government could, some time ago—not so long ago—find at least \$100 million to bail out such multinational corporations as Imperial Oil and Gulf Oil. But they can't find, or they don't seem willing to find, the money to finance education.

Where was the government's restraint, for example, Mr. Speaker, in that most infamous of the pork barrel ministries, the Ministry of Government Services? Where was the restraint in the government's ceilings over Hydro's new head office building in Toronto, where they threw away \$1,485,000 just in architects' fees for the original design of the head office? Then they scrapped that design, but turned the design over, free of charge, to the successful bidder, Canada Square Development Corp., which has nearly completed that \$44.4 million building at the corner of College St. and University Ave. Where was the restraint in that incident, Mr. Speaker?

Some of the members of this House probably haven't heard of the government's hospitality fund. It is a small budget; I think in 1973 it spent only \$223,237. It was not a large amount in total government spending.

But the people in the province may wonder why their tax dollars should go for buying dinners and luncheons for worthy organizations, I'm sure.

There was the Canadian Canoe Society, \$2,580; the Gyro Club of McKenzie Island, \$913; and the National Canadian Public Relations Society had a dinner or luncheon for \$2,565. The freeloading media got in on the bandwagon as well. The Central Canada Broadcast Association had a nice luncheon for \$2,158. And this one really intrigues me: the press orientation dinner for the royal visit. This isn't the dinner for the royal visit, it's just the press orientation dinner for the royal visit, at \$3,251.

Maybe that doesn't amount to a large amount of money, but there are areas there in the Ministry of Government Services that we should be restraining—and we don't.

Mr. Speaker, the major trouble with this government is that it is speeding toward the future with its eyes firmly fixed on the rear view mirror. What it sees in that rear view mirror is a vision of society based on the popular thinking of the 1950s. There is no doubt that it is a government of technocrats who are still enthralled with the popular wisdom of the late Fifties and early Sixties. That vision wrongly sees that all society's ills can be improved through technological advances. Let me give you a quote, Mr. Speaker, from a very good book published recently by a man called Loren Lind. It is called "The Learning Machine; a Hard Look at Toronto Schools." This quote comes from his book.

Some inkling into Davis's vision for the future is provided in the speech he gave at the Royal Bank of Canada's headquarters in May, 1964. [The following is a direct quotation from the Premier's speech; he was then Education Minister.]

The title of the talk was "Education: The Year 2064 as it appears from 1964." [He envisaged the day when] each student must be taught above all else to communicate with computers; with his own and through it with those of others. Our great-grandchildren, whether test-tube or full born will enter the school of the future, in the creche, in the nursery schools being cared for by humans and robots but freeing the parents from whom the genetic structure was fashioned for work or recreation. Learning will begin at once, but imperceptibly so, as the proper environment is constructed and continuously altered to match growth and needs obtained by the genetic computer.

It is that inhuman vision of society, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP emphatically rejects. It is that vision of society that I emphatically reject.

Mr. Lawlor: Brave new world.

Mr. Foulds: Brave new world, right. That is why in the next few months we will be laying out our policies, time after time, in human terms to meet the human needs of the people of this province.

Where do we go from here? How do we begin to talk sanely about education in Ontario? How do we begin to talk about re-humanizing the school system? We in the New Democratic Party would start with the people on the firing line, the teachers. We would start, as we have said many times, by giving them full and free collective bargaining rights including the right to strike. Not because we like strikes; frankly, Mr. Speaker, we don't. In fact, politically, strikes hurt our party more than either of the other two political parties.

We in the New Democratic Party would give teachers full collective bargaining rights because we admire the job they are attempting to do. We happen to know that when they talk about working conditions for themselves, or wanting to negotiate working conditions for themselves, they are also talking about negotiating learning conditions for the children in the classrooms.

We know that every time they reduce the class size, through a collective agreement with a board of education, they are enabling the children in the classrooms to get the additional individual and personal attention they need. We know that, by and large, the teachers of this province are far more aware of and far more sensitive to the needs of the children in the classrooms than all of the educational administrators in the various regional and board offices throughout the province or in the ministry's own offices.

Therefore, we see the granting of full teacher bargaining rights merely as the first step toward re-establishing the dignity of the classroom teacher so that he or she can be a full participant in the key decisions which affect the running and direction of our school system.

One of the most blatant failures of the Minister of Education in recent months has been his failure to bring in proper legislation governing teacher-board negotiations. Such legislation could have and should have been brought in a year ago; last spring. Such legislation should have given teachers full collective bargaining rights, of course. If we

had brought it in at that time, Mr. Speaker, we could have referred it to committee outside the House; the debate could have been sane and rational. It could have had full participation from the public and we could have had it in place for this present school year.

And that legislation should not merely contain full collective bargaining rights for teachers, but it must also make good-faith bargaining a focal point in the legislation. And the good-faith bargaining clause should be mandatory, as it is in the Labour Relations Act. But unlike the Labour Relations Act, in this bill this ministry must have the will and must develop the expertise to enforce good-faith bargaining.

The second major step we in the New Democratic Party would take to reintroduce humanity into the school system would be to place a very real emphasis on elementary and pre-elementary education. The major fault with the present educational ceilings is that they do not fundamentally realign spending. They merely curtail; they slice the top off the educational budgets but they do not get at the vertical fat within those budgets.

Where we need to put more of our money into education is at the elementary and the pre-elementary level. The Minister of Education's statement on educational ceilings last September reminded me of the former Treasurer's (Mr. White) starker budget of the previous spring. At first glance it appeared quite effective, but first impressions didn't stand up to close scrutiny.

Putting it bluntly, it is shocking that the minister only narrowed the gap in allowable per pupil spending between elementary and secondary school students by a paltry \$12. Knowing the present anti-education bias of the Conservative government, I suppose we should be thankful that it was not achieved by cutting back on secondary school spending. But it is even more shocking that last week the minister's most recent statement did nothing to narrow the gap between the per pupil ceiling and the per pupil grant between elementary and secondary pupils.

If the government was sincere about giving a high priority to education, and especially about increasing services to elementary school pupils, it should have taken the following steps, as the new Democratic Party would do: An immediate lump sum increase to the elementary per pupil ceiling of \$150; a commitment to raise this by an annual amount of \$100 yearly until parity is reached between elementary and secondary grants.

Although this would cause a bulge in educational spending temporarily, it would save enormous amounts of money in the long run; and it would save enormous amounts in terms of human endeavour in the long run; because if we could not merely diagnose the learning problems of children at a very early age—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: What time has the member in mind?

Mr. Foulds: —but also provide remedial services for those children, we would not have to spend the inordinate amount of time we presently spend in our school system teaching and reteaching, doing remedial work in universities, if we could tackle the problem and concentrate on those learning problems at a very early age. We would not have the problem with dropout rates in high schools that we now have.

And it would be worth the expenditure. It would save us money; and it would save us an enormous amount of anguish and frustration on the part of teachers, but more important, on the part of students.

They would be more productive students within the educational system; they would be more productive students in society when they graduated; and they would contribute to the gross provincial product and the economy of the province so that we had a wider taxation base. It would work out, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Where would the member raise the money?

Mr. Foulds: Where would we get the money?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Who is the member going to tax, tell us that?

Mr. Foulds: We would tax the resource industry.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Same old story.

Mr. Foulds: We would institute a special levy on industry and commerce for educational purposes, since they benefit so directly right now from the educational spending in terms of training. They benefit from it, but they don't spend any money on educational programmes worth their salt. We would devise a system, frankly as they did in Great Britain under the Labour government of 1964, where those industries that adopted apprentice programmes and did training programmes within the factories would get a rebate on their educational levy. There are all kinds of areas.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The Labour government almost bankrupted, and has bankrupted, industries in Britain; that is the problem.

Mr. Foulds: No it didn't, no it didn't. The reason a number of industries in Britain are bankrupt is because they have not done any upgrading of their industrial machinery since the turn of the century. Business in Great Britain hasn't done the job of modernizing industry that has been done, say in North America and in Germany.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: But the government has.

Mr. Laughren: The government doesn't have the resources either.

Mr. Foulds: The third major step that the NDP would take to rehumanize education—and I know that in the end the member for Prince Edward-Lennox won't understand this, but I would like to finish my speech before we adjourn so that other people who wish to speak in this debate can get on to it.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They want the government to take over resources development.

Mr. Foulds: The third major step that the NDP would take to rehumanize education—did the member have his opportunity to speak in this debate?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The NDP are going to tax resource industries, at the same time saying that the government should take over the resource industries. They should make up their minds.

Mr. Speaker: Order please, order, Would the hon. member continue his remarks through the Chair?

Mr. Foulds: Yes, I certainly would, Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to turn my back on the reactionary from Prince Edward-Lennox. As I was saying, the the third major step that the NDP would take to rehumanize education would be to place an importance on teacher education never before seen in this province. It is the fundamental conviction of the NDP that teacher education is fundamental to the continuation of a healthy school system. For this reason, serious consideration would be given to increasing the practical experience component of teacher training programmes. Perhaps apprenticeships and internships are ways of developing this component, and it is the policy of the NDP that legislation and/or structures would be devised to extend the sabbatical concept to make study leaves possible, both on a short-term basis and on a long-term basis. For example,

surely it is possible that we could relieve teachers of classroom duty for short periods to attend seminars or courses for a weekend, a week long or a month's duration, as well as having the usual concept of a year-long sabbatical every seven years?

One of the key reasons for the malaise in education today is the alienation of parents and the public generally from the school system. In fact, if one were to be critical, one could perhaps say that many parents get interested in the school system only when there is a crisis, either with their individual child or if there is a crisis because of a teacher work stoppage at the local level.

To overcome this malaise and this alienation the NDP would encourage the development of local school councils, composed of principals, teachers, parents and non-parents served by the schools. Such a school council could, for example, be developed over an area served by a high school and six to eight feeder elementary schools. This school council would be a key if not the key body in determining the aims and objectives of the school. The parent representation or the resident representation on the school council could very simply be elected at a town-hall type of meeting.

We will be elaborating on these policies, Mr. Speaker, in terms of education as we go through the budget and as we go through the estimates of the Ministry of Education. Our key problem is to make the Davis impersonal juggernaut system of education more human. Our key objective is to develop each and every child to his or her fullest capacity to benefit and serve the society in which he lives, and the key person to do that is the classroom teacher.

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. member be able to wind up these remarks now?

Mr. Foulds: I am just going to do that, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. Those are some of the ideas that I wanted to put on the record this morning, Mr. Speaker. I thank you for your patience. I will now take my seat.

Mr. Kennedy moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

It being 12:30 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 26, 1975

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Laughren, Mr. Good, Mr. Foulds	483
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Kennedy, agreed to	511
Recess, 12:30 o'clock	511



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Wednesday, March 26, 1975

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26, 1975

The House resumed at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

MILK INQUIRY

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I would like to convey to the members of the Legislature a recent decision by the Milk Commission of Ontario to hold a public inquiry into certain aspects of the milk industry.

Milk, a basic food necessary to good health and nutrition, has undergone several price increases in recent months. These price increases have come about for several reasons, some being increased input costs at the producer, processor, distributor and retailer level, and the withdrawal of the consumer subsidy on milk by the federal government.

Whatever the specific reasons for increased milk prices, the consumers in Ontario, as well as those individuals connected with the milk industry, have a right to know how certain elements in the milk chain—from the cost of processing and marketing fluid milk products to trade practices, price spreads, management policies and methods of financing—contribute to the final price paid for a quart of milk.

Recent milk price increases at the producer level have been reviewed by the Milk Commission of Ontario and upheld. Indeed, the Consumers' Association of Canada (Ontario) has supported these necessary increases to farmers but they, along with the Milk Commission, are concerned about what happens to milk prices once the milk has left the farm.

Bearing this in mind, the commission, upon its own initiative and under authority vested in the Milk Act of 1970, will proceed along the following lines:

1. Investigate pricing practices and margins between processors, distributors and retailers of fluid milk products;

2. Inquire into the manner in which these practices may vary within a corporate organization;

3. Examine the manner in which these practices may vary from one part of the province to another;

4. Inquire into the variations in practices between different processors, distributors and retailers within the province;

5. Investigate the retail margins currently being given on the basis outlined in Nos. 2, 3 and 4;

6. Inquire into discount practices in and after the year 1972; and

7. Compare the retail margins and discount practices in Ontario with those in other jurisdictions.

This public inquiry will begin as soon as the necessary arrangements can be made.

I am confident the consumer appointment of Mrs. Robin Jeffrey to the Milk Commission of Ontario on Nov. 1, 1974, will prove to be a very valuable dimension during the public inquiry.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Housing.

HOME RENEWAL PROGRAMME

Hon. D. R. Irvine (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech on March 11 indicated this government's commitment to ensuring that Ontario families continue to be the best housed in Canada.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): And the government has failed most miserably.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: To do this, we must both encourage new housing and preserve the existing stock.

Mr. Deans: The minister should be ashamed of what he has done.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Today I am pleased to report to the House on the progress my ministry has made in implementing the Ontario Home Renewal Programme.

Mr. Deans: It is a real big seller, this one.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: The Ontario Home Renewal programme was developed by my ministry to extend home rehabilitation opportunities to areas not included in the federal-provincial Neighbourhood Improvement and Residential Rehabilitation Assistance programmes.

Mr. Deans: How about the people who cannot get housing at all?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Under OHRP, municipalities receive per capita grants to issue loans and grants to eligible homeowners for major property repairs. The programme also extends to homeowners in unorganized territories with the administration provided by provincial rather than local officials.

I am pleased to report this programme has met with a very enthusiastic response from municipalities and homeowners. As a measure of its success, may I point out, Mr. Speaker, that while we funded OHRP with \$10 million for the full fiscal year of 1974-1975, the programme did not become operational until October, 1974.

Nevertheless, by the end of the fiscal year on March 31, 1975, we fully expect to have disbursed more than \$9.5 million to 111 municipalities and 34 homeowners in unorganized areas.

I am tabling a list of municipalities which have received OHRP funds. We expect these funds to result in almost 2,900 rehabilitated living units. Another 1,250 units will be rehabilitated as a result of RRAP, for a total of 4,150 units.

Mr. Speaker, the ready acceptance of this programme by municipalities and by the homeowners, and the results expressed in housing units speak for themselves very clearly. I look forward to continuing this programme with additional funds in the forthcoming year. Thank you.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): The government should have started years ago.

ENERGY MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME

Hon. D. R. Timbrell (Minister of Energy): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to announce today that the government of Ontario, through my ministry, will be implementing the next stage of a comprehensive management programme.

The importance of energy conservation and the need to alleviate potentially critical future supply problems by moderating de-

mand have been repeatedly stressed by this government.

Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature will recall that the National Energy Board recently concluded that by the early 1980s, there will no longer be sufficient crude oil to meet Canadian feedstock requirements west of the Ottawa Valley.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): That's not what the producers said three years ago.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The future supply situation regarding Canadian-produced natural gas is even more alarming. Ministry of Energy studies firmly indicate that present supplies are beginning to fall short of total Canadian needs and committed exports.

Ontario, which imports from other parts of Canada or from other countries 80 per cent of its total energy requirements and which has one of the highest per capita rates of energy consumption in the world, must now take strong, effective action to ensure that the total demand for energy throughout the provincial economy is considerably reduced in the years ahead.

If all of us in Ontario have the resolve we can, and will, accomplish this vital objective by improving the efficiency of energy use, by better managing energy distribution and consumption, by encouraging voluntary action to conserve energy, and by putting into practice an energy conservation ethic across Ontario.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): That's why the minister criticized the federal Minister of Energy.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Will the member save his energy for the question period?

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: These, briefly, are the goals of the energy management programme.

My predecessor and colleague, the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), has emphasized that government co-ordination is required so that all of the varied energy management activities being undertaken by no fewer than 11 ministries in this government and by the private sector at large will achieve concrete results.

The energy management programme has been carefully designed to co-ordinate on a long-term basis the various aspects of all of the government's energy saving projects, and to act as a research and information resource centre for energy management projects which can be called up by other ministries, by industry and by the public. The budget for the

coming fiscal year is to be \$2.1 million, the bulk of which will be directed to space-conditioning projects which involve improving the efficiency of heating, ventilation, air conditioning and lighting.

Those ministries dealing with individual sectors of the economy will be announcing their own elements of the energy management programme. My ministry, in its catalytic and co-ordinating role, will ensure that unnecessary duplication is avoided and that the government itself sets an example for efficient use of energy in our province, particularly in the application of space-conditioning methodology and in vehicle operations.

It should be pointed out that within the context of government initiatives in energy management, the Ministries of Housing and Government Services have been particularly progressive in implementing space-conditioning programmes and the Ministry of Transportation and Communications has already defined government policy regarding the purchase and use of smaller automobiles.

We have examined the energy use trend and costs in Ontario and unquestionably, we must change our current, wasteful pattern of consumption to an efficient pattern of consumption which minimizes waste and cost in Ontario and, unquestionably, we must change our current wasteful pattern of consumption to an efficient pattern of consumption which minimizes waste and maximizes energy yield.

It is projected that the cost of energy used in Ontario this year will be in excess of \$5.6 billion. If present consumption rates are maintained, Ontario's energy bill could be twice as high by 1980, making the energy management programme all the more important.

The provincial government, by putting the energy management programme into effect, wants to reduce the rate of growth in energy consumption in Ontario by one-third over the next five years.

Already we are seeing the beginnings of what will be very significant energy savings, obtained through voluntary action by all sectors of the economy. However, let me also state that the government realizes that further measures, including incentives and regulation may be necessary. If we—government, industry and the public at large—achieve this one-third reduction in the energy consumption growth rate, total energy expenditures can be cut in this province by about one billion dollars a year by 1980.

Through the energy management programme, government will co-operate with

and provide operational management assistance to industry, to business and commerce, to the construction and transportation sectors of our economy, to our municipal governments and to the public, to enable us all to save energy now so that we don't suffer the consequences later.

It is vital that we recognize the facts: Energy is not available in unending supplies, but it is within our power to avoid the disastrous results of continuing on an energy binge.

We plan to go well beyond the current federal government advertising programme to work with industrial end users of energy toward better energy management.

Mr. Roy: Oh does he? Another dirty trick.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We plan to demonstrate to the public and to industrial and commercial users of energy, practical, proven applications of existing and new energy-saving technology, together with the substantial cost benefits which can be realized.

The government has in the past, and will continue to draw on the capabilities and advice of the private sector in the development of energy savings projects, as well as in a wide spectrum of other matters. The energy management programme will complement existing industry programmes, and those being undertaken by the province's energy suppliers, including Ontario Hydro.

The government's energy management plan, the next stage of which I am announcing today, will, hopefully, make it possible for business and government in Ontario to reduce the need for new capital investment in energy producing facilities, reduce the environmental impact of energy mismanagement, extend the life of non-renewable resources, save money for those practising conservation, and generally lessen the impact of higher energy prices on our economy.

The availability of energy for tomorrow is of primary concern to this government in Ontario today. This government, with the implementation of the energy management programme, is taking a leadership role in harnessing all of the ability, all of the research and development, and all of the motivation which exist in government and in the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, as I said a few minutes ago, further announcements will be made by my colleagues and by myself as individual projects within the government's overall energy management programme are launched. My intention today is to inform members of the Legislature, at this early date, of the objec-

tives of the programme and the role of the Ministry of Energy in ensuring that every potential area for energy saving is closely investigated and that effective provincial action is taken.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions?

The member for Kitchener.

CONDOMINIUM DEVELOPMENTS

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Housing, following his statement that we must encourage both new housing and preserve the existing stock.

What is the minister prepared to do with respect to the problem, as brought forward from the study recently in North York, that the single-parent families and the handicapped are most particularly involved in problems when apartment buildings are turned into condominium units? Is the minister actively studying this problem and has he reached any conclusions with respect to this matter so far?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I read the report as submitted by the borough and have not had the opportunity to fully analyse it, but I have said before that the conversion aspect rests with the municipality.

Mr. Deans: Oh of course, there is always someone else to blame.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Whether or not they convert into a condominium is up to them to decide. I have asked them to very carefully consider how many people they place into a rental situation when they convert—although not necessarily all are placed into a rental accommodation. At this particular time I haven't got a definitive answer for the hon. member. However, I will say that recently the conversions have been considerably less than they were last fall, and the indications are that condominiums are not that popular. It may reach a time, as it did a few years ago, here in Metropolitan Toronto, when they are a glut on the market.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware that more than half of the apartment units now being offered for rent in the Metropolitan Toronto area are restricted to adults only, and, in view of the concerns he expressed in his statement, is he willing to enact legislation that would stop discrimination by landlords against people with children?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, the matter raised is not a supplementary, but I would like to answer it in any event. It is a matter of concern to us. I'm not fully in agreement with the percentage which the member has mentioned, he might be slightly wrong on his percentages.

Mr. Cassidy: We've checked it out.

Mr. Deans: It's 48 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: In any event, I think we still have to go back to the matter of supply of all types of accommodation, rather than just zero in on one particular type of accommodation.

Mr. Deans: What difference does that make?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: This is what we're trying to do. As I said yesterday, we have gone ahead with our limited dividend programme. We have recently had \$42 million agreed upon by this government to proceed with housing in the areas of low vacancies. We also have asked the federal government to proceed with its limited dividend programme. They have \$200 million allocated for LDs across Canada. We're hopeful that they will allocate a considerable portion of those funds in Ontario and, if we proceed with our other home ownership programmes and plans, whether through AHOP or whether it's through HOME in Ontario, I think we can fulfil the needs of all our people. But it takes a combined programme by the federal, provincial and the municipal governments to fulfil the needs of our people.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): May I ask a supplementary, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: One more supplementary.

Mr. Germa: If it is true that local councils are inhibiting his plans for housing, what does the minister plan to do to circumvent the obstructionist attitude of these local councils?

Mr. Roy: Isn't that a dirty trick too?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, what I've been doing recently, and expect to carry on doing, is talking to the municipalities, to the elected representatives and the people in the municipalities, to try to impress upon them that there is a need for them to accept housing and to make sure they understand the different programmes. Many times there is confusion about what type of housing

will be provided by a certain programme. I do not think it is the time to take away local autonomy at this particular point. I believe we have to work with the municipalities and work with the people—

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Oh boy, that would just suit the minister's purpose.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister is a disaster; he really is.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —to make sure that we have housing. If we haven't got housing in the member's particular area I would appreciate it if he, as a member of this House—

Mr. Laughren: Doesn't that tell us something about the minister's housing programme?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —would stand on his two feet and ask his local people: "Why don't you accept housing?"

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): That's a good idea.

Mr. Deans: We do it every day.

GO-URBAN SYSTEM

Mr. Breithaupt: I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications, Mr. Speaker. Following the exchange with my leader yesterday concerning the matters of the use of the GO-Urban materials from Krauss-Maffei, and looking at the article in today's press with respect to the possibility of Ontario quitting the GO-Urban plan, can the minister advise us if, in fact, the article in the press is correct and there are no particular advances in continuing any use of materials or projects in this entire system?

Hon. J. R. Rhodes (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, as I said to the hon. Leader of the Opposition yesterday, I will be making a statement in the House in the very near future, as I committed myself to do some time back. I cannot be responsible for those articles that may be written. The member will note that there is some source of information that the reporter has. I'm not familiar with it.

Mr. Breithaupt: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister be prepared, when he does make that statement, to advise us if, in fact, the suggested figures of some \$700,000 spent by the Ontario Transporta-

tion Development Corp. are correct; and will he be able to give us some details at that time as to the moneys which have been spent by that corporation?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, again, I said yesterday that I would do exactly that when I made my report, which will be coming very shortly. I indicated I would be giving the figures as they related to costs that have been incurred since the cancellation of the project.

TENDERING FOR TRUCKS

Mr. Breithaupt: I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the—

Mr. P. Taylor (Carleton East): We welcome the minister back from his holiday.

Mr. Breithaupt: —tendering for some 400 half-ton trucks in the Kenora and Sudbury area last summer. Is it correct that one company received the contract for all of those vehicles at once on a regional basis and that local firms were not involved in that tendering procedure? Is it further correct that those vehicles were all shipped out within three weeks, which might lead someone to believe that a prior knowledge of requirements did exist on that project?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I have to admit that the Leader of the Opposition did send a request to my office for a complete résumé of those vehicles to which the member referred. If I recall correctly, many of the dealers in the immediate areas where the vehicles were used were asked to tender. It is a policy that we get tenders from a number of operators within the specific areas where the vehicles will be used. I'm not aware of the accusations the member makes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

ENERGY MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Energy, with regard to his statement, whether the programme he's bringing forward this afternoon is intended somehow to be an answer to the \$23 billion in spending anticipated by the Ontario Hydro Corp. prior to the year 1982? If it is, can he give some specifics as to what kinds of cutbacks he anticipates recommending to the private

and public sectors with regard to the use of hydro so we won't have to spend the \$23 billion or \$24 billion over that period of time?

Secondly, can he indicate whether he has any programmes that might be put into place immediately, perhaps along the line of reversing the method of applying the rates that the user must pay, to ensure that the more you use, the more you pay?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, there are about four questions there, I guess. To start with, let me say that what I have announced today is in no way to be considered the final answer. I referred to it several times as the next stage.

Mr. Deans: What has the minister got in mind?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Does the member want me to answer this question or not?

Mr. Roy: Don't be so sensitive.

Mr. Deans: I'm asking the minister what he has in mind.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: For some time the ministry and the government have been involved in a public educational programme, if you will, as have other governments and agencies such as Ontario Hydro. What I've announced today are specific amounts of money allocated for improvements within public buildings to save energy and to give an example to the public sector, as well as projects within various ministries of the government relating to segments of the overall public sector in industry, agriculture, institutions and so forth.

As it relates to Hydro—and this has come up several times—I think one of the basic problems here is that the member may be confusing the creation of demand with reaction to demand. Over the last 50 years—

Mr. Stokes: Who created the demand over the last 20 years with building programmes?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Order.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Over the last 50 years the demand for hydro has doubled every decade. In their submissions to the Energy Board last year, Hydro indicated—and I'm not apologizing for Hydro; they look at the statistics regarding the growth of the Ontario economy, the number of new residences the number of new industries, the number of whatever one wants to look at. They also look at conversions, improvements on farms, conversions from gas or oil and

the potential for more conversions from gas or oil, given the supply and demand situations in those two areas. We can't just look at Hydro in isolation. We've got to look at the total energy situation.

They said: "Our best estimate, given this past information and our look into the future, is that it will probably double in the next decade." On that basis they project what they needed by way of new generating facilities, new transmission corridors and that sort of thing, and came up with the dollar figures. The exact dollar figure, I think, is about \$20 billion—

Mr. Deans: It is \$23.8 billion.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I grant that it is inflated from last year; that's a serious concern and should be to all of us. I think this is an opportunity for the hon. member to not only highlight that bill—it's a very large bill, and either all of it or some of it has got to be met and is going to be met by we, the people of Ontario. But here's an opportunity for the hon. member to join with the government in stressing the energy conservation ethic and stressing at all levels the need to be innovative.

Well, the hon. member obviously has a supplementary; I will leave it to that.

Mr. Deans: I thank the minister for the lecture. Can he now explain to me what we can anticipate by way of reduction in the Hydro's anticipated spending from the \$23.8 billion as a result of the programmes which he intends to implement, flowing from his statement today?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I expect that within the next month Ontario Hydro will submit to me their request for rate increases for the next year. At that time, along with my advisers in the ministry, I will review that request in light of current levels of consumption and in light of our goals in this programme when making my reference to the Energy Board for their review. At this time I haven't got the hard facts and figures because they haven't come to me yet.

Mr. Deans: Is the statement simply a whitewash, an attempt to sell another non-programme of the government? Or is there some intention on the part of the government to cut back on the anticipated spending of Ontario Hydro? Secondly, where does the government propose to get the \$23.8 billion?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, to take the last part first the member makes it sound

as though all that has to be raised this year. It has not.

Mr. Deans: That's to be raised in eight years.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The point is that whichever projects are approved, those which, in the best judgement of the government are, in fact, needed to serve the interests of the people, will have to be financed. There's no question about it.

Mr. Roy: Thank God the Tories won't be the government then.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: But whatever the amount, I can't predict at this point.

Mr. Deans: The minister doesn't know.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I can't predict what the amounts will be in nine months' time. No, I can't, because I haven't seen their requests to me. I haven't made up my mind on what I haven't seen.

Mr. Deans: These programmes don't mean a thing.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Let me just say something, Mr. Speaker. Unlike that party I don't believe one can have an instant answer today to solve all problems.

Mr. Deans: This government has been developing this utility for 20 years.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: What we are saying—and no other government in this country has said this—is that it is our goal to reduce that rate of increase by a third over the next five years.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): That's just PR.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I'll allow the hon. member for Carleton East a supplementary.

Mr. P. Taylor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister of Energy say, in keeping with his final remark about reducing the rate of energy consumption, whether or not he intends to instruct Ontario Hydro to stop advising the planners of large buildings to install central thermostats as opposed to thermostats for each individual unit within that building, which has been proved to be a method for controlling and reducing the consumption of energy?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, the member indicates that he has some knowledge that Ontario Hydro is instructing; Ontario Hydro doesn't instruct.

Mr. P. Taylor: I said will the minister instruct Hydro to stop advising them.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Hydro is asked for advice. I'll check into it, but I know it is asked for advice from time to time on the relative merits of various systems. It does not, as a rule, instruct, as I thought the member's word was.

Mr. Roy: It was advise.

Mr. P. Taylor: I am asking the minister to instruct them to stop advising.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I will look into it. I have seen some studies from the United States which indicate there are savings by going to individual meters as opposed to bulk meters.

Mr. P. Taylor: This is thermostats.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I am talking about Hydro meters as well. That's another aspect of it.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Individual meters can reduce consumption by 25 per cent.

Mr. Speaker: A final supplementary; the member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, in this programme is the minister going to persuade Hydro to revise its rate structures so it will discourage the wasteful use of electric power by reversing the philosophy that the more one uses the lower the rate one pays?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the member for Wentworth. That was part of his question; I apologize. That was discussed at the Energy Board last year and instructions—not instructions—comments made by the Energy Board have resulted in the inauguration of studies on the ways and means of achieving that. I would hope those studies can be completed very soon and that we can make such a determination.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

RENTAL ACCOMMODATION

Mr. Deans: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Housing. Given that the Minister of Agriculture and Food has just indicated there is going to be a study into the price increases in the milk industry and given that housing might also be

considered by some to be a necessity, when is he going to instruct that there be a study conducted into the rate of increase in rents in the Province of Ontario? When is he going to recognize that giving money to people who are in the income category in excess of \$20,000; making available a limited number of houses for people in the range from \$12,000 to \$20,000; and making available a few houses in the rental field for those under \$12,000, is not an adequate response to the needs of the majority—perhaps 60 per cent of the population—who earn less than \$12,000 a year? What is it between the apartment owners in the Province of Ontario and this government that makes him so adamant in his refusal to investigate the reasons why they increase their rents on such a regular basis? What is it that makes him refuse to require justification?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, again, I repeat what I have said several times before. We have reviewed certain rent increases. I had a letter yesterday in which a person was complaining about a very unusual high increase in rent. That unusual increase happened to be \$20 a month. I have asked for particulars in regard to when was the lease signed originally and when was the last increase and so on. We have gone into many increases and we have found that in most cases they are justified. The point the member doesn't understand is this: There is a very sizeable increase in the cost of maintenance.

Mr. Deans: I want to know what it is. Why doesn't the minister conduct a study?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: We have been doing our analysis of it. If the member wants to do his, he can do it. I'm telling him the best way to look after the rental accommodation problem is to have supply; and that's what it's going to be.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): The minister has the staff. He falls short there, too.

Mr. Cassidy: They are down by 30,000 this year.

Mr. Deans: Does the minister agree, by his own statements on March 20 and today, that there are occasions which arise when there's justification for reviewing rental increases? If he does why doesn't he conduct a study now of the major rental accommodation available across the province and determine once and

for all whether or not—as is thought by many including me—that rent increases are unjustified on the basis of increased costs? If that is not the case, let him table the material in the Legislature and show us why it isn't so.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, once and for all, I say again, I am not going to be intimidated by the NDP. I'm going to tell them this. We're going to have supply, we'll have supply for the people of Ontario; and we're going to have the programmes which are necessary for the people of Ontario.

The socialist philosophy is entirely different from what we happen to have.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): We're not trying to intimidate the minister, only to make him do his job.

Mr. Deans: We believe housing is essential.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: And I'm not going to listen to their philosophy.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This type of question is developing into a debate time after time. Would the hon. member have further questions for other ministers?

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: No, no more supplementaries.

MILK INQUIRY

Mr. Deans: I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Can the Minister of Agriculture and Food rationalize his statement of about a week ago when he said an inquiry into the milk subsidy was within the purview of the federal government and, perhaps, the Food Prices Review Board, with that of his statement today in which he says he is now going to conduct such an inquiry? What's happened in the last week to 10 days to change his opinion?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Good question.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Some information has come to our attention which we thought warranted the Milk Commission proceeding with a study; they had been approached by at least two different groups. I would point out to my hon. friends, through you, Mr. Speaker, that this is a study by the Milk Commission of Ontario, not by the government, not by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food. It is a study by the Milk Commission of Ontario.

Mr. Deans: It has no relationship to the minister either.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): It is a whitewash.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would say as well that the Food Prices Review Board at Ottawa is also proceeding with a similar type of study, but not in the same detail as ours.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is a week late, under pressure.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am not a week late under pressure at all so the member needn't get his tail in a knot. We are doing what we think is right.

Mr. Deans: That really got him.

Mr. Foulds: They're in a knot over there.

Mr. Breithaupt: That is an agricultural simile.

Mr. Deans: It's frequently called back-tracking.

MOHAWK KNITTING MILLS

Mr. Deans: Can I ask the Minister of Labour if he has had brought to his attention the pending closing of the Mohawk Knitting Mills in the city of Hamilton with the likely lay-off or severing of employment of all of the employees; and the request of a certain number of employees for government assistance in order that they can independently fund one sector of that industry which is viable within the city of Hamilton? Will he make representation to his absent colleague, the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett), that there ought to be direct input by the government to try to protect those workers' jobs and to ensure they can be on an equal footing with any number of companies which get money from the government with some relative ease?

Hon. J. P. MacBeth (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear the first part of the question. I think I got the end of it; was the question was I aware of Mohawk and its problems?

Mr. Deans: Mohawk Knitting Mills is closing.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: I don't think I am. I had some information and we entered into an agreement with a knitting mill this past

week, Mr. Speaker, but I don't think it was Mohawk. I'll ask my adjustment service people to investigate this one and see how we can help them, if we can.

HAMILTON-NANTICOKE TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Deans: One final question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Can the minister indicate how he expects to be able to have a rational policy with regard to transportation from Hamilton to Nanticoke when the planning body for the airport, the body studying the possible airport location in that area doesn't have any provincial representation on it? It will be a major motivator and economic force in that area.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I must confess I was not aware of the make-up of that particular committee, and the airport is obviously something we have not been involved in. I can certainly inquire as to the possibility of us having a representative on that particular committee. I agree with the hon. member that what develops in that airport area is certainly going to have an effect on the traffic patterns and the need for highways; so I will look into it.

Mr. Deans: Can I ask a supplementary question; whether the minister believes the study of the airport and the subsequent decision with regard to the airport and the Nanticoke transportation corridor would be a matter which might be referred to the environmental review body set up by the Minister of the Environment (Mr. W. Newman) two days ago?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Again, I really have practically no information at all about what has been happening at the airport study. That particular group I believe was established by the federal government in conjunction with the municipal governments.

Mr. Deans: It must affect the ministry.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Well certainly it will affect us, but I wasn't aware we had no input into that committee. I will inquire and if it needs an environmental look we will take a look at that too.

Mr. Speaker: The Provincial Secretary for Resources Development has the answer to a question asked previously.

FACILITIES ON THE TRENT-SEVERN SYSTEM

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Mr. Speaker, on March 21 the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. G. E. Smith) asked the following question:

Is the minister aware that the federal government, through its park branch, has announced locking charges for boaters using the Trent, Severn and Rideau systems? Would the minister inquire from the federal ministry what the money will be used for?

Mr. Speaker, on March 14, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, the hon. Judd Buchanan, announced an increased capital development programme for the national parks and a change in the fee structure for national parks and other areas and facilities operated by Parks Canada.

The Trent and Rideau Canals are operated and paid for by Parks Canada. Therefore the responsibility for establishing user fees is totally within the jurisdiction of the federal government. In the same way, user fees for provincial and municipal areas and facilities within the Rideau-Trent-Severn waterway corridor is the responsibility of the managing agency.

In all cases, the level of fees normally is established as part of a broader fee policy applying to all areas under the respective agency jurisdiction. In the case of the canal user fees, the same fees also apply to two canals in the Province of Quebec.

The federal minister stated that the user fee structure changes were being instituted to help defray the costs of the increased parks and canals programme, including an expanded programme in Ontario.

The CORTS agreement makes no reference to user fees because, as I stated previously, this is an individual agency policy decision. However, the CORTS advisory committee—the citizens advisory group established under the agreement to advise the federal minister and my colleague, the hon. Minister of Natural Resources—is required to solicit public opinion with respect to the water.

I would assume therefore, Mr. Speaker, that in the public meetings to be held by the advisory committee, any public comment on the canal fees would be directed to the committee, which in turn would advise the

ministers, including any recommendation it wishes to make.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Supplementary: I wonder if the minister would take a look at the 1906 water agreement between the federal and provincial governments in relation to this matter and see whether that is not the vehicle for determination of fees and lockages through the canals?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would be pleased to look at that.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa East.

ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES

Mr. Roy: In the absence of the Minister of Health (Mr. Miller) and the Premier (Mr. Davis), I would like to ask a question of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development: Would the provincial secretary give an undertaking to this House that the government will cease the practice, when awarding contracts or jobs to architects under which the architects are chosen on the basis of a list, and that the only way they get on the list is to make a contribution to the Conservative Party? Would she undertake to stop this practice?

Hon. M. Birch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): I will give the hon. member the same kind of answer his question deserves:

Mr. Roy: Supplementary!

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Roy: I have a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: There will be no supplementary to an improper question in the first place.

Mr. Roy: An improper question? On a point of order: What's improper about that?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The question period is to ask for information. The member for Sudbury East.

MOTHER'S ALLOWANCE

Mr. Martel: I have a question of the Minister of Community and Social Services. Recently, as reported in the press, the review

board suggested that a mother should have to withdraw funds which had been willed to the children rather than get mother's allowance. In view of the fact that we went through this in committee about a year ago and the minister was going to have it investigated, who has instructed the review committee to make that type of recommendation?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): Mr. Speaker, I'm not familiar with the case the hon. member is speaking of, but I would be glad to look into that individual case. However I would like to mention that these matters are discussed with the official guardian, and there is a certain amount of money that can be left in trust for the care of children. At the same time, if the assets exceed a certain amount of money, there is no further sharing of assistance under the federal Canada Assistance Plan.

Mr. Martel: A supplementary: The money that is provided in the will or left to the children belongs to the children and surely it has nothing to do with the mother. Therefore we should not be penalizing the mother in these instances.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Again, as I said Mr. Speaker, there is a certain discretion. I think it's very difficult to speak in a general way. If the hon. member would give me the particulars of this case, I would be glad to look into it.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Natural Resources has the answer to a question asked previously.

PRICE OF SEED CORN

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food who is under the gallery. Since the price of seed corn is running around approximately \$1 per pound and since many farmers in the province consider this price to be excessively high, I would like to ask the minister if he has had any complaints from farmers in this connection? And if so, would he consider that farmers are being ripped off?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether I consider farmers as being ripped off or not. Many of the farmers who are buying this corn are also growing it and selling the seed as well. There are many hybrid seed corn growers in Ontario, as my hon. friend should know. As far as the price is concerned, it is high; there's no question of that. But bearing in mind that 1974 was the poorest corn crop year that I know of in recorded memory, either in Ontario or in the United States, it's understandable that quality corn seed may not be as good as it was in other years and that it may be short in supply.

However, as I understand it, the price is much stronger than it was last year. When one considers that a bushel of corn will plant four to five acres, it's spread over a fairly substantial chunk of land. I would say that while we're aware of the situation, there are no price controls in this country of ours. That was decided last July 8, if my friend remembers.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

GRAVEL LICENCE APPLICATION

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, the leader of the NDP asked a question of me a few days ago concerning the status of an application from a Mr. Sam Manetta for a licence to extract gravel in Pontypool.

In March, 1974, Mr. Manetta made an application to open a pit in the township of Manvers. A number of persons objected to the issuance of this licence, and as a result I referred the matter to the Ontario Municipal Board for a hearing. I understand the board conducted a hearing on Feb. 10 and as yet has not reported its recommendations or findings to me.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES

Mr. Stokes: I have a question of the provincial Treasurer. It is in connection with a statement he made yesterday concerning a subsidiary agreement under DREE Ontario for a development programme in Dryden. What are the criteria that are used now for municipalities seeking some kind of development assistance or funding under DREE Ontario? And would the minister not agree, since he is responsible for the regional development programmes across the province, that an upgrading of the Design for Development programmes take place so that conventional wisdom appropriate in 1969 and 1970 may be brought up to date and reviewed so that a good many of the applications made under

DREE Ontario might pass in the light of the new circumstances?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I don't know that I could give the hon. member a precise answer as to criteria—certainly not off the top of my head—but I will be glad to get that information and pass it to the member. In terms of upgrading, I think the statement yesterday perhaps didn't say it as clearly as it should have. The statement implied that Design for Development, phase 2—phase 3 really, the approval process—in northern Ontario, was now five years old and that we had already met some of the targets which were projected for the 1980s.

We had a discussion about this in the ministry two weeks ago, and I was asking just where matters stood. There was a request from a meeting at Quetico that the plan be upgraded and with local input. Those plans are under way and we are starting to gear up to that sort of an exercise, I would think that probably by some time in 1976 we would produce a progress report and revisions on a plan for northwestern Ontario.

I would agree there have been changes. I mentioned yesterday that the pulp and paper industry, which in 1970 and 1971 had not as rosy an outlook certainly as it has now; and I think the same thing is true of the mining industry. I have discussed this with the staff and we were talking about the need to upgrade plans. We had more or less tentatively agreed that this should be done on a five-year basis. The thought that I would be responsible for five-year plans put me so firmly in a red position that I was appalled, but nevertheless I agreed to it.

Mr. Stokes: One final, brief supplementary: Would the minister agree with his colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources, that Ontario, and particularly northern Ontario, isn't getting its fair share of DREE funding?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I always agree with my friend, the Minister of Natural Resources, that great exponent of the virtues of northwestern Ontario and its need for more support. I particularly agree with him when he is suggesting they need more federal funds; I would encourage that kind of reasoning—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): He is almost laughing.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and that line of thinking at all times. That view is shared by the Chairman of Management Board.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Right.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The Provincial Secretary for Resources Development is a great believer in that principle also. He is a great exponent of northwestern Ontario.

Mr. Ferrier: We need more in the north-east.

Mr. MacDonald: What a love-in!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Up the north!

Mr. Deans: Why does nothing happen since they believe all this?

Mr. Ruston: The minister is laughing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: A lot better than the member for Essex-Kent.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would specifically agree that Ontario, relative to other parts of Canada on a per capita basis, on a square mile basis, on any basis that one wants to calculate it, has received zilch in terms of DREE assistance, and the rest of Canada has received a great deal.

But I am the eternal optimist; and since Mr. Jamieson became the minister, some progress has been made and we seem to be getting together and recognizing the fact that within as large a province as Ontario there are regional disparities, which are not as serious as they are in some parts of Canada, but which, nevertheless, within this province have presented problems and will continue to present problems.

DREE assistance is needed in such places. Cornwall, of course, comes quickly to mind; and there are certainly other places in northern Ontario which are relatively as much in need of federal assistance under DREE as parts of the Maritimes or Quebec or western Canada. So the answer is yes.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: The member for York-Forest Hill.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary? There has only been one supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Make it a new question in your turn. The member for York-Forest Hill.

SPADINA ARTERIAL ROAD

Mr. P. C. Givens (York-Forest Hill): I would like to ask the Minister of Transportation and Communications when he intends

to reply to the application of Metropolitan Toronto for the 50 per cent provincial contribution to pave the four-lane arterial road in the Spadina ditch; and when he replies to it, whether he intends to reply to it in the affirmative in accordance with the recommendation in the Soberman report?

Mr. Roy: And the minister's comments in the House.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated I would be making a recommendation to cabinet. That decision has not been made at this time. When the decision is made, it will be made known in response to Metro's application. The member knows my recommendations.

Mr. Givens: A supplementary: In light of the fact that the minister has had this application before him for several days now and that we're entering the construction season, when is it likely that he's going to make this recommendation? Surely he is not going to wait for another year, is he?

Mr. Roy: The minister has made the recommendation—

Mr. Martel: He will make it on the eve of the election.

Mr. Roy: What is the recommendation?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I suppose I could use the time-worn phrase, "in the fullness of time."

Hon. S. B. Handleman (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): In due course.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Cochrane South.

TORONTO-HEARST LRC SERVICE

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. In view of the fact that it takes two years, once a decision is made, to get a train on the tracks, how seriously is the ONTC looking at the prospect of implementing an LRC train on the route between Toronto and Hearst? Can he give us any idea when the decision might be forthcoming as to when, or if, he is going to go ahead with implementing this kind of a service?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, quite frankly I don't think we're looking at it very

seriously at this time at all, because of the fact that there have been absolutely no LRC vehicles purchased in Canada as yet. We aren't sure just exactly what sort of a policy is going to be developed as it relates to rail, along with other policies as a result of the national transportation policy review that is going on.

I can tell the hon. member that I met this morning for three hours with the Hon. Mr. Marchand, discussing some of these particular items. We have, at this stage, not made any specific move towards implementing that sort of service anywhere in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Ferrier: As a supplementary: Is the minister saying that until the federal government comes to a certain policy decision and agreement that the ONTC just has to more or less wait on the sidelines until that federal policy is enunciated?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member knows full well that a part of this run he is talking about is not ONTC right of way, it's of the other railroads.

Mr. Laughren: Nationalize them.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Until such time as there is a national policy developed—and we agree with the development of a national policy and we want to discuss that with the federal government to see what their involvement is going to be—we won't take any steps in this direction, changing the type of equipment being used on railroads.

Mr. Foulds: Bring them under public control.

PICKERING AIRPORT

Mr. Deacon: Yes, I have a question of the Minister of Housing. It now being four weeks since the federal government made the decision to proceed with the Pickering airport, is it not time that this government told Ottawa to either compensate the owners from whom the Ontario government removed the rights for development three years ago, or lift the freeze? Will the government not now set a deadline or 30 days and tell Ottawa to either compensate the owners or remove that freeze?

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): Wire Pierre.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Tell him something else.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I have a letter that should be received by Mr. Danson—maybe it hasn't been yet—asking that they outline their position to this government as clearly and as quickly as possible in regard to the hon. member's question. I haven't received the answer yet.

Mr. Stokes: He won't answer it after the comments of the minister's parliamentary assistant (Mrs. Scrivener).

Mr. Deacon: Will this government just set a deadline by which time it will either lift the freeze unless Ottawa does make compensation? Stop fooling around with it.

Mr. Roy: Will the minister answer for us?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I had a meeting on Monday with the Hon. Barney Danson and, contrary to what some people may think, we're still talking. We did discuss certain issues and I expect to have an answer from him.

Mr. Breithaupt: Hon. Mr. Danson is a fine fellow.

Mr. Ruston: He is more open-minded than the minister is.

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. Laughren: In the absence of the Premier and the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. Auld), I would like to direct a question to the Provincial Secretary for Social Development.

Mr. Roy: Try to get an answer this time.

Mr. Laughren: Is she aware of the documents published today in the University of Toronto student newspaper, the *Varsity*, which indicate a major shift in emphasis by her government toward post-secondary education in Ontario? Is she aware that if the COU proposals in those documents are implemented they would mean a possible increase in tuition fees for students without an accompanying reduction in grants by the Ontario government; that there would be an accompanying decrease in the quality of education at the post-secondary level in Ontario; and that there would be further discrimination against the staffs at the universities, who are already being paid less than people doing comparable jobs in other parts of the public sector as well as the private sector?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, no I am not aware of that article in the *Varsity*.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, I have one final supplementary if I might: Would the provincial secretary assure this chamber that this will be brought to the attention of the Minister of Colleges and Universities and that he would then make a public statement on it?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I will bring it to the attention of the Minister of Colleges and Universities.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

PLANT SAFETY INSPECTIONS

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Labour. What action has the minister taken on the 28 or so alleged unsafe labour practices and unsafe labour conditions that the president of Local 444, Mr. Charlie Brooks, brought to his attention about one month ago?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I have quite a report here which I'll be pleased to send across to the hon. member. It's quite detailed. We are keeping a close eye on the Chrysler company up there. They are complying with our directions and we are satisfied, but—we are inspecting them regularly.

Mr. B. Newman: Will the minister table that, Mr. Speaker, or send it over?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: I'll send it over.

COMBUSTIBLE PLASTIC FOAM

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. What action has the minister taken since the dangers of foam plastic as a fire hazard in homes and other residences have been drawn to his attention?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, as I recall, the hon. member raised the question of foam plastic in home furnishings, not in residential construction.

Mr. Burr: It was in homes.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I assume he means the use of foam plastic within residences, not in the construction. The hazard has been

brought to my attention. As I understand it, there is a possibility that Mr. Ouellet, under the Hazardous Products Act, may take some action here. They are the only people who have the jurisdiction. We've drawn that to his attention.

In the meantime, the technical standards branch of my ministry is pursuing the subject. There is nothing really definitive about the information the hon. member has given to us. Therefore we are having to conduct additional inquiries. In my own opinion the best possibility for any elimination of the hazards, if they exist, and I question that assumption, would be under the Hazardous Products Act as administered by Ottawa.

Mr. Burr: Supplementary: Has the minister not read the December issue of the Ontario Fire Marshals Quarterly News and the article on foam plastic hazards? It gives a great deal of information?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I haven't read that particular issue. Now that the hon. member has drawn it to my attention, I can assure him that I will be reading it.

Mr. Deans: He hasn't read it? Isn't that his job?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland South hasn't had the opportunity to ask a question today.

HOME INSURANCE RATES

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations in reference to the Throne Speech, which indicated strong and decisive response from the government on moderation and restraint in matters related to pricing of goods. Will the minister order the fullest possible inquiry into the entire area of the fluctuating rate structure, and increases up to 50 per cent, as they relate to home dwelling insurance, as proposed by the Canadian Underwriters' Association?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, at the present time we do monitor rates, but we do not control them. I'm quite prepared to look into the question the hon. member has brought to my attention and ask the Superintendent of Insurance to report to me on it. At the present time, as he knows, we do not control insurance rates; we do monitor them.

Mr. Good: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Order please, the question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson from the standing social development committee, presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill with a certain amendment:

Bill 4, An Act to amend the Child Welfare Act.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

NOTICE OF MOTION No. 3

Clerk of the House: The government notice of motion No. 3 by Hon. Mr. McKeough:

RESOLUTION: That the Treasurer of Ontario be authorized to pay the salaries of the civil service and other necessary payments pending the voting of supply for the fiscal year commencing April 1, 1975 such payments to be charged to the proper appropriation following the voting of supply.

Resolution concurred in.

NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 4

Clerk of the House: The government notice of motion No. 4 by Hon. Mr. Winkler.

RESOLUTION: That the committee on procedural affairs should investigate and report to the House with all convenient dispatch its recommendations respecting the following: 1. Whether substitutions should be allowed on standing committees other than those considering estimates and if so on what terms including time of necessary notification to the chairman; 2. Whether the voting procedures in such standing committees should adhere more closely to the procedure in committees of the whole House than heretofore, including stacking of divisions; 3. What improvements should be made in the physical facilities for the meetings of such committees.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves notice of motion No. 4.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, I think there are a few things that could be said with respect to this resolution. The points have been raised in the House on several occasions with respect to this matter, most recently when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon) was speaking on the motion to strike the committee to deal with committee formation. Certainly the points which are raised in the resolution are worthy of support and have the support of this party.

We believe this matter of substitution is most important for the effective use and development of the committee structure within the Legislature. I commend the Chairman of the Management Board and the government House leader for bringing forward this resolution and I hope the committee will be able to deal with it expeditiously in the best interests of the House.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, like the Liberal House leader, I am pleased that we have finally got around to looking at committee. It has been something that has been a bone of contention among many members for the last two or three years, and I don't think it's before time that we should be taking a serious look at the way in which the committees are structured and the way in which they operate within their own sense of responsibilities.

I want to remind the House leader and the members of the House that the matter of the stacking of divisions, for example, is in fact a matter that is an agreement from time to time and is not something that is a hard and fast rule in the House. I would not want the committee to come forward with a recommendation that stacking become a hard and fast rule in dealing with any amendments placed before a committee.

I think it has to be left to the discretion of the committee and perhaps to the unanimous consent of the members, since from time to time there may be a matter that a particular member or a particular group of members might feel deserves individual attention.

I therefore strongly urge the committee on procedural affairs not to make a recommendation with regard to creating a hard and fast rule about any future stacking of any future divisions, but that it may be considered by the committee that it would be appropriate, as it now is appropriate in the committee, for the committee by unanimous consent to agree to hold off any votes on any matters that are in contention until an appropriate time is reached, perhaps close to the end of that sitting or perhaps close to the end of the consideration of those particular estimates.

I'm particularly eager that two things should be paramount in the thinking of this committee. One, I want them to think in as non-partisan a way as they can about the matter of substitutions. I've wondered about it and thought about it for a number of years, and I can see no advantage to any side in continuing the current practice of not allowing substitutions in the consideration, let's say, of private bills.

I'm sure that if the member for Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski) had a private bill from his constituency before the committee, he would probably like to be a part of that committee not only for the purpose of discussing the bill, or supporting the bill or otherwise, but perhaps even for the purpose of moving amendments on behalf of his own constituents. I think that is probably true of all members of the House. I really do urge that that be kept in mind at the time consideration is being given to whether or not substitutions should be permitted.

I also suggest that it ought not to make much difference to the House what the name is of any particular committee member. As long as the representation on the committee is by party strength, and as long as that committee and its chairman are aware in advance of the sitting who it is who is going to represent each of the political parties at that particular time for whatever reason the committee is sitting, it should make very little difference as long as the numbers are maintained with regard to the appropriate strengths of the three political parties represented.

I do urge also that we give consideration to putting in adequate recording facilities in at least one and perhaps two of the committee rooms immediately. I think it's in the best interest of everyone, when we are reviewing such matters as commissions and their operations when they come before a committee, that those be made a matter of public record.

We probably could cut down to some extent on the repetitive nature of the questions if a member who might have to miss part of a particular hearing because of a commitment here or elsewhere, was able to pick up the instant Hansard—it doesn't have to be done in the normal Hansard form—to leaf through it and to find out what the answer was to the question that he may well have asked to be raised on his behalf. It may save time or it may not, but it's worthwhile looking at.

I also think that, for the purposes of the record, it's a public responsibility that chairmen and representatives of boards and com-

missions of the government should have their views on record with regard to matters of public concern. If it be the Liquor Board, the Workmen's Compensation Board, the Racing Commission or any other commission or board, when questions are put to the chairmen or to the representatives of that particular commission, their answers should be on the record and the record should be available for public scrutiny in other than just simply the reporting of the media.

It shouldn't be left up to the members and to the commission and to people who happen to be present at the hearings to try to recall exactly what was said. It should be there for all to see. I think that makes for a much better system of representation. It brings about a greater degree of truth and a greater degree of accuracy. Then in future years when one refers to matters that were commitments or undertaken as commitments that have not been pursued or that have been pursued, it's clear for all to see what was undertaken and what should have been arrived at and what should have been decided.

I make these comments. I hope the committee will take a moment or two, will think about them and will recognize that I make them with the complete understanding that within six months we'll be the government and we'll have to represent the government's side and have to abide by and live with these rules.

Mr. Breithaupt: The member was doing well until that last part.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to hear some of the comments made, and at the fact that the minister has brought in this notice of motion. There is one area that has just been raised where I would certainly ask the minister whether or not he would be considering this as included in No. 3, and that is the form of recording of the proceedings that we can provide for in the future.

For example, in our select committees we have someone there who speaks into a mike and types out a draft. It's not a full Hansard or provision for a full Hansard. It's not done at great expense.

It is really important that we have a record of what has been said, especially when many people come before the committee who are very experienced in certain areas and make significant contributions. Yet we have no reference or no record of what those people

provided the committee in the way of information or enlightenment concerning their problems that we're trying to solve. I would ask if the minister intends that part 3 of the notice of motion would include the committee's consideration of some form of recording of proceedings that is appropriate under the circumstances.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on the resolution, specifically to one point. I would hope that under subsection 3 of the terms of reference for the committee on procedural affairs it would recommend very strongly the recording of all standing committee debates on legislation. When a bill is significant and important enough to be referred outside this House for consideration, I would hope that we would consider that important enough to record in terms of debates, just as we record the debates in committee of the whole House on legislation and just as we record the debates on estimates in standing committee outside the House.

I've had the experience of sitting in on the standing committee on social development, of sitting in on that committee for some three weeks as we debated and discussed Bill 72, which is the new Education Act. Yet none of that debate and none of the proposed amendments were recorded.

We could, I think in fairness, Mr. Speaker, save both time and money in the long run if we recorded the debates on legislation. For one thing, when we have a debate running for a three-week period, as we did then, we often had people coming in, both from the public and from the Legislature itself, who had missed three, four or five days of the debate when we had adequately covered a topic of a certain amendment, and the whole thing had to be reopened again so that they could be filled in because there was no record.

Secondly, it would save time because the opposition now feels—certainly we felt in terms of that particular bill; they even went to a committee outside the House—we had to refer it to committee of the whole House simply to get the recording on a number of key issues—at that point I think it was only five or six—in a very lengthy bill. If that could have been done while the committee was going on, we could have saved some time in terms of processing in the House itself.

I really think legislation is one of the primary responsibilities of this House. It's as important if not more important than the debate which takes place on estimates. For that reason it should be recorded for a record both

for the House members and for the public generally. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: I would just like to say one or two words. We haven't had a chance to comment on this question of substitution over the last two or three weeks.

Mr. Speaker, I think that apart from our differences of party, which are very real, as members of the Legislature we all have a common interest in making the Legislature function efficiently and effectively. That's why I hope the committee on procedural affairs will come up with a positive recommendation as far as substitution and the right of substitution are concerned.

I say this to members of the government—if they consider the way the hearings normally proceed on a bill when it is in committee, the running of that committee or the work of the committee is normally determined by the opposition members on the committee. That is, for the most part they carry the burden of what's going to go on there. Some of the government members make useful contributions but often they are simply there to make up the quorum. The opposition's function is to oppose, among other things, and we want to raise points and we do.

I think it is also worth pointing out that the government is not inhibited from having its experts and its specialists take part in a committee hearing on a particular bill in the same way that the opposition is. The specialists in a particular area of legislation in the government are, of course, the government ministers and on occasion their parliamentary secretaries. These are the people who go to a committee in order to carry the bill through that particular committee.

As a matter of courtesy and custom and obvious necessity, those ministerial people enjoy full rights on the committee including the right to move motions and the right to speak, to answer questions, to make comments and that kind of thing. Nobody ever thinks to ask whether or not those people happen to be members of that particular committee.

For some reason which is beyond me, Mr. Speaker, this whole hassle over substitution has come up because the government side, in the past, has indicated that its specialists can take part on an equal basis in committee but that the specialists of the Liberal opposition party or our party cannot.

I may say for the record that it is very

frustrating. For example, in the condominium bill which was before the standing committee on justice just before Christmas, I came in as one of the two spokesmen for my party on that particular bill but I was deliberately and provokingly relegated to second-class status by the chairman of the committee. It wasn't just lacking the power to move motions or amendments and it wasn't just the fact that one had to speak last after all members of the committee had had their turn.

It was the fact that in addition there was a feeling put abroad that one was second class, and that was encouraged by the chairman of the committee.

That really shouldn't be allowed to be and, of course, when it takes place, Mr. Speaker, it has the effect of delaying the work of the committee, raising people's tempers and generally being unproductive in the furtherance of sound legislation by this House.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, there is no time-saving involved right now in the present prohibition on substitution. If anything, it may take up more time because the members of a committee are there because they have to be there. Other members who take an interest in it, from our party or the Liberals, may also attend and contribute. We have more people taking part than if, through substitution, we were able to have only those people with a direct interest take part in consideration of a bill.

I would suggest as well, Mr. Speaker, that if the government were to show co-operation in this area of substitution, an area which has obviously been of concern to the opposition for many years, it might in some small way help to accelerate the handling of the business of the House.

I can't make any promises about that. I can't say that all will be milk and honey, particularly in an election year. But it seems to me that as members of the Legislature, we have a common interest in trying to remove unnecessary causes of friction that sometimes divide us and sometimes hinder the work of this House.

If we want to fight on party issues, that's fine. If we want to fight on policy issues, that's fine. But in the past this question of substitution Mr. Speaker, has been one of those petty and frustrating annoyances that have made life so difficult for people on this side of the House, when in fact we are trying to contribute to the work of the Legislature and not detract from it.

I hope that the committee considers this recommendation positively and brings in a

substitution rule as an innovation of the House.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one or two comments. I want to commend the government House leader for bringing this resolution before the House. I can agree with several things, and I have several reflections. In particular, I believe there are one or two things that should be done which might involve broadening the terms slightly, but I think the terms are already broad enough that they could include these points.

First of all, I believe substitution should be recorded in the order paper. That would have a very good effect. The other thing I would like to suggest is that the members of the House should attend some courses in parliamentary procedure under that committee for the very basic reason that if one examines what happens in committees, very much of the time is taken up by budget and Throne speech material, rather than on the actual work before the committee. I say that very advisedly, because I think any examination would show that to be true.

The other thing I want to stress is that I think there's often a distortion between what this House is actually here for and what it actually does. To me, that distortion is simply that very often the examination of expenditures, which aside from the redress of grievance is the primary reason that this House meets, as I understand it, is not necessarily for the educational process of the members. The first two requirements are for the members to deal with those matters of the House and the matters that are placed before us here in the interest of the public. I often think there's a distortion of this.

Sir, I think it would be a good idea to have some definite meanings that would distinguish between examination of estimates, public accounts, expenditure, the redress of grievance and so on, and get these things back into shape so that our committee structure can function the way it is designed to do. I say that advisedly. I think there are additional things that should be considered, and that's why I wanted to make those points today.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, as we are making comment on this motion, I would like to suggest as whip that at the time the steering committee deals with the names that are to be placed on each of the committees, they should take on the responsibility of electing the chairman and vice-chairman at the same time so that the com-

mittees are organized and ready to go as of the day of selection. I put that suggestion forward in the hope that the committee can work it into the three terms of reference in some fashion or other.

Mr. Ruston: How about no smoking?

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution as far as it goes, the resolution being to give this to the procedural affairs committee who will look at these matters and report back. But I support those speakers who have said that, in addition, we should have that procedural affairs committee investigate the other question of whether committee proceedings should be recorded.

I've gone through two committee reports by the Workmen's Compensation Board, one of which was tagged on to the estimates and of which no recording was kept, and the second being the formal one, which was recorded in committee. At each of those times, the statements made by the chairman and the various board of officials to that committee were invaluable in terms of how the board functions and how we can best function as members vis-à-vis the board, when we have complaints come to us. Unless the members who are there are taking notes in shorthand, that direction is lost.

The memory retention of most of us is not all that long, and these invaluable comments on what they were going to do and how things were going to proceed, or should proceed, and how we could best function are completely lost and gone. So I would say to the minister that not only should those be recorded but this resolution should also give to this committee the decision as to whether committee meetings should be recorded.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on this and my comments are going to be very brief. Much of what has been said here was said in the committee when we were first striking the members to the various committees, and I would suggest that all of those who have constructive suggestions to make be present at the committee when it meets the next time and resolve the problem there rather than in here.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the interesting observations that have been made. It is not my intention that the terms of reference be restrictive; the exact opposite. I trust that these terms will be used in a broader sense.

As I have said in the past, I have no intention of interfering with the committee in its function or even in recommending to it what its determinations should be. I would simply like to say that in my experiences on a committee in previous years, in visiting different jurisdictions—and of course I was a member of another jurisdiction—exactly the same problems arose there that are arising here, with the exception of the visit that I had to the California Legislature. I think the committee room there was done extremely well for the benefit of all concerned; the division between the witnesses and the committee members and also other participating members who were not members of the committee. I think all of these things should be taken into consideration.

I also agree with those who say that probably the recording of the deliberations of committees would have some effect on the reduction of debate in the House. I am not too sure of that in some cases, but in others I am sure it would be so.

Therefore, I hope that this committee deals with the terms, as I said, in the very broad sense, and comes back with its desires as to the committee function.

Resolution concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

REPRESENTATION ACT, 1975

Hon. Mr. Winkler, on behalf of Hon. Mr. Welch, moves first reading of bill intituled, the Representation Act, 1975.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, just very briefly, all members of the assembly are very well aware of the objectives of the bill. I felt that in the absence of the minister it should be in the record of the House prior to the recess that is just before us, for whatever use it may be to the members so that they may proceed with certain aspects of consideration to be brought back after the recess.

PROFESSIONAL FUND-RAISING CORPORATIONS CONTROL ACT, 1975

Mr. B. Newman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to control Professional Fund-Raising Corporations, 1975.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to provide for the licensing and

control of professional fund-raising corporations.

It is not aimed at local Red Feather, United Appeal or other similar drives where a great deal of the organizational work is voluntary and expenses incurred are a very small proportion of the total proceeds.

ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS CODE ACT

Mr. Cassidy moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Ontario Human Rights Code.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to prohibit discrimination in the rental, the sale or the occupancy of housing accommodation against families with children or against any person because of age.

I introduced the bill in the last session and I am reintroducing it. The problem of discrimination against families and accommodation is, in fact, becoming worse and our indications are that now more than half of the apartments available in Toronto are for adults only. We hope the bill will be adopted by the government. We understand the principle is now under consideration by the Ontario Human Rights Commission.

CONTROLLING OF HOURS IN RETAIL ESTABLISHMENTS ACT

Mr. Edighoffer moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the Controlling of Hours in Retail Establishments.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is the same as the previous bills introduced—to provide for uniform store hours and business hours for retail establishments throughout the province.

RENT CONTROL AND SECURITY OF TENURE ACT

Mr. Cassidy moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for Rent Control and Security of Tenure.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, at a time when rent increases in cities like Toronto and Ottawa are outrunning the rate of inflation by two or three times—that is, a running of 20 per cent to 30 per cent per annum—it is

clear to us that an Act is required by this Legislature in order to ensure that rent increases are geared to increases in costs.

We have put forward this principle before on behalf of the party and the bill has been before the House in the past. I hope that this one will also be accepted by the government before thousands of families, and thousands of individuals on low or modest incomes are simply bankrupted by the present tendencies in rents.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THIRD READING

Clerk of the House: Bill 4, An Act to amend the Child Welfare Act.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Speaker, just a comment to say that the committee met this morning and we were able to get through the bill rather quickly. I simply want to make the point that the minister conceded during that discussion that in the future we would meet in his office with all interested parties to try to start to shape something along the line of prevention of the breakdown of the natural family. We, on this side of the House, were delighted with that action taken by the minister. We are looking forward to the meeting in the near future.

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill 4, An Act to amend the Child Welfare Act.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): I understood that there was to be an amendment; has that been moved?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): It has been carried.

Mrs. Campbell: Oh, I'm sorry. I wasn't present.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (continued)

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peel South.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate we're winding up the session prior to the Easter recess, so I will keep my remarks as brief as possible.

First, I would like to add my congratulations to you on having been elected to your high office and to commend you on your diligence, firmness and fairness in discharging your duties in a most difficult job. I know all members join with me in acknowledging the accuracy of this description.

In entering this debate I wish to make a few remarks on a subject the principle of which is now history, and which the opposition persists in flogging continually. I appreciate that I do this at the peril of boring everyone, but it's continuing the discussion on regional government.

In his remarks on the Throne Speech, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon) predictably took a swipe at regional government. He seems obsessed with doing this, and subsequent speakers from the opposition have joined in this clamour.

In these excesses he makes one remark that is totally untrue, Mr. Speaker. He said that if the Conservative Party should be re-elected to power in this province there will be a regional government imposed from one end of the province to the other. Mr. Speaker, this is absolutely false. This is the ultimate in overstating cases and there are overstatements that have been made by the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) but some of his are insignificant compared to this one.

In Peel we have 10 municipalities and I could quote statistics to illustrate the variation in mill rates, the attendant tax levies, and so on. One of the major effects of this government has been to provide significant grants to municipalities to stabilize property tax and the municipal levies. Until 1974 this was generally very successful. But in that year, last year, there was a hike in taxes. However, in our area, where regional government started a year ago in January, as a result of regional government there was a decrease of 11 per cent. We don't hear about that from the members opposite.

In Mississauga the province contributed \$1.09 for each dollar that was raised locally. Last year grants to Mississauga were increased by \$1,206,714.

In Peel with the regional plan 10 municipalities were consolidated into three. Now it is a complicated exercise to determine what effect this has had on the tax burden, the tax levies. Regardless of whether there is

regional government or not, rampant inflation and the increased costs that go with this were going to add a burden regardless of the type of government.

Mr. Speaker, the control of a major part of the financing was and is right within the municipalities and the regions themselves. It depends on the will of the people, the needs of the community, those who are elected. It is their responsibility to administer the taxes, the public works and the various things that go to make up the municipal structure and their fields of activities.

It seems logical to me that reducing the 10 municipalities to three should result in efficiencies. Restructured government will result in equality in both responsibilities and the benefits.

I don't wish to belabour the point but the fact is in Peel the studies started some 10 years ago with the Plunkett report. It has been discussed and studied interminably over the 10 years prior to inauguration of the programme. I attended a county council meeting at which the leaders of each of the 10 municipalities agreed to regional government on principle. Subsequently the bill was drafted, based on the suggestions of the county council representing those 10 municipalities.

We know there were dissenters among them in that group and this isn't unusual. This occurred. We know that but the consensus was to go ahead with regional government; the 10 leaders agreed with it in principle and it was proceeded with it.

I mentioned earlier that I took exception to the word imposed; that regional government was imposed on municipalities. It is not the intention—it was not and this was not done—that there would be regional government imposed from one end of the province to the other, which is totally a fantasy; but those now in existence were not imposed. This word simply is not applicable. There is quite a difference between honest, legitimate differences of opinion as to whether or not there should be restructuring and an imposition, which implies and there is no accord in this direction by local municipalities. This was not so.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): We were forced into it in the Niagara region.

Mr. Kennedy: There was no forcing anywhere across the province. It was done in consultation with municipalities. I hope, Mr. Speaker, this will put the problem into perspective and that the opposition will be fair and acknowledge the origin of these new restructured forms of government in the various areas across the province.

The government has responded and will respond to the wishes of local people and there is no intention to do other than consult with them; to co-operate and act in partnership with municipalities on matters of mutual concern. The provincial-municipal liaison committee is an example of these ongoing discussions. I recall some years ago a meeting held at the Science Centre prior to the introduction of the PMLC—perhaps it grew out of this—which was just such a very successful and interesting meeting.

Regional governments have been berated and beleaguered by critical opposition and the criticism has not been constructive. The form of government is feasible, workable, sensible. It consolidates services and it consolidates administration. It has been unjustly maligned by an ambivalent opposition. Regional government permits revenues, benefits and, as I said, expenditures and responsibilities to be shared more equitably on a broader basis.

When the announcement of the Peel-Halton and Hamilton-Wentworth regions was made in Hamilton—I think it was Jan 22 or 23, 1973—the Leader of the Opposition whose riding borders on the Hamilton regional area, was quoted in the Star as saying:

The proposal should be shelved until plans for a regional government in Brant are ready. The plans for the two regions should be co-ordinated.

There is only one meaning I take from this, Mr. Speaker, and that is that the Leader of the Opposition favours regional government.

Why then does he go around the province continually knocking it, hoping it will be a failure?

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): He speaks out of both sides of his mouth.

Mr. Kennedy: The Liberals don't think it will fail really, when one gets right down to it; they really don't. But it might well if they took over with the attitude they have toward it and several other issues I'll touch on later.

This form of government is going to be a success; it is a success. There are many examples of successful amalgamation to various degrees throughout the province. I don't know of anyone who wants to go back and pull these all out. No way! This is progress. I would ask again, where do they stand? I couldn't get it from any entries into debate either here or out in the hustings. Would they dismantle regional government?

I want to touch on a little history. One of the first forms of regional government, though the name is different, is Metro Toronto. It is an unqualified success. Would the opposition

dismantle this? These are the same terms they're speaking of with respect to other regions. I haven't heard anyone, at least in recent years, speak in favour of taking this retrograde step. I know, they know, we all know and the municipalities know there's some rough water, some ripples, as these units of administration become shaken down into smooth, efficient operations. This is to be expected; it's natural and there are no surprises in this.

However, I do believe the great majority of the people who are elected to carry out the terms of the bills in the various areas are working with dedication to make them work. I think they can look with pride on the success they have achieved in about something like 16 months of operation. It has been very, very demonstrative of the capacity of these elected people to deal with the problems that are attendant on such a large new entry into this type of restructuring, despite the fact that they get sniped at from all directions.

I went back into Hansard and had a look at Bill 80 to see how the opposition reacted. They talked about it as if it was a crime then. I found how they were feeling and whether they were in good humour in those days. I found their attitude then was about the same as it is now. The Leader of the Opposition of the day—and I speak with respect because I knew the leader—was Mr. Oliver, a respected member of many years standing in this House. However, what he said at the time of the Metro bill was that he believed in progressive amalgamation. There were some words leading up to this, but he said he believed in progressive amalgamation. He wasn't quite for it or quite against it—it was something like now. Then he sat down.

The minister piloting the bill through was Robert Macaulay. I don't know if any members here were here on that occasion. Perhaps the former Minister of Health, the member for Ontario (Mr. Dymond), was. It was a widely debated topic anyway and received lots of publicity. Mr. Macaulay said that although the Leader of the Opposition spoke of progressive amalgamation, there was some confusion here because at the same time the Leader of the Opposition said fire and police services should be taken over at the time of the bill—in other words, have progressive amalgamation but bring in fire and police. Yet the bill didn't provide for that.

The government wanted progressive amalgamation with those two services, yet the opposition leader, having spoken for progressive amalgamation, wanted instant amal-

gamation of those two services. Subsequently, police have come under the Metro plan. Fire is still, I think, one of the local municipal responsibilities, though they have as good a working arrangement as is needed to provide the service to all of Metro.

Another interesting comment was made by the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) when he said: "The opposition have no understanding of the background of the subject."

Perhaps the best illustration of the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition was the observation that if you had a boat with 13 holes in it—the number of municipalities at the time—all of them taking in water and any one of them enough to sink the ship, there would be no use in saying: "Boys, fill up hole No. 1."

An hon. member: Who said that?

Mr. Kennedy: That was the former minister, Robert Macaulay, when he was putting the bill through. In other words, they were looking to patchwork solutions to a major problem—I guess the member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root) was here at the time. So the same illustration could be used today in the most recent amalgamations.

I recall some of the 13 boroughs at that time. North York was one and it, in effect, was on the ropes financially—it was bankrupt. This is no discredit or criticism of the municipal leaders of the day. They were in a bind to provide housing, to provide all the services necessary to accommodate people. But there wasn't the residential-industrial ratio that would permit this. And this is what really projected this forward, that there could be a broader sharing.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is just what is taking place. These same principles apply today. Bill 80, in the fullness of time, has proved to be a very skillfully developed bill put into operation by very able people to the extent that it is world renowned. People come from cities around the world to consult and examine and see what we have done here and, I presume, to return home and see if it's applicable to their local situations.

There is another interesting piece in Hansard. I don't want to belabour it, in the interests of time. Mr. Speaker, but it is interesting. The Leader of the Opposition criticized Mr. Frost's government by saying that the legislation was at least 10 years too late, referring again to the Metro bill. I quote:

We are late in getting started and it does seem to me if we had started on this matter some 10 years ago we would have by

this time got around a lot of the difficulties and we would have a much larger family around the city of Toronto than we presently have.

That caught my eye, I can assure you. I would agree that probably Metro Toronto might have started 10 years earlier. But there were two routes that could have been taken subsequently. Either Metro Toronto was to be contained, as it is now, or it could have been extended in ever-increasing circles. To my way of thinking, Metro Toronto is a large enough family under the present situation. Accordingly, we have moved forward with similar arrangements for government in the adjacent areas surrounding Metro Toronto.

The opposition leader also said in reference to this:

We, as older members of the House, will recall an instance of that in the city of Windsor some years ago.

I see the member for Windsor-Walkerville is here and he may be interested in this, if he wasn't aware of it; I wasn't.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): I will be interested.

Mr. Kennedy: Yes, I am sure. I wasn't aware of this, but Mr. Oliver said:

In that instance in the city of Windsor some years ago, in the 1930s I believe, there was in that instance a complete and total amalgamation. It was possible in the city of Windsor and I think, looking at it from this vantage point, all of us will agree that was the best solution.

So they supported that. He thought it was great then, although it may have seemed a little harsh at the time.

So evidently, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals believed in amalgamation in the 1930s. Have they ever stepped backwards! I think it has been downhill all the way since my term here. Obviously, if one can read anything they are advancing. They are advancing to the rear. They're not in favour of going forward with these very essential moves that will provide more equality for all residents.

Mr. Haggerty: Mostly to the left too.

Mr. Kennedy: Left and to the rear. Well, maybe by horse and buggy, too. They agreed with it in the Thirties, but as nearly as I can determine in reading and rereading comments in Hansard, they've been ambivalent on the subject ever since.

It is hard to know where they stand in the Seventies. The Leader of the Opposition said we shouldn't go ahead without going ahead with the county of Brant, and now they're criticizing it. Mr. Speaker, apart from any partisanship—certainly we're partisan here, but I think we're also objective—I'm sure it's a matter of deep concern to the people of Ontario, and it is to me, that there is no firm policy articulated by the opposition with respect to this very important matter as well as several others. Regarding education, they would remove the ceilings, yet they say there should be constraints on spending. In the teacher situation, I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition is speaking for all Ontario, as this party is—for the students, the teachers, the boards of education, the taxpayers—or does he just speak for some of the teachers? I don't know. You can't tell. It sounds like the latter to me.

They fought for local autonomy, yet they wanted us to take over the York board at the time of the difficulties up there. By their own admission, at Windsor—Windsor is an interesting part of the subject this afternoon—

Mr. Haggerty: Everybody was there but the member for Peel South.

Mr. B. Newman: Windsor is "the garden gateway to Canada."

Mr. Kennedy: At Windsor they said, "Well, we won't have any policies. Maybe we'll develop some later. We'll send out a questionnaire." Are they coming in, by the way? I would ask their leader, are we going to have what they hope is an alternative to the government by virtue of returned questionnaires and presumably from that, as expediency dictates, at the time of the next consultation with the electorate? It's not good enough, Mr. Speaker. I think the Ontario electorate will be so concerned over this that they'll reject out of hand the Liberal Party.

Mr. Haggerty: They didn't reject Sir John A. Macdonald.

Mr. Kennedy: I submit, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of what we've been hearing over the last year or so, that this party is not to be taken seriously. Someone has mentioned that it is a wholly owned subsidiary of the federal party. They may have taken heart from recent polls, Mr. Speaker, but I do believe that on reflection the people of Ontario will recognize that the Ontario Liberals are not a creditable alternative to the leadership needed in the 1970s and so ably pro-

vided under the guidance of the Premier (Mr. Davis).

Mr. Speaker, I only want to speak on one other subject at the moment, and it is one that has a high priority in debate here and across the province. I refer to the matter of housing. The opposition continually berates this government about housing, but the Liberals at least should turn their attention to Ottawa and put the heat where it belongs. The hon. member for St. David (Mrs. Scrivener) made some profound remarks in this regard, which didn't go unnoticed across the way. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that funds aren't coming from Ottawa as expected.

The NDP response to the Throne Speech by its leader and subsequent speakers, was the same record with respect to housing that I've heard from them in the seven or eight years I've been here.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Yet nothing's changed.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): It shouldn't be necessary.

Mr. Kennedy: All right, it is the same thing, but I suggest there has been no change and we all want more housing. I suggest that the 85,000 that have been built—below expectations, about 15 per cent perhaps—

Mr. Haggerty: Twenty-two per cent.

Mr. Kennedy: Okay, I won't argue it, but when one considers the high inflation rate, high interest rates, drying up of the housing market, Ottawa's attitude, uncertainty in the labour and supply markets, it is perhaps more significant under these conditions that we have achieved the enviable record that has been recorded in Ontario in this past year.

This isn't to say that, as we have mentioned, there is not still a great deal of need, especially among young couples or anyone of any age who can't get a home and who wants a home. It is difficult for young people to save money in this inflationary time that we find ourselves. Wages and incomes were never higher, but the demands on these likewise drain resources and we know it is difficult to save for the purchase of a home.

I had a thought for the Minister of Housing (Mr. Irvine) which I would commend to him. If the government is really interested in helping some of these families or young couples who are just on the margin of not being able to acquire a home, I suggest this. The government has embarked on a programme of acquisition of large tracts of land

for residential, industrial and commercial use, I presume, and all the parkland amenities and so on.

Just dealing with the residential part of it, if they get four or five lots per acre in these tracts and say, broken down, with services, ready to go, that the cost is \$6,000 for the lot, yet the market value might be \$12,000 because of the demand. The house is erected at a cost of \$25,000, for the sake of illustration, maybe less; because I believe in do-it-yourself construction and I think if there was an opportunity for people to build their own homes they would respond in very interesting numbers and we would be surprised.

Anyway, with a lot of \$6,000 and a house at \$25,000, the cost to the purchaser is \$31,000. Yet the market value, because of the \$6,000 for the lot, takes it to \$37,000. I say, this, Mr. Speaker, if the purchaser resides in that residence, presumably with his family, and maintains ownership for 10 years, that \$6,000 should be forgiven; write it off. Against that measure we have them in subsidized housing; \$6,000 over 10 years, \$600 a year, and I am sure subsidized housing costs a lot more. In effect, what I am saying is it would be sold on a two-price structure. We would sell it for \$31,000; if he leaves inside the 10-year period the government would take that \$6,000, the market price of the lot, and he would pay \$37,000. If he stays, okay, good luck.

Some members will perhaps recognize this as a variation of the successful Veterans' Land Act programme. So under certain terms of eligibility which would need to be established, and I mentioned that, we could have young people or others coming in, we could have developed—we would need to recognize the real social benefits involved—the pride of ownership. Let those who are in apartments and wish to move come out and have a home, get out into the sunlight, give them some hope, give them the opportunity.

I say, Mr. Speaker, if the government really wished to do something they could look into this very seriously and I ask that the minister do so. It's much better than subsidized housing in the traditional terms as we know it. It would cost the taxpayers nothing.

I had two or three other subjects of a local nature I wanted to touch on. The Rattray Marsh-Bramalea protection, for example. We've had a couple of serious tragedies in our area. There was a happy resolution of the Lakeshore study area, a development area; and the road subsidies. However, in the interest of time and I know others want to get on, I will leave those for another time.

The Throne Speech, to me, Mr. Speaker,

has been undeserving of the criticism vented against it from across the way. I take just one little paragraph.

Ontario cannot stand still. It will continue to fulfil its accustomed role within the Canadian nation which is that of a progressive, compassionate and innovative society with a standard of living and a quality of life unequalled on the North American continent.

Mr. Speaker, it is necessary that the amendments to the Speech offered by the opposition be resisted.

The preambles of the speeches leading up to the motions by the leaders of the opposition parties didn't carry in them the conviction that one might be inclined to read in Hansard, although it's no great shakes there either. I will be voting against those amendments, Mr. Speaker. I haven't consulted my colleagues but I think they will; what I will do is invite the members of both opposition parties to reread those speeches, reread the amendments and then join us in rejecting them.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York North.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege. It will only take a minute but I think it's worth putting before the members of the House and having it recorded in Hansard.

Tomorrow, at York Manor in Newmarket, Mrs. Mary Louise Patterson, the widow of the late George Patterson of Alliston, Ont., will reach her 101st birthday. Just mentioning that Mrs. Mary Louise Patterson is celebrating her 101st birthday may not mean too much to most of the members in the Legislature but to the older members who have been around here, Mrs. Patterson is the mother of Mrs. Malcolm McIntyre who was a familiar figure around this Legislature for many years as I'm sure you, Mr. Speaker, know well. Mr. McIntyre was secretary of the cabinet for a great number of years.

I'm sure each and every one of the members in here would want to join with me in wishing Mrs. McIntyre's mother, Mrs. Patterson, a very happy birthday on her 101st birthday tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland South.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak in the Throne debate. I believe I have spoken on the occasion of every Throne debate since being elected to

the Legislature in 1967 as the member for Welland South. Perhaps now, with the final bill here, Bill 22, the Representations Act, 1975, this will be my last opportunity to represent the constituents of Welland South. Through redistribution I hope to continue to represent the same citizens once again under a different riding name, Erie.

Erie consists of three municipalities: The town of Fort Erie, known as the gateway to Canada and one of Canada's largest ports of entry; the city of Port Colborne, known to many as the gateway to navigation on the Great Lakes system and one of Canada's largest inland ports located at the entrance of the Welland Canal on Lake Erie; the township of Wainfleet, a rural-urban municipality noted for its specialized farming abilities.

I regret that through redistribution the town of Pelham, which has many scenic landmarks, will not be part of the new riding of Erie. I will be rather remorseful not to continue as its representative in this Legislature, but I am rather pleased that the Niagara region will gain another seat in the Legislature providing the government brings in the necessary legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to you for the manner in which you have carried out your duties in this chamber, at times under very difficult circumstances but in a fair and just manner; perhaps not in agreement with all members but with authority and respect.

I also want to express my gratitude to the Hon. Pauline McGibbon, the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, for her address on the opening of the 29th Parliament. I was delighted to see, as many other citizens were, that the traditional duties of the head of the government of Ontario were now the responsibility of a very gracious woman. It was a great occasion for this province and quite a boost in the recognition of International Women's Year.

Usually, it is the practice for a member to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Throne Speech, the member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. J. A. Taylor) and the member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Lane). Mr. Speaker, I do, but with some reluctance. I thought, with the possibility of a provincial election being called this year, in view of the usual importance of a Throne Speech that indicates government policy or programmes, the Premier would have his heavyweights carrying the banner. I was looking to the member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar) and the member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson). The

Premier has failed to produce the heavyweights and has failed to provide a Throne speech with any noticeable programme.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to deal with a particular aspect of the Throne Speech. There can be no doubt in my mind, or in the minds of all the citizens, that the most pressing problem facing Canada is the rapid increase in the inflation spiral, which affects everyone through the rising cost of living. Since the Throne Speech of 1974, almost one year ago, and the debates that followed, we have seen consumer prices increase by more than 11 per cent and the price of food has risen in that same period by well over 17 per cent.

In the Throne Speech of March, 1974, introduced by the Conservative government, inflation was dismissed as a problem. It was also cast aside in the Throne Speech of 1973. The comments of the Throne Speech in 1974 can only be dealt with in a national context.

Every member of this Legislature has read or received complaints concerning the numerous comments by experts and government leaders and consumers as to the inflation impact on our everyday living. We all agree that some price increases are the result of international economic forces that are beyond the province's control. But the influence of government action in every jurisdiction can soften the impact of inflation. With more than \$8 billion in annual expenditures, this government has the responsibility to counteract the high prices of consumer goods throughout the province.

Since the election of 1971 and the buoyant years in our economy, the Premier and his cabinet have failed to show the strength of leadership that is clearly required to bring about some measures of stability to our economy and to reduce the high inflationary costs that face every citizen and in many instances cause undue hardship to those who can least afford it. Instead the Premier's economic policies have reinforced the already heavy inflationary pressures in our society. The government's financial forecast as outlined in the Throne Speech and its proposals are in a quandary of remorse, uncertainty and embarrassment.

The first page of the address states:

For the first time in many years, the long prevailing prosperity and buoyant growth of the Province of Ontario have been challenged. Because of unprecedented inflation abroad and here in Canada, and because of world recession, Ontario is presently confronted by economic conditions

which will call for strong and decisive response from the people and from this government.

Mr. P. J. Yakubuski (Renfrew South): We are not getting it from Ottawa. We will have to get it somewhere.

Mr. Haggerty: We won't get it from here because it has been lacking for the last two or three years.

The second paragraph of the Throne Speech certainly does single out the group or body that is wholly or partly responsible for the inflationary pressures in Ontario. The government is bold enough to chastize labour as the culprit. I might read that second paragraph, Mr. Speaker. It says:

From the people we must have moderation and restraint in the pricing of goods and services and in wage contract negotiations to help stem these inflationary pressures and maintain our competitive position in world markets.

To my knowledge, this is the only time that labour has been mentioned in any Throne Speech and it is a disgrace by the government to single out labour as the responsible party. But again this is typical of the government not to shoulder any responsibility for an extravagant economic policy. We in this Legislature have seen this economic policy of the government continue for the past 36 months, or in fact since this Premier took over the reins of the Robarts government. We have seen this government bring in supplementary budgets year after year. The budget deficit for the year 1974 alone is estimated at \$850 million, the highest in provincial history.

I suppose if one takes everything into focus the modern economic Conservative is no longer a budget balancer. Many experts in the field of economics have stated any expenditures of government in excess of current revenue were to be shown in the budgets as deficit and that budget deficits were injurious to the health of the economy and must be shunned as far as possible.

Living beyond our means surely does not improve our economy and once such practices are pursued by a body like this government which is privilege-bent to its own policy decisions with impunity, it may well be rather dangerous to our present economy now or in the near future. For this administration to continue with budget deficits year after year certainly adds to the spiralling cost of inflation as a fiscal nightmare.

The present administration has done little, if anything, to control this specific cancer. Many members concerned for the well-being of this province know that over a short period of any recession there is a possibility of a downward swing in government revenue and that possibility may occur at any time. Such a deficit must be covered or protected by a surplus realized during expansionary growth periods by the private sector and the government.

But for some unknown reason, this government's policy is to spend and spend during a buoyant economy, especially when the private sector is expanding at a rapid rate and will add to the full employment.

There is a common knowledge that in any slow growth period or recession when unemployment is on the increase, as it is now in Ontario, government does not apply restraint but primes the economy to maintain full employment.

Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate that the United States government through tax reductions and rebates will put some \$33 billion, the highest in American history, back into the pockets of the consumers and corporations in an effort to create full employment in the United States, following the principles established by the federal minister, John Turner. But the Premier and his cabinet colleagues have taken their usual approach to solving important issues by criticizing federal economic policy.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, the government will play the waiting game to see how much of the tax cuts taken by the United States government will add to the windfall of productivity here in Ontario. Times have been so good here in Ontario and throughout certain other provinces in Canada that Canadians do have the highest—

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): They sure can't run a railway.

Mr. Haggerty:—earned income of any developing country throughout the world. We are well aware of the exceptionally good period of economic conditions in the past three years for the private sector and that expansionary growth patterns have been able to obtain large corporation profits in a buoyant economy well above the annual production gains.

I know that sometimes this is noted as a ripoff in a number of instances. This government has not moved in any direction to control the cartels in the Province of Ontario. They did not move in to take a look at the

price-fixing that goes on. They have not brought in any legislation that perhaps will control the combines.

I know this perhaps is a federal matter, but again there have been no charges laid in the Province of Ontario for this exorbitant increase in prices here in Ontario. Perhaps it's caused by many of those that I mentioned previously. But to single out labour as responsible for the present economic crisis is unjustified.

This year 3,107 Ontario collective bargaining agreements will expire. Expiring agreements cover almost half a million employees, or 47 per cent of those working under union contracts in Ontario; a crucial year for both management and employees, for bargaining in 1975 will take place in an economic climate that is dominated by rapidly rising prices, an indication to the experts in economics that the cost of living will not recede here in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, inflation has cut deeply into the gains in workers' incomes in Ontario. The public is deeply concerned about the current bargaining conditions throughout Ontario pertaining to both the industrial scene and to the Crown employees at all levels of government. I'm interested in a release by Statistics Canada dated Jan. 2, 1975. It says:

Work stoppages in Canada during October, 1974, resulted in a loss of 752,800 working days. The time lost brings the 10-month total for 1974 to 8.9 million man-days—a record figure for the year. This is in comparison to the year 1973, with 7.3 million man-days lost. The 1974 figure represents 40 per cent increase above the previous year.

This represents a substantial loss of income to both employees and employers, as well as governments. No doubt this loss of earning adds further fuel to inflation. This additional loss of income to families causes undue hardship in most cases, when already the employee's income has been seriously eroded by the cost of living.

Mr. Speaker, I know the hardships and the frustrations that strike-bound employees have encountered—and strikes in Ontario have been known to be bitter ones—in obtaining a fair settlement, particularly under present economic conditions in an inflationary environment.

We in the Liberal Party strongly endorse the principles of free collective bargaining and feel that strikes are an integral part of the collective bargaining system. Bargaining must be in good faith. Sometimes it has

failed—not in great numbers—but enough to arouse the general public's interest to demand government intervention to end long periods of disruption and labour disputes and produce a more rational system of order.

Even top American union officials—such as president George Meany, AFL, president Walter Abel, CIO, and the United Steelworkers of America—have called for a review of the recurring cycle of bargaining charades. They are seeking approved, rational means of settling their differences without inconvenience to either party or the public, who are the most concerned.

The Liberal Party of Ontario supports the position of promoting new patterns in collective bargaining. The highest priority must be given to promoting continued consultation and negotiations between labour and management throughout the life of the contract. Enabling legislation must provide for early mediation at the request of either party, and continued mediation for the period of the contract.

We have long recommended the establishment of a tri-party commission—composed of representatives of labour, management and government—to sit continuously in any place in Ontario during a labour dispute and to be continuously active at all times. The commission's objectives would be to ensure and to interpret technology changes, industrial mergers and takeovers which can result in industrial closures and large-scale layoff.

Perhaps if we were to have that initiative provided by the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacBeth) we wouldn't have the strike problems at Standard Tube in Woodstock. I believe the Ministry of Labour should have been working there very closely to assist both parties to get back to the bargaining table to allow full employment to continue in that particular industry.

I attended a seminar on labour in Guelph. A member from the Conservative Party, a member from the NDP and myself were present. I remember the Conservative Party member standing up and saying: "The present Minister of Labour is gutless. The previous minister before him was gutless, and the previous one before that minister was gutless." He said they would not get involved in the labour issue. In other words, they would not take the bull by the horns and take an active part in any labour dispute. The game was to wait and see.

Well, sometimes you can wait and see and wait until industry closes its doors because of the lack of initiative by the Minister of Labour. His responsibility is not to corpora-

tions but to the labourers, the working people of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, we must protect employees whose collective bargaining rights are threatened. They must not be restricted in negotiations. This applies to Crown employees in particular and to Bill 105, the Crown Employees Collective Bargaining Act, which removes the right to strike from all government employees. The Liberal position in this particular labour environment is that employees in essential services—which include police and firefighters and perhaps there are a few other ones—discard collective bargaining and substitute binding arbitration. In this context of bargaining rights, I strongly insist that the government provide additional financing for the Ministry of Labour to provide sufficient staff, trained as competent conciliators and mediators. We should insist on more effective intervention by the Minister of Labour, along with his senior mediators, to act as an ombudsman to endeavour to bring about an agreement as speedily as possible, with broad powers to act as an arbitrator and to be available seven days a week throughout the Province of Ontario.

There is no need to have labour and management confrontations on our streets in Ontario. Matters of great concern to the public must be settled in a new labour court atmosphere without the delays that are now present in the Labour Relations Act. Ontario surely needs complete review of all labour legislation.

One other suggestion that we should be looking at at the present time through labour legislation, which is enforced in the United States, particularly under the Taft-Hartley Act, is an emergency cooling-off period for strikes that are considered injurious to the public's interest. The strike may be postponed for a period of 60 days allowing the federal mediators and conciliators to take the time to assist in obtaining a settlement while the employees continue to work.

During the Throne debate of almost one year ago, 1974, the Leader of the Opposition moved, seconded by the member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt) the following words to be added to the motion: "For its failure to establish a prices review committee of the Legislature which, together with a reduction in provincial deficit spending would exert control on inflation." That's a very reasonable approach to providing guidelines in order to bring about orderly growth in the Ontario economic environment.

What is required now is some initiative by all governments to review and implement in-

stitutional machinery to bring about price stability in our economic climate suitable for our primary industry—for example, the automobile and the steel industries.

In particular I want to make a few comments related to our neighbours to the south where they have had success in such a programme. There should be a wage and price review board initially armed with authority to investigate price and wage decisions in enumerated industries which would hopefully represent the public interest. We need guidelines to urge unions and industries to limit their demands and annual productivity gains, particularly by unions even if a particular industry has improved its efficiency more rapidly than others in the province or in all Canada.

The guidelines I have suggested by no means are the sole answer to halt inflation but would assist in controlling it on reasonable terms. The problem now existing in the automobile industry in Ontario in my opinion, could have been controlled and it could still maintain full employment. The contract settlement between the United Automobile Workers and their employees in 1974 in the United States resulted in gains of 4.9 per cent for workers at a time when the wage guidelines recommended 3.2 per cent.

For their part, the automobile manufacturers' spectacular productivity gains led them to very large profits but they failed to lower their product prices accordingly. I suppose there is a lesson to be learned by this. If the automobile industry had reduced its prices of automobiles as it has in the last two or three months, the employment rate in the automobile industry would have been at full force today.

I think it is typical of everything else. Whatever the traffic will bear, they will charge the consumer for that commodity. This is particularly so in the automobile industry. I think they have out-priced themselves in moving their cars. The proposals have actually worked with reasonable success and have been the wage-price guideposts in the United States in certain commodities and labour.

In the steel industry in the United States, for example, they use this type of approach to wage and price controls. The steel industry there has an agreement, which I believe runs out in 1976, whereby management and labour agreed upon a certain percentage increase in wages and profits, and it has worked very well. In fact, the federal government of the United States has stepped in on two or three different occasions and said to the steel companies, "Roll back your prices." And they

have rolled them back. In the meantime, wages have not increased at a rate that would add to the inflationary process in the United States.

A price guidepost instructs businessmen to maintain existing prices if productivity in their enterprise matches the national average, to raise their prices if they have done less well, and to lower them if they have reaped substantial gains, more substantial than their counterparts.

Mr. Speaker, there are a few other comments that I'd like to add in this debate. In particular, I want to comment on paragraph three on page four of the Throne Speech, which reads:

The government will seek the co-operation of law enforcement agencies and the general public so that the cities and streets will remain among the safest and most secure in North America.

I think this is particularly true in Metropolitan Toronto, where the tourists who come to this city think it's one of the greatest places to visit.

It is pretty safe to walk the streets at night, and I hope it continues that way. But I am deeply concerned about the remarks of this particular paragraph, and I'm not quite sure, if one is to interpret the paragraph, that it does not indicate a police state. I hope not.

Mr. Speaker, I support the motion put forth by the Leader of the Opposition, that this House regrets the failure of the government to enunciate a programme to moderate the combined effects of unemployment and inflation on our people and the economy; the lack of a clear commitment to co-operate with the government of Canada and the municipalities to inaugurate a housing programme that would significantly reverse the downward trend in housing starts; the absence of a clear commitment and programme to stop the waste in government spending caused by duplication of services, overlapping of government jurisdictions and bad administrative judgement; the absence of action to improve general labour-management negotiating procedures, which have been so detrimental to our economy; and the failure to enunciate a clear policy for the retention of agricultural land in production with compensation for landholders affected.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will concede to some other hon. member who wishes to join the debate.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I must say, and I'll say it rather quickly, I regret the organization of the House business is such that the last six or eight speakers have about 20 minutes with respect to the remarks they wish to make in this debate if each speaker is going to be fair to the other. I can see no reason why we shouldn't continue on next week and treat this Throne Speech debate with the proper importance and seriousness with which it is usually treated. Perhaps we would have had a lot of time if some of the other speakers hadn't gone on for 2½ hours.

Briefly, this is one of the most lacklustre Throne Speeches I've ever encountered. It contains nothing concrete except the proposal for an ombudsperson, and who knows when we're going to get that. It's reminiscent of some of the promises that one had prior to the 1971 election, where having promised it in the minds of Ontario people, it's assumed to be there. This may well be the situation with the ombudsperson.

Apart from making very vague references to services to the elderly and social benefits affected by inflation, measures to provide farmers with assurances of a profitable operation—I don't know how they are going to do that. None of these vague promises filled out in the flesh; there is no meat on any of the bones. The Speech from the Throne was a real bomb. It talked about encouraging home ownership and yet the minimum salaries to qualify continue to escalate well beyond the point where the average person in Ontario could consider home ownership.

One of the areas which it completely neglected to mention was the area of labour. They didn't completely neglect it, in the sense that they tried to blame all inflation upon labour rather than even mentioning prices. There wasn't anything in the speech which would appear to suggest a control or even an investigation of the prices. They blamed labour and wages for it, which is typical of this government and, of course, not a proper analysis of the economy whatsoever.

Also in this field of labour, there was nothing about what they were going to do with the Labour Relations Act. It's now almost five years since it was dealt with at all.

The other area of concern in its lack of mention in the Throne Speech is the entire area of women and their rights and their equality. The only reference is that there will be a deliberate policy to find greater opportunity for women within the public service. How much attention was paid to that was

made very evident by the leader of the New Democratic Party, the member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis), when a few days later he asked various cabinet members who the woman was in their department who was dealing with this and creating a greater opportunity for women within their particular ministry, and the ministers could not recall any of their names and had to go out and look it up and report back.

In fact, their reporting back revealed that they really hadn't been informed.

It was a memo sent to the deputy minister, and presumably the deputy minister didn't think it important enough or a serious enough matter to even let the minister know who that person was in the ministry who was going to provide a greater opportunity for women within that ministry. So that's how much attention this government pays to opportunities for women and the role that women have within Ontario's society at the moment. Here it falls very short and is one of the most disappointing areas. Progress toward equality for women continues to be very slow and very inadequate, and nowhere in this country is it slower than in Ontario.

The response by the government to the Ontario Law Reform Commission report, brought out in February of last year, was pitiful. Their only response was to bring in a bill which effectively allowed one spouse to sue the other. In terms of a marital break-up, perhaps if one spouse happens to break the nose or a leg of another in a dispute I can see where it might be of very small use—perhaps of some use for the injured spouse to sue the other—but that's really the step forward that it took.

It took another minor step forward, but it was almost a step backward in so doing. It reviewed the Murdoch case in Alberta, which came before the Supreme Court. Because the case was cast in the terms of the wife having worked on the family farm—and therefore had some rights in ownership of that farm owing to her because of her actual work on the farm, the case had to be decided by the Supreme Court within those narrow limits: Is there a contribution? When there is a contribution from one spouse should that spouse—the wife in this case—benefit from that contribution? The whole case was looked at in that light and there was a very good dissent by Bora Laskin in the decision, in which he said that that contribution should clearly be taken into consideration. But they weren't considering, in that case, the overall partnership in a marriage; that was not the case before them. If they were, I suspect

that Chief Justice Bora Laskin would have spoken to that wider issue.

In its report, the Ontario Law Reform Commission made it very clear that marriage was an equal partnership and at the time of divorce or nullity the assets acquired since marriage should be evenly divided between both spouses. But did this government take the Ontario Law Reform Commission attitude? No, they took the very narrow case taken by the Supreme Court and said in the bill which they presented that if a wife got involved in the husband's business, running the farm of helping to keep the store, then a careful accounting of that time spent would be eligible for some share in the division of the particular property arising from that particular business. They took the wrong conclusion from the dissent of Chief Justice Laskin, and we're going to apply it all across Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, as you may know, I introduced a private member's bill in the last session and will reintroduce it in this session, An Act to establish Matrimonial Property Rights. I took the Ontario Law Reform Commission attitude that marriage is a partnership in which both husband and wife work together as equals, and one spouse's contribution to the undertaking—even if, in the case of the wife, her only contribution is running the home and looking after the children—is just as valuable as that of the other spouse in providing the home and supporting the family and sustaining the marriage as a partnership and an entity.

At the time then of divorce or annulment, my bill would require that the assets acquired since that marriage be divided equally between them. It goes on in other areas to provide for some exceptions, for example, gifts or inheritances to one of the spouses, although the income produced in the capital appreciation of such would be considered part of the division. In the case of a business being involved, if that business was threatened by an equal division all at one time, there would be up to three years from the date of the order of the judge by which the total share of that could be brought forward. Any payments would not, of course, be affected by the subsequent remarriage of either of them.

It would also stipulate that for a year prior to the commencing of the divorce suit no gifts could be given to third parties or such gifts would have to be taken into account in the division. This is the fair way to proceed.

Also, in the submission of the new bill which I will bring in, I would ensure that in the case of the matrimonial home—and that has been well defined—one spouse while they're married—and it would apply if there was a divorce or annulment or until that is settled—could not sell the matrimonial home without the consent of the other.

The Ontario Status of Women Council's views are a little stronger on this than what mine are. They would say, irrespective of the initial ownership of that house or its registration, that, in fact, the ownership was equal. I take the view that if a spouse happens to own a house before marriage, when marriage occurs that house is still that spouse's house. Any increase in appreciation of that house would be divided equally, but per se one shouldn't take a house previously owned by a spouse and upon marriage say that that is now half the other spouse's. I would prefer to go along with the Ontario Law Reform Commission report in that small respect. At the same time, unless by court order, one spouse could not sell the matrimonial home without the consent of the other spouse. I think that is very valid.

As well, in this whole area I think we're well at the time when marriage contracts should be provided, to be signed at the time of marriage or, lacking that formality, that the marriage certificate provide an outline of the property law as it exists in Ontario, so that couples entering into marriage, particularly the women thereto, know their full property rights. At the moment in Ontario, there is a great lack of knowledge of property rights.

There is also another problem in this area which, in a border city, perhaps is a little more obvious than in other municipalities or rural areas in Ontario. Windsor being a border crossing city, in the whole area of maintenance and support payments by deserted husbands we have the problem of the deserting father fleeing across the border, which is one very easy way of avoiding maintenance and alimony payments. They're extremely difficult to collect. Most deserted women are not in a position to afford the moneys to take court actions in two different jurisdictions. Legal aid is provided only for legal expenses in Canada and the courts on both sides of the border are slow to act in this area.

A bunch of signatures of concerned women in Windsor were collected under the leadership of three women, Mrs. F. Mercer, Mrs. B. Close and Mrs. Marylou Cooper, on a petition which was sent to Laura Sabia of

the Ontario Status of Women Council. She was quite impressed and has promised to press this before the Ontario Law Reform Commission and other groups which she is addressing on this particular area of maintenance and support payments. I'll read the resolutions rather quickly; they are not too long.

Whereas the default of maintenance and support payments creates injustice and undue complications and hardship be it resolved that in the event of default of maintenance and/or support payments the onus be on the Minister of Community and Social Services for adequate maintenance and court action under section 6, of the Deserted Wives and Children's Maintenance Act.

The second resolution was on tracing the delinquent ex-spouse and I feel that this is very important.

It is resolved that the province, in conjunction with the federal government, arrange access to the provincial and federal income tax returns in order to allow the tracing of the delinquent ex-spouse. This would be upon court order and all information, save the address and the employment status, would remain the confidentiality of the court.

This is the only way, I think, one could trace deserting husbands to other localities in Ontario or to wherever they've gone. A third resolution speaks to where they go:

Be it resolved that the Province of Ontario and the government of Canada make representations to other foreign states [this is particularly important in Windsor] to expand the number of foreign jurisdictions willing to subscribe to the Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act, the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1970, chapter 403, or any other similar statutes or treaties; and these jurisdictions as well as those already agreed to in the aforementioned Act be encouraged to enforce these agreements and that the Province of Ontario give serious consideration to providing whatever support necessary, be it financial or otherwise, towards that end.

In other words to set up some real reciprocal agreements about tracing deserting husbands or ex-spouses to wherever they have deserted; to be able to go to their income tax returns as far as concerns getting addresses for the tracing; and to require reasonable payments by them.

I find this to be very reasonable and it should be embraced by our particular jurisdiction here in Ontario.

The Province of Ontario does have agreements, as it works out, with New York State, I believe, and with Michigan. But the courts act very slowly in these cases and it's difficult to fight court actions in both jurisdictions. Some real attention needs to be given to this area particularly when in 1973—I'm not sure if it was the calendar year or the fiscal year 1973-1974—it was shown that \$7 million ordered by the courts was not collected from delinquent ex-spouses. Some real savings can accrue to the province if it would set up a system to pursue these delinquent ex-spouses and see that those payments were made. By not so doing it cost the Province of Ontario \$7 million in that particular year.

One other area I would wish to speak on rather briefly—I'm sorry I do not have much more time for this—is the case of an ex-civil servant. That's not clear; let's say a civil servant who is no longer working for the province. The case of Andrew Putnocki from Windsor is an example of how the government treats its civil servants and the incredible mixed-up way it handled his particular firing.

Mr. B. Newman: The way he was treated is a real disgrace.

Mr. Bounsall: The procedures were and are abominable and I'm sure he is not the only example of the kind of treatment and lack of procedures being followed by the Ontario government in letting its civil servants go.

The government went about it in all the wrong way; that is the most favourable thing we could say about this gentleman and the government in its handling of his case. I haven't the time to give the entire background here in deference to other members who wish to speak, but I'll do the best I can in the short time available.

This gentleman became a civil servant in 1970, a rehabilitation counsellor in the Ministry of Community and Social Services. Three appraisals were made of this gentleman between then and the middle of July, 1971, by the regional supervisor, and all were favourable.

In June, 1971, a new boss arrived on the scene, a new supervisor of the Windsor office. Apparently they didn't get along right from the start, and the first inkling we have of Mr. Putnocki's not being adequate was from this particular supervisor. It appears that he was a very good social worker but he didn't keep up with his paperwork very well and, as a result, he was not a very good bureaucrat.

From then on the reports, started to go downhill. In May, 1972, there was an evaluation of Mr. Putnocki, concluding with his recommendation for dismissal because he wasn't a very good bureaucrat. The deputy minister ordered a hearing, which was held.

In August, 1972, an incredible thing happened: He was informed that his annual salary increase was being deferred for six months. To make a long story a little bit shorter, he appeared before the public service grievance board and subsequently in a divisional court case. On that particular point, the grievance board said the ministry acted without authority and contrary to Civil Service Commission directives. Here we have a suspension of the annual salary increase for six months. Mr. Andrew Putnocki grieved it, and the assistant director was sent to investigate this complaint and others. The director of personnel, on receiving the report on Sept. 13, suspended Mr. Putnocki without pay. That's an interesting point. The Public Service Act states that only the deputy minister can suspend.

There is no trace of the director of personnel of Community and Social Services having been given the authority to suspend without pay and no trace that the deputy minister had so authorized.

The director of personnel sent a letter on Sept. 27, saying there would be a hearing on Oct. 4 to discuss his dismissal and Oct 5 to consider the three grievances, which certainly is a little backwards, if I may say so. It's not surprising that Mr. Putnocki and the CSAO would say, "Look, how can you deal with the dismissal grievance when you haven't dealt with the three grievances prior to that, some of which led perhaps to a decision to dismiss?"

Finally, they went to the public service grievance board, and that board, spoke rather toughly about some of the procedures followed and particularly stated that the six-month salary increase deferral was quite illegal, although it upheld the decision to dismiss.

No transcript was kept of the public service grievance board decision. They refused to let Mr. Putnocki have witnesses. They refused to let any person but one speak at that time with respect to the charges. I'm not saying that this board is incapable of a good decision, but they allowed only one person to speak. The lawyer for Mr. Putnocki was not allowed to speak, and witnesses brought along were not allowed to speak. How they could arrive at a decision that was valid, I have no way of knowing.

Mr. Foulds: A positively shameful procedure.

Mr. Bounsall: Finally, when it was appealed to the Ontario Supreme Court, the Supreme Court divisional court said that the dismissal hearing was not legally conducted or authorized and that senior officers of the ministry, including the deputy minister, did not properly carry out the mandatory requirements of the civil service regulations according to either their letter or their spirit. "Their attempts to do so," said the court—and this is a marvellous piece of understatement—"were inept."

In its final decision, the divisional court said with respect to the handling of the public service grievance board hearing that although the procedures carried out by the ministry were inept, they ruled that it followed a previous court case that once there, all grievances prior to the one for the dismissal as well as the dismissal could all be taken into account at the same time. That's a debatable decision and perhaps may well be appealed at some point, but that was their decision in that respect. Therefore, with no new evidence allowed at that level of court, they upheld the decision.

Another interesting comment they made was that they had to take whatever evidence was presented, by way of I don't know what, because it commented several times throughout the decision that they had to make assumptions as to what happened at that grievance board because there was no transcript.

The final injustice in all of this, Mr. Speaker—and I will end my remarks rather shortly so that others can talk—was that when a decision of the grievance board is made, before that person is let go it must be commented upon, accepted or rejected by the Lieutenant Governor in Council and a letter sent to the person fired, upholding or not upholding the decision of the grievance board. That was never done. So really Mr. Putnocki still has never been legally fired in spite of all the lousy procedures followed.

The deputy minister and the staff were, in the divisional court decision, spoken quite strongly to over the way they handled themselves. He's never yet been fired, and this is really acknowledged in the very first line of the divisional court statement. The applicant, Andrew Putnocki is a civil servant; he's never been fired. Under Section 51 of the Act, the determination of the board is final but subject to the authority of the Lieutenant Governor in Council. He's never received his firing.

Irrespective of what the courts may be able to do—and I think he's perhaps reached the end of his tether there, Mr. Speaker—the comments which the board can make

and have made about the ministry and their procedures, and the fact that he is a civil servant, I think demands some justice from the cabinet and they have been appealed to on this matter. I would certainly think from the time that Mr. Putnocki appealed his decision, on Nov. 5, 1972, to take it to the grievance board, to this very day, or until at least the end of the Supreme Court divisional court decision, he should be paid his wages for that entire time, because it's clear that lousy procedures were followed.

I would say to the cabinet that in their consideration of this appeal they take very much into account the circumstances and the procedures and the fact that he's never been fired, in what they finally decide to do. I would suggest they be very lenient and show some mercy to this person whom they have kicked about incredibly.

It could happen to any other civil servant in this province, because we have no real safeguards against it. Believe me, when we get the ombudsperson appointed, this—and I suspect many other cases of firings—will be the first thing that will be on this person's platter to deal with. In other jurisdictions where this has occurred, they have in fact dealt with cases of this sort, that have been of long standing, and dealt with them in a way which was beneficial to the person applying. So they could short-circuit that system and give some mercy now, rather than waiting for their own ombudsperson.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that there's not more time to speak on other topics here. I'll just touch very briefly, on one of them. I don't agree with the view of the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Rhodes) on mopeds in this province. The least he could have done was to require that helmets be worn by these 14 year olds and others who ride them. He could at least have done that. The second step which he should at least have taken was to have a licensing programme to see that the people owning them and driving them were in fact capable of driving them; a driving test for those who would have that licence. I suspect that not too many children are going to be killed by these mopeds—that is, being struck by them—but the persons who are going to be hurt are those driving them, as they collide with automobiles, telephone poles, etc. They will become very widespread this summer, and we don't even require that helmets be worn, nor do we test the vehicles to see that they can be properly driven. I am sure that

the municipalities will license them as they do bicycles.

My last point is that I cannot understand how the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) could continue to say that parts of Windsor and Essex county, which have regionalized themselves for sewer service should not get the grants that go to regional governments for this purpose. There is a large section of Windsor and parts of the county east of Windsor which have established a regional sewer system. The Treasurer refuses to admit that there has been regionalization to that extent.

Out in the county, the same is true of the water system. They have really got a regional water system. Because the county has not called itself a region yet, the Treasurer will not say: "Here's the equivalent grant that would go to regional municipalities which have done the exact same thing you have done." The Treasurer is being very stubborn here, and unreasonably so. This is a point at issue between the government and the people of Windsor and Essex county which will not be forgotten.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the few minutes that I have at my disposal, I want first to make comments concerning the Throne Speech.

In the number of years I have been here, never have I heard so little said in so many words. Other than the comment and the suggestion by the government of taking over a suggestion from the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer), the Throne Speech was completely bereft of any type of policy or programme.

When the members opposite come along and talk on the Throne Speech, I wonder how they talk on nothing. As a result, I would suggest to each and every one of them that they read the suggested amendment, proposed by my leader on page 120 of Hansard, and let their conscience be their guide and support that amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Windsor West brought up the case of Andrew Putnocki. I too am quite aware of that problem. I know Andrew Putnocki personally. In my estimation, it certainly was a very shameful way in which the government did treat the dismissal of a man who, in my estimation, is very capable and was performing his job in

a satisfactory fashion. I think the cabinet should rethink the decision and restore Andrew Putnocki to his former job.

Mr. Speaker, within the past year the problem of asbestos seemed to have been quite a going thing. It was the popular thing. May I bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, a press report in March, 1966—I don't know the exact date in March—from the Toronto Globe:

A study by Dr. Irwin J. Selikoff at Mount Sinai Hospital in New York suggested asbestos dust is a health hazard for workers exposed to it and their families. Autopsies on 1,100 persons in three cities showed that 25 per cent had asbestos lodged in their lungs.

This doctor indicated in his studies that asbestos was linked to cancer and is definitely a health hazard. On March 4, 1966, Mr. Speaker—March 4, 1966—I asked the then Minister of Health concerning the health hazards of asbestos. So the issue was well in the minds of the Ministry of Health at that date. That is almost nine years to the date.

Mr. Speaker, nothing was done on the part of the ministry concerning the dangers of asbestos. Back in 1971, the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations of the day was Mr. Arthur Wishart. I asked of him in the estimates debates if he was aware of the use of asbestos in the manufacture of ladies' coats. I also told him at that time that there was the health hazard and there was the cancer hazard with the use of this, or the potential hazard in wearing coats that had asbestos fibres mixed in with the cloth in the weaving and the manufacture of the coat. At that time he was unaware of the thing and said he would look into it and he would have the matter investigated. But you can see, Mr. Speaker, from 1966 nothing was done until 1971, and from 1971 nothing was done until today. Now the government of the day is aware of the asbestos problem.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk on another—

Mr. Speaker: Will you please conclude.

Mr. B. Newman: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Speaker: We wish to adjourn the debate.

Mr. B. Newman: All right. I'm finishing now, and I can go back.

Mr. B. Newman moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, the administrator of the province awaits to attend the chamber to give royal assent to certain bills.

ROYAL ASSENT

Hon. G. A. Gale (Chief Justice of Ontario): May be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province has, at its present sittings thereof, passed certain bills to which, in the name of and on behalf of the said legislative assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

The Clerk Assistant: The following are the titles of the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 4, An Act to amend the Child Welfare Act

Bill 8, An Act to amend the Pollution Abatement Incentive Act

Bill 12, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act, 1974.

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Administrator of the province doth assent to these bills.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, prior to my adjourning the House I would like to say that the business for Monday, April 7, has been announced; and I think all members are apprised of your generosity on the adjournment of the House. I think we might proceed to that stage of business, which really isn't an item of business. I am prepared to trust that all members will have a very nice holiday, a restive holiday, and return ready to work.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I would not have cut my comments short had the House leader decided to do this because I still had part of an issue to raise in the House. I would suggest that we proceed until 6 o'clock.

Mr. P. Taylor (Carleton East): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it your invitation is for 5:30 and it is now 10 past 5.

Mr. Speaker: Everyone is right, of course, this afternoon. Is it still the wish to adjourn? In which case I presume the hon. member

will be able to continue his remarks on April 7.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have asked for the adjournment of the House. The member adjourned the debate; he has the floor when the House reconvenes.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, there's a topic I wanted to discuss. I consented to the House leader intentionally, out of courtesy, to allow the hon. gentleman to come in and give royal assent to the various pieces of legislation.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): I want to rise on a point of order, and the point that I want to take up with the minister is the ad hoc disposition of the business of the House.

The fact of the matter is we sat here and the House leader of our party was apprised of the fact that we had three more speakers. They obviously were expediting their remarks to come within that time frame. I know there was no intimation from the government House leader to the official opposition House leader, and I don't think to the NDP House leader, that there was any intention to adjourn the House. The fact of the matter is that motion is not debatable. We can't even get into the consequences of it.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, if I might, by way of explanation, it's not that important to me. I am prepared to suggest to the House that we sit until 5:30. I might say that I certainly had indicated earlier what I planned for today and also for Monday, April 7. There is no question about that.

However, that really doesn't matter. If the member is that keen to proceed, I think the House will agree.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. minister withdraw the motion then?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I do, yes.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, just for the moment on that. I understand there are three members who still have remarks they would wish to make. If we could agree to hear those three members out, even though it might go a few moments past 5:30, we will then have completed the debate other than the wind-up and I think we will be back on the track, if that will be convenient.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (continued)

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the House leader for consenting to allow us to continue our speeches.

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): It is all in the spirit of the Passover.

An hon. member: The minister had better head for home.

Mr. B. Newman: Out of courtesy I had decided to allow the procedure to take place. I could have carried on my comments, but I don't want to waste time now.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read into the record just a few headlines. For example: "Third Traffic Holdup by Train Charged." Another: "Remington Park Residents Protest Rail Path Closing."

Mr. Speaker, I bring these to your attention because this will show to you the harsh, the cruel, the inconsiderate approach used by big business—and in this instance it happens to be the CPR—in coming along and doing things without the knowledge of the public concerned. They just ride roughshod; they do as they please.

Mr. Speaker, I own a piece of property yet I can't do with that piece of property what I would like. I have to go through certain procedures before I can do anything on it. CPR should have to do exactly the same thing. Simply because they own the right of way in a given area doesn't mean that they can come along on that right of way and do what they please.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. There's quite a bit of noise in the Legislature. The hon. member.

Mr. B. Newman: I was pleased to see the Environmental Assessment Act being introduced into the Legislature, however it will have no effect on a procedure such as this. It will have no effect on CPR's actions. But I bring this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, to show how big business, in this instance, completely disregarded the community.

In the area in which I live—and I may have a conflict of interest so to speak, because I live fairly close, within 1,000 feet of a railroad track—CPR owns the right of way. The right of way was a single track used to transport freight and passengers in and out of Windsor and the city of Detroit. All of a sudden CPR decided they were going to triple track the area, so they built two parallel lines with the main track in the centre. And now, all of a sudden, they've decided they're going to use this for a marshalling yard.

Little did they realize—I shouldn't say little did they realize; they should have realized—that they had the right of way available in an area that was not populated. It was in a commercial or a manufacturing area. But all of a sudden they wanted to expand it right in a residential area. As a result, Mr. Speaker, the people got up in arms and petitioned both the federal and the provincial members to come along and attempt to stop the CPR from doing this.

I would like to read to you, Mr. Speaker, the letter sent to me by one constituent. Here it is:

I live in the South Walkerville area in Windsor on Lincoln Rd. Lincoln Rd. ends at the the CPR right of way, one half block from my home. This area, as you may know, is one of the nicer residential areas in the city, with homes that range from \$50,000 to possibly \$100,000 in value.

Recently the CPR has constructed two parallel lines beside the existing rail line, and they are now using these rail lines to shunt freight trains and freight cars. Needless to say this is causing some considerable disturbance with the noise, with the unsightliness of the freight cars and with the diesel pollution in the air.

The sad part of this is that just east of Walker Rd. there is vast area of undeveloped field and a factory area that could very well have accommodated this type of railway manoeuvring. Undoubtedly someone in the higher echelons of the CPR who probably doesn't live within many miles of a railroad track made the decision to put these rails where they are.

I think it is unfortunate that Canadian Pacific Railway, or any other large corporation, proceeds with such development without taking into account the harmful effect that they have on such a nice residential area.

CPR was the same company that interfered with three ambulances by stopping its trains on a highway. It was fortunate that the ambulances weren't involved in any emergency manoeuvres at the time, otherwise it could have been extremely serious. The city has protested, and Ald. Tom Toth has discussed it in council; but what do you do with CPR? They are a body to themselves, and they attempt to dictate to government.

Mr. Speaker, any time any kind of change is going to take place in a given area, the people in the area should be circularized or notified that the company or organization is going to make changes; public meetings should

be held to describe what they intend to do and alternatives—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): That's up to the Canadian Transport Commission in Ottawa.

Mr. B. Newman: I know it comes under the Canadian Transport Commission, but I'm bringing it to the attention of the Speaker so that the Environmental Assessment Act possibly could apply to the railway companies and the harmful effects they create by disregarding the rights of citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to use my 20 minutes, because I want the other two speakers to have a fair share of the time, but I do want to bring to the attention of the government the plight of the city of Windsor in relation to the construction of sewage and water projects.

In 1972 I brought to the attention of the present provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) — and he was the provincial Treasurer at that time—the concern of the city when they looked at the way the Ottawa-Carleton region was being treated and asked for similar treatment. They wanted a one-third grant from the Province of Ontario as well as a one-third grant from the federal government towards the development of provincial sewage and water lines.

The city council in Windsor, under the leadership of Mayor Bert Weeks, has asked the provincial Treasurer to treat the city of Windsor in the same way as a regional government, but apparently to date there has been no change in his attitude.

The Windsor Utilities Commission, under the chairmanship of Murray Whelpton, has likewise petitioned the government for assistance in the construction of a filtration plant and in the development of transmission lines.

The government says that Windsor is not a regional government. That may be true, but why should we come along and penalize an area because it isn't regional? The utilities commission, for instance, really operates on a regional basis. For example, if the construction of the filtration plant were solely for the residents of Windsor, it could be substantially smaller. It is going to take care of the townships of Sandwich West and Sandwich South, the town of Tecumseh and the village of St. Clair Beach. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, one can really say that development is on a regional basis.

It may not be on as big a regional basis as is development in the regional governments, but it still is on a regional basis. I don't think the citizens in Windsor should be penalized

simply because there is no regional government in there. They are the ones to decide whether they should or shouldn't have regional government. In the meantime, they should be treated in exactly the same fashion as are residents in any of the regional governments. It is absolutely unfair.

Mr. Speaker, I was going to bring up the problem of unemployment in the city of Windsor and the extremely harmful effect it has had on the economy of the community as well as the harmful social effects it has on those who now find themselves without employment.

Too often people think the auto worker has it made. He's getting unemployment insurance and he's getting supplementary unemployment benefits. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, not all of them are getting all these benefits. As a result, many of them are finding the days extremely difficult.

I think that the provincial government, in co-operation with the federal government, should undertake retraining programmes for those who are unemployed now but who can be trained for other jobs that can be found, not necessarily in the community but throughout the length and breadth of Canada.

For example, I understand that in Alberta the unemployment situation is practically next to nil. Many from the Windsor area have gone to that province seeking employment. I would think that a retraining programme could possibly train many of our own unemployed in the community so that they could likewise go into other parts of Canada and find suitable employment.

Mr. Speaker, one of the other issues I wanted to raise is the one concerning vacation pay. Too often when a company finds itself in difficult circumstances it simply goes bankrupt. There was the case of a tavern, the Bavarian Inn in the community. It simply went bankrupt. The firm had withheld vacation pay for the employees and the employees can't collect. The company is bankrupt. That is completely unfair.

Vacation moneys should be deposited in a trust. They are supposed to be a trust. They should be available to the employee, regardless of the financial circumstances of the corporation, so that when that corporation does declare bankruptcy at least the vacation pay funds are available.

In the case of Sun Tool and Stamping Co. in the community, I asked the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacBeth) concerning their vacation pay. I had difficulty finally resolving the issue because both the federal and provincial

governments were involved, but eventually the issue was resolved and the 240-some employees did receive their vacation pay.

Another problem I wanted to make mention of, Mr. Speaker, and I'll only be about another two minutes, concerns a rent supplement programme.

My colleagues are disturbing me, Mr. Speaker. Will you call them to order?

Mr. Foulds: Let's hear it for his colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, Order, please.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): The member is disturbing them too I think.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, many senior citizens are content to live in the housing in which they presently live but can't afford to live in that housing. In my estimation the government should not attempt to put them into senior citizens' housing unless they wish to go into senior citizens' housing. They should keep them where they are by providing them with a rent supplement.

The idea of a rent supplement is nothing new. I've been speaking on it in this House since 1966. I only wish the government would come along and pay attention to some of this and provide rent supplements for senior citizens in exactly the same fashion as they are doing now in supplementing the rent of those who are living in senior citizens rent-geared-to-income housing.

All senior citizens with the same income should be treated in exactly the same fashion. If the government supplements the rent of an individual living in rent-geared-to-income housing to the extent of \$75 a month, then it should likewise supplement the rental of a senior citizen who is living in housing not geared to income to that same extent.

Maybe, Mr. Speaker, we should start looking back at the children taking care of the parents; and maybe we should have a grandfather bonus or something through the Ministry of Community and Social Services and pay to the children the equivalent of the supplement that the government is paying now to senior citizens who are living in rent-geared-to-income housing, if that son or daughter would undertake to house and take care of the father and/or mother or both. It would be a lot cheaper. We wouldn't have to build housing accommodations. The children, if they wished, could come along and take care of grandpa and grandpa or mom and dad in their own home.

Mr. Speaker, I have a whole series of other topics I wanted to bring up, but I don't think it would be fair on my part to come along and deprive the two other speakers of an opportunity to speak. I'm not going to be one who speaks for an hour and a quarter and takes the time of others in this House for more than an hour in the Throne debate. I have spoken no more than approximately 18 minutes, Mr. Speaker.

I will conclude, and suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that you convince your colleagues to read the amendment that is found on page 20, the amendment suggested by my leader, and use common sense and vote with us on it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale.

Mr. J. Duksza (Parkdale): I want to address myself to the issue of foreign medical students in medical schools in Ontario, an issue that has acquired some importance in the last while. In fact, it is an issue that for the last five months or so has passionately preoccupied both the public in general and the medical community in particular.

The problem is probably best summarized by an insidious editorial which appeared in the *Medical Post* of last Nov. 12.

It states in its first paragraph:

This year there were 241 seats available to medical students in the faculty of medicine at the University of Toronto. Of these seats, 33 are occupied by Chinese and 28 other seats are held by students from countries such as the US, Lebanon, the UK, Venezuela, Jamaica, Yugoslavia, Italy, Korea, Israel, India, Argentina, Guyana and Trinidad. These 61 foreign-born students represent 25 per cent of the entire first-year class. There was no method of selection except that of marks. There were no personal interviews.

This issue has received intensive press, including interviews with such U of T faculty members as associate deans Jan Steiner and Edward Llewellyn-Thomas, the president of the Canadian Medical Association, Dr. Bette Stephenson, and several GPs. During the past few months there have been literally dozens of letters, representing a number of different viewpoints on this issue, in both the *Star* and the *Globe and Mail*.

Some people have viewed this issue as one of the rights of native-born versus foreign-born students. We have heard them say: "Native Canadians are being discriminated

against in their own country;" "Foreign-born students are displacing our children," and so on.

Others are willing to give landed immigrants the same opportunity as native-born Canadians but they view the problem as an incompatibility between Canadian high schools and medical school admissions policies. Again, we have heard: "Our high schools are unable to compete with those of Hong Kong"; "Our admissions policies are too marks-centred"; or, "Our children don't have a chance because their high school environment prepared them to value other activities in addition to studying."

Still others focus on the patients being served. "We need doctors who fulfil the needs and expectations of Canadian society"; "We need students who are similar in culture to their patients so that they can communicate best with them."

The variety of ways in which the issue has been defined in the press reminds one of the story of the elephant in the dark house. Each person described a very different animal depending on what part of the beast he touched. It is time to view the issue from a different perspective. The following list of questions is one place to begin:

First, if we are unhappy about students being rejected for medicine, maybe we ought to ask if it is satisfactory to turn away 14 out of 15 qualified applicants to medical school. Perhaps there ought to be more places.

Second, if people are concerned over the issue of native-born versus foreign-born Canadians, then perhaps we should open the whole question of doctor distribution and origin. Perhaps students ought to be drawn from geographic areas or ethnic groups for which doctors are most needed, in the context that the future doctors will serve those areas for a given number of years following graduation.

If we are concerned over the possibility that one ethnic group would be over-represented in the medical schools' student population, we ought to open the larger question of what it means to be over-represented. Should each ethnic group have doctors in proportion to the number of members of that group? If this were the ideal, we would find that several ethnic groups are highly under-represented since they have zero representation in medical schools. Several other ethnic groups could then be viewed as replacing our children in the same sense that their presence is preventing the ideal representation.

We might do well to remember here that

although 25 per cent of the first-year class are foreign-born students, 22.2 per cent of the population of Ontario was born outside Canada, while for Toronto itself the percentage of the population which is foreign-born is 34 per cent.

Third, while we are questioning the entrance criteria for the U of T, what about the entrance requirements of other medical schools in Ontario? In the case of McMaster, for example, the main criteria, unlike here, are a biographical sketch and an interview which demands both excellence in English and a cultural concordance with the norms of our society. Translated, that means the longer one has been in Canada the more acculturated one is, the more likely one is to gain admission to a place like McMaster. U of T, which does not use an interview, may provide a more democratic selection by leaving out cultural considerations which would tend to discriminate against the newly-arrived immigrant.

Fourth, underlying many of the arguments, there is an assumption as to what kind of a doctor is in the best interests of the patient. We should get some viewpoints as to the patient's interests from other sources besides doctors and students, such as from the patients themselves.

We should ask whether those with highest grades do make the best doctors from the standpoint of patient care. Is one ethnic group better able to communicate with patients than another group? If so, with which patients? Are all communication problems related to a student's cultural background or are there some general psychological or personality characteristics unrelated to ethnicity which may even be more important determinants of communications skills?

Each of these questions touches upon a particular part of the elephant's anatomy, but we need to stand back farther to get a clear perspective of the animal, to get a broader view of the issue. To do this, let's reflect on a number of comparable life and career situations which exist in Canadian society.

Situation 1: A factory advertises for manpower and offers minimum wages. Seventy-five per cent of the hired labour is Italian and Portuguese and the remaining 25 per cent of the jobs are given to Canadian-born people. Is it reasonable to expect a hue and cry from the media, from the public? Of course not. Jobs that rank on or near the bottom of our power-prestige work hierarchy do not command our attention.

Situation 2: A new hospital has just been

built and is in the marketplace for 100 trained nurses. Eighty per cent of the nursing positions are filled by foreign-born persons, mainly Asiatics. Assuming the public realizes that the nurse is the more frequent contact person with hospital patients, is it then reasonable to expect an outcry that foreigners are taking our jobs away from us? No; decidedly no.

The questions arising from these examples must focus on why we react with such passion and arbitrariness on issues concerning foreign-born/native-born doctors and why we remain passive on similar issues in the factory and nursing situations.

We cannot say that our reactions are based solely in terms of the perceived importance of the jobs because we are willing to tolerate foreign-born nurses who are essential to the maintenance of our health. On the other hand, we cannot dismiss the reasons for our elitist reactions because we ignore the plight of our foreign-born factory workers.

The whole issue of our concern about foreign-born doctors may stem from our over-dependence on the medical profession. Any issue that is seen to cause some possible future difficulty in the delivery of health to each of us individually, however irrationally based, will evoke our emotions. Calmness and reflectiveness in dealing with this foreign-born doctor issue cannot descend until we, as members of society, learn that health resides within us and is not necessarily a marketplace commodity that only doctors can dispense to us.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. George.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): I will be as brief as I can and address myself immediately to the matter of housing and the housing policies of this government. We have had the rhetoric, Mr. Speaker, and it is unfortunate in my view that whereas at the municipal level of government one tries to be truthful and to bring forward all the facts pertaining to a given question, here that practice is not followed. I'm not here to make any apologies for any other government, I'm here to deal with the facts as they pertain to this particular government.

In the year 1974, the allocation from the federal government to this government for housing was \$428.4 million. In 1975, it is \$445.4 million. We can all argue it isn't enough. The thing that is important, from this government's point of view, is the fact that in two fiscal years it has underspent

its own appropriations for housing by \$103,393,466. When this government starts in crying for the poor, it had better remember and tell the people that \$20 million of that was for rental housing for the poor.

Mr. Speaker, since I have to speak in short-hand—and I'm not very good at it—I'd like to look at the matter of the OHAP programme; if you can call it a programme.

Mr. P. Taylor: It should be called the "MISHAP" programme.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, you started out with a minister who said specifically that there would be 12,000 housing starts in 1974—and he did say 1974. Then we had a new minister who started talking about 12,000 starts in the fiscal year. Then we lost even the starts and all we got were some agreements in principle. This is a problem which is this government's responsibility and its failure.

Mr. Kennedy: And the municipalities.

Mrs. Campbell: Oh, we're now getting them into the plot.

Mr. Foulds: Stop passing the buck to the municipalities. What a copout.

Mrs. Campbell: Good. Mr. Speaker, I'm so glad that interjection was made, because I'm waiting for the next stage in this serial when we get to what kind of a plot the municipalities are running against this government.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): One of this government's dirty tricks.

Mr. Foulds: Most of them are Tory tricks.

Mrs. Campbell: The thing that comes through to the public is—

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): It's all part of the conspiracy.

Mrs. Campbell: —they're explaining away their failure. It is a failure that we are talking about, and you'd better believe they know it, Mr. Speaker. We've already pointed out the ineptness of the government's land acquisition policy and the fact that, by some psychic quality, there were always people who had bought up the properties from the farmers. This government's policies seriously inflated the price of land across this province.

Mr. Roy: Right on again. How's that for a dirty trick on the government's part?

Mrs. Campbell: The thing that I think I would like to say is that even in condominium housing they didn't feel they had a responsibility to ensure that there would be no speculation in that area of housing development. People were permitted to buy up several units and then sell them at a profit. That is their record in housing, and I invite them to face up to it.

The difficulty is, Mr. Speaker, it shows the attitude of this government in various areas. They don't consider they are here to serve people. What they do consider is that, by any means they can, they want to stay in power; they want to have their nice public relations-oriented programmes, and they want to forget that there are people out there affected by what they do or don't do. The people are a faceless mass to this government; but believe me, that isn't the fact of the situation.

I would like to discuss very briefly a matter than concerns me greatly, and which I've brought up several times.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for St. George has the floor.

Mrs. Campbell: I'm glad they have enjoyed the party. I take it they have been at the party.

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): There's a better party here.

Mrs. Campbell: I have brought to the attention of the previous Attorney General (Mr. Bales) and this Attorney General (Mr. Clement) the fact that in my opinion, again the government has no concern for the little person in this community. In the city of Toronto, in our courts, because of the understaffing they cannot get the summonses out to people except after months. They are protected, on these little parking violations. But when you deny a person the right to have a defence, you are subverting justice whether or not you consider it to be that.

The great majority of the people who are in those courts are not there because they are criminals; they are citizens and should have the right to have a defence. If months go by, they can't really do much about it. The courts therefore are held up to opprobrium by the public and that is totally unfair, because the government has fine judges, it has fine Crowns, it has good staff, but it doesn't care that there be equal justice for people across the province in this area. It is one of the problems I have to face from

people calling me all over the metropolitan area.

The last thing I am going to mention is that as a result of the Soberman report and the comments on it, and as a result of Highway 404, there is no doubt that we will be seeing some changes in alignments which to many people in the city of Toronto mean the beginning of the Crosstown Expressway. The government has been so uncertain in its remarks and so unclear in its positions that the people are concerned and confused as to what the future is in the city.

It is remarkable that the Treasurer of this province could stand in this House and say that the core of Toronto was of great importance to the metropolitan government, and indeed of great importance to the whole province, yet the ability of the city of Toronto to have its own autonomy over its own area is being eroded all the time. The government has taken certain steps to change representation in that council in advance of the Robarts report. I trust that it will not so treat Mr. Robarts as to put him into a position which is totally political in its decisions, because that would be unworthy of the government and certainly would not be worthy for him with his reputation in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say more but we do have one more speaker and I am prepared at this point to yield to the member for Nipissing. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I have some very short remarks to make on two subjects that are very parochial in nature. If anybody wants to leave and go elsewhere I certainly wouldn't be offended whatsoever.

Mr. Foulds: There are very few people out there. Everybody has left.

Mr. R. S. Smith: There are very few to talk to anyway, so I wouldn't be offended. I would like to speak on two matters that are of great significance in my area. They are two things that have been rather misrepresented, mostly by people in the Ministry of Natural Resources and by the Ministry of Housing.

The first has to do with the question of Lake Nobsong and the Nobsong Park Development Ltd., which has made a proposal through the Ministry of Housing to develop about 2.4 miles of shoreline on Lake Nobsong. They failed, should we say, to go ahead when they had their proposals finalized and when they had approvals given by the ministries and these ministerial ap-

provals ran out. On reapplication, they were quickly given back to them, whereas on most other applications, I'm given to understand, the whole process has to be followed through to have approvals given the second time, if the developer has not taken up the first approvals that were provided to him.

There was then an intervention by a group of cottage owners on that lake to have the plan not approved by the Ministry of Housing. But the people concerned had in their hand a letter from the minister himself, indicating that approvals would be given by the Ministry of Housing just as soon as they passed the OMB hearing, which was forced by the intervention of the group which purported to intervene on the basis that further building on the shoreline of this lake would cause deterioration in the lake to the point where wildlife and fishing would be badly damaged, as well as the quality of the water itself.

Anyway, it was very strange that the Minister of Housing would write such a letter but, apparently, it is in the hands of the developers. In so doing, he indicates that the OMB hearing is more or less just a farce that they have to go through. On this assumption, I presume that the provision of approvals, along with this letter that has gone out from the minister concerned, has been done more on a political basis than on the input of the different ministries that provided information to the Ministry of Housing before the final approvals were granted.

I'm not one of those who feel that there should be no building at all on any of these lakes, but I certainly am one of those that feel the lakes themselves should be protected, more from political interference than from environmental hazards in this case. I believe that the lake itself has come to the point where it cannot stand any further building.

Of the 31 miles of shoreline on that lake, 29 miles are publicly owned, which leaves two miles held in the hands of the Crown. If one goes to examine the two miles held by the Crown, they are all marsh and the lake is inaccessible through the two miles held by the Crown. In fact, what we have here is a private lake for those people who own the properties around it, and there is obviously no public participation in the enjoyment that that lake provides.

I have suggested to the Ministry of Natural Resources that to solve this political problem of the approvals for Nobsong Park Developments—and I say that the approvals have been obtained on a political basis rather than on the basis of good environmental management or on the basis for the regular Ministry of Housing procedures that everybody

else has to follow—that this government should be looking to the expropriation of these lands from these people, they should be put in the public domain and a park with public access to that lake is the proper answer to the problem that faces not only the ministry but the people concerned on the lake.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that the people involved in this subdivision have used political connivance to obtain their approvals, and I believe that if this government is going to be responsible it will move in and block that type of procedure by expropriation so that the public can be given the necessary access to the lake.

We are all aware that it has been a policy of this government since the 1950s that 75 per cent of the shoreline of lakes in northern Ontario should be publicly owned. In this particular case, less than six per cent of the shoreline is publicly owned—and that six per cent is of very low value—so there is every reason for the Crown and Natural Resources to move in and expropriate these properties before development takes place. I believe this is the solution to their political problem—because it is their political problem—and the solution to the problem of the other people on that lake who are trying to protect it.

I would like to point out that the Ontario Municipal Board has set its hearings for June 21, and it is expecting to hear from the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Ministry of the Environment in regard to studies that are to be done on the lake.

Obviously the ice won't be off that lake until about the second week in May, so there is just no way that proper studies can be done in that short period of time, particularly when Natural Resources depends on other help than its regular complement to do these studies. There is no way they can do the studies, put the information together and make a proper presentation to the Ontario Municipal Board by June 21. So even the date of the hearing by the Ontario Municipal Board is set so that proper studies can't be done by the Ministry of the Environment or the Ministry of Natural Resources.

The whole thing is stacked against the people around that lake who are trying to protect it and is stacked in favour of the developers. I include the hearing date set by OMB, because there is no way that the two ministries involved—and they will tell you this themselves; in fact, they have told me—there is no way that they can provide proper studies on the lake by the hearing

date of June 21. So even the setting of the date is another indication of what has taken place in this political fiasco that the party opposite is creating in this area.

In support of the statements that I make, I would point out that the head of the local conservation authority has written directly to the Premier of this province, explaining to him how the political pressures have been put on the government to make certain decisions in this area and how he and his authority have opposed the implementation of the plan of Nosbonsing Park Development Ltd.

Mr. Bullbrook: I grew up with these fellows. They were Tories the day after they were born. I know them both. They make the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) look like Douglas Fisher.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Nipissing has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Even Doug has become a Tory. What's the matter with that?

Mr. Bullbrook: That's right.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I wouldn't even mention their names but some of them have had to resign from some of the government commissions within the last year or so. It's not hard to figure out who they are; they have conflict of interest all over the place.

Mr. Roy: We are not saying that that is a dirty trick.

Mr. R. S. Smith: This is just another one and our area is full of them. If one wants to start talking—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That's a pretty serious allegation.

Mr. Bullbrook: A pretty serious allegation.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I have three minutes left so perhaps I will make a few remarks about dirty tricks. I come from an area where I know every dirty political trick in the book.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Those are the members who know about that.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): He should know. He will tell us.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I have learned well from every Conservative candidate I have run against, particularly the last one. He knew every political dirty trick. I'm sure the Tories

must have a seminar set up at which he is going to be brought in as the guest speaker and the chief spokesman. He has every political dirty trick right down to a T. And the Tory members know it as well as I.

Mr. Roy: He makes Barney Danson look like a choirmaster.

Mr. Bullbrook: He has been made a foundation for the 11th time. He was the Tory candidate six times.

Mr. R. S. Smith: There is nothing the matter with the Election Act except that he found every way to get around it or to abuse it.

Mr. Stokes: I think the government members appreciate what a favour this member did them.

An hon. member: How?

Mr. Stokes: By keeping the seat.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Nipissing has the floor.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I wanted to point out to members that although we do have a fairly good Election Act in this province, it doesn't really matter because we have to have the machinery to guard against the abuse of that Election Act set up under the jurisdiction of the chief electoral officer. I don't think we have that in this province. They don't want to enforce the Election Act.

On numerous occasions dirty tricks were played on election day and the people were caught red-handed; the police were called. The chief electoral officer of the district was called and he refused to come because he had been appointed by the Tory candidate and he certainly wasn't going to have anything to do with him.

The police came and said, "We can't do anything about this fellow; he's on the police commission." And I was standing there watching this fellow vote for the sixth time that day. I said to the fellow, "Who are you voting for six times?" He said, "For the Conservative candidate." I said, "What is he giving you?" "Two dollars each time," he said.

Mr. Bullbrook: That is all they think about people.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I want to end up by saying to the Tories that if they want to talk—

Mr. Bullbrook: I am going to yield to him. Let him start again.

Mr. R. S. Smith: —about political dirty tricks, I'll talk about cheap political dirty tricks.

Mr. Roy: Two bucks a time.

Mr. R. S. Smith: That is what we got from that party in my area—cheap political tricks. It's 6 o'clock; I can't go any further and I wish I could because I could spell out about six other times—

Mr. Bullbrook: Let him move the adjournment of the debate; we'll let him on.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I could spell out about six other times this poor fellow was caught—

Mr. Foulds: It is called a discount, cut-rate price.

Mr. R. S. Smith: —obviously in contravention of the Act. There were numerous people who contacted the returning officer and the chief returning officer of this province, who usually sits in that chair, with complaints. There was nothing done; not a damn thing was done. If somebody over there wants to talk about dirty political tricks, I would like them to talk to me and I would like to be given a chance to talk to them.

Mr. R. S. Smith moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: This House stands adjourned until 2 o'clock on Monday, April 7, and may I extend my personal best wishes to the members of the Legislature for a happy and peaceful holiday.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 26, 1975

Milk inquiry, statement by Mr. Stewart	515
Home Renewal Programme, statement by Mr. Irvine	515
Energy management programme, statement by Mr. Timbrell	516
Condominium developments, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Germa	518
GO-Urban system, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Breithaupt	519
Tendering for trucks, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Breithaupt	519
Energy management programme, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Deans, Mr. P. Taylor, Mr. Burr	519
Rental accommodation, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Deans	521
Milk inquiry, questions of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Deans	522
Mohawk Knitting Mills, questions of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Deans	523
Hamilton-Nanticoke transportation, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Deans	523
Facilities on the Trent-Severn system, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. G. E. Smith, Mr. R. G. Hodgson	524
Architectural services, questions of Mrs. Birch: Mr. Roy	524
Mother's allowance, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Martel	524
Gravel licence application, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lewis	525
Price of seed corn, questions of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Gaunt	525
Design for Development programmes, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Stokes	525
Spadina arterial road, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Givens	526
Toronto-Hearst LRC service, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Ferrier	527
Pickering airport, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Deacon	527
Post-secondary education, questions of Mrs. Birch: Mr. Laughren	528
Plant safety inspections, question of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. B. Newman	528
Combustible plastic foam, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Burr	528
Home insurance rates, question of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Haggerty	529
Report, standing social development committee, Mr. R. G. Hodgson	529
Notice of motion No. 3, re civil service salaries and payments, Mr. McKeough, concurred in	529
Notice of motion No. 4, re recommendations for standing committees, Mr. Winkler concurred in	529
Representation Act, 1975, Mr. Welch, first reading	534
Professional Fund-raising Corporations Control Act, 1975, Mr. B. Newman, first reading	534
Ontario Human Rights Code Amendment Act, Mr. Cassidy, first reading	534
Retail Establishments Control Act, Mr. Edighoffer, first reading	534
Rent Control and Security of Tenure Act, Mr. Cassidy, first reading	534
Third reading, Bill 4	535
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Haggerty, Mr. Bounsall, Mr. B. Newman	535
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. B. Newman, agreed to	550
Royal assent to certain bills, the honourable the Chief Justice	550
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Dukszt, Mrs. Campbell, Mr. R. S. Smith	551
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. R. S. Smith, agreed to	559
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	559



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, April 7, 1975
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 7, 1975

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: I recognize the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine.

Mr. T. A. Wardle (Beaches-Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and to the hon. members of the Legislature this afternoon, 31 students from Corpus Christi Separate School under the direction of Miss N. Gilbride, sitting in the east gallery.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I know you would like to know that there is a group of students from Waterford District High School in the city of Nanticoke in the east gallery as well.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations—if he has given any further thought, parallel with the programme to spend a couple of million dollars in educating young people and others on the evils of drink, to bringing forward some new regulations which would stop the advertising of alcoholic beverages and beer in this province, or at least taking some initiative which would lead Ontario and nearby jurisdictions in abolishing this kind of advertising.

Hon. S. B. Handleman (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, no, we haven't considered abolishing advertising, but we have certainly taken steps to curtail it, at the request of the member to the hon. Leader of the Opposition's immediate right.

I sent a copy of the new LCBO directives on advertising to him, and if those were checked against previous practices I am sure he would have noticed that there was considerable curtailment.

I think one of the problems which arises in the attempt to abolish advertising would be

that such an attempt could apply only to Ontario-based advertising media. Obviously it could not apply to those media which are located outside the country or in other provinces.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): But the minister has to start somewhere. We have to start somewhere.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: This has been tried in other jurisdictions and has been a failure, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: I wonder if the minister would not agree, however, that it appears as more and more provinces and states recognize the expanding problems of alcoholic beverages among the youth there is going to be a move by many jurisdictions to stop advertising, just as occurred in the case of cigarettes, and that there is at least as much reason for stopping alcohol advertising as there is for stopping cigarette advertising? It is not something which is impossible and we might give some leadership in this.

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): We tried that 10 years ago and the opposition objected.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Was the hon. minister around here 10 years ago? It's too bad he is on his way out now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure all members of the House that—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I am sure all members of the House are aware of the fact—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A question has been asked and the minister is trying to answer. The hon. minister has the floor.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): He has become the professional winder-upper for the Conservative party; has he?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, of course the government is not unaware of its responsibilities in this area. It certainly has taken what it considers to be effective measures to help in the problem which the hon. member outlines and we concur in his appraisal of the problem. Certainly, it is a serious one but is he aware of the fact that cigarette advertising which was curtailed in many other jurisdictions—it has not been completely prohibited but has been curtailed—certainly has not resulted in any reduction in the amount of smoking; nor has the amount of drinking been curtailed in those jurisdictions which have tried to prohibit advertising? I quite agree that there is a problem. I do not accept that other than excess advertising contributes anything to the problem and we are certainly in favour of curtailing advertising. The distilleries themselves have voluntarily curtailed the amount of advertising they place.

Mr. Lewis: What a silly statement that is. From an intelligent man that is a very silly statement.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? A supplementary, the member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister who has just replied: Would the minister consider asking the liquor industry, the beer industry and the wine industry to funnel the funds they may save from reduced advertising campaigns into the rehabilitation of those who are afflicted by the use of their products?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, first of all we are not too sure that they are saving any funds because there are other forms of promotion and obviously they can embark on those which are in addition to advertising. Many of the distillers, of course, who are quite responsible in their attitude towards alcohol abuse, are making significant contributions partly through their own advertising to promote the cause of moderation. I don't believe that a request of the nature the hon. member suggests would be either appropriate or very constructive.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE ON ENERGY

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask the Premier if he can clarify the position that

Ontario's delegation at the energy conference will take vis-à-vis any change in the well-head price of petroleum out of Alberta or Canadian sources. Is our position going to be flatly that there should be and must be no increase or is the basis going to be what the Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell) has said—that certain increases might be considered as long as there is at least some projection into the future as to what the changes will be?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the position of Ontario hopefully will become very clearly defined on Wednesday morning. I expect the Leader of the Opposition and others will find it as precise and clear as I am sure it will be for others and at that time he will have a very clear understanding of exactly what that position will be.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: As a supplementary, can we be assured that it will not be the same position as the Premier and the Treasurer took last year which allowed the price to go up by the substantial amount we have been paying since, which has—

Mr. Lewis: The federal Liberals want it to go up.

Hon. Mr. Davis: One moment, Mr. Speaker. I have to go back in history about a year and I will repeat what I said then. While there has been a great deal of discussion about an "agreement" the fact remains that the first minister of Canada, discharging his responsibilities, very quietly and precisely said, "If you can agree on a \$2 increase, fine. If you don't, it will be legislated."

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like a further supplementary: Since the Premier was talking to the hon. Allan Blakeney over the weekend is there any thought that there is going to be a more or less concerted provincial approach to the very interesting concept put forward by Mr. Blakeney for a fund which is going to foster, let's say, the kind of research and exploration which is going to be so important for the maintenance of our own supplies?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to prejudice what will happen on Wednesday and Thursday. If you were to ask me to express a personal opinion, I would do so and that personal opinion would be that there will be less than total unanimity at that conference on one or two issues. That may or may not apply to the proposal that will be suggested by the Premier of Saskatchewan.

I really don't anticipate that at Wednesday's and Thursday's meetings all the first ministers will be in total agreement as to what should be done. I doubt that very much.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): How can he figure that out?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well it didn't take much. In fact I would say that even the intellectual capacity of the hon. member for Downsview could have come to the same conclusions with a minimum amount of effort.

Mr. Singer: I recognize that.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Supplementary of the Premier: Will there be any discussions, at the energy conference in Ottawa, exploring the possibility of the Province of Ontario entering into a consortium with other interests for the construction of a natural gas pipeline down the west shore of Hudson Bay?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that's one of the matters that, over a period of time, should and will be discussed. I would doubt, and this is once again just a personal point of view, that will emerge in the discussions on Wednesday and Thursday. I don't say it won't, but I doubt it.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

OTTAWA TEACHERS' DISPUTE

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask the Minister of Education if he can report to the House the status of the negotiations in the secondary system in Ottawa. Since I believe the last word we had from him was that a new mediator was to be appointed from here, are we any closer to a solution? And if not has he any other initiatives?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, the mediator who was appointed a few weeks ago, Mr. Owen Shime, is still acting in that capacity and is in touch with both sides. I'm hoping to have a chat with him later in the day to find out his impressions of where the situation stands at the minute.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: The minister is not able, then, to tell the House whether there has been any movement towards a settlement or if they are still at the same standoff position they were in when the strike began six weeks ago?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I can't tell my friend that, Mr. Speaker, because I think that Mr. Shime, when he went into his mediation sessions with them a few weeks ago, agreed there would be a news blackout. I don't think there's been any indication from any side as to what has or has not been happening; but the fact is he is still there as a mediator.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What news blackout?

Mr. D. H. Morrow (Ottawa West): A supplementary to the Minister of Education on this subject: I wonder if the minister has received a memo from me asking that if this mediation fails—as it apparently has, ending this morning at 5:15 a.m. in Ottawa—has the minister received my communication asking that if the teachers then do not accept voluntary arbitration the government consider legislation to get the teachers back into the classrooms and the students back to school?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is yes, I have received that memo from my friend the hon. member for Ottawa West.

Mr. Lewis: So the member for Ottawa West is running again, is he? Who would have known it, had we not been here today?

Mr. J. H. Jessiman (Fort William): That fixes that one.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary; the hon. member for Carleton East.

Mr. P. Taylor (Carleton East): Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Education clarify what seems to be a contradiction here? The minister explained that Mr. Shime is still on the job and now he admits that he knows the talks broke down at 5:15 this morning. Now which is it; is Mr. Shime still hopeful of some negotiated settlement or has he indeed given up hope of a negotiated settlement?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, as far as I'm concerned—as I say I haven't talked to Mr. Shime, I'm expecting to talk to him later in the day—he is still active—

An hon. member: He walked out, didn't he?

Hon. Mr. Wells: —he is still mediating the situation. Now I wouldn't presume to tell mediators how to operate, but I understand that at times they're there and then they're not there, and then they're back again in a day or so. As far as I can tell my friend, Mr. Shime is still operating as our appointed mediator in that dispute.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: A final supplementary; the hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Has the minister met with the delegation from the Ottawa Board of Education that was coming down today to see him? If so what was his response to their requests?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no, I haven't met with the delegation from the Ottawa Board of Education. I understand I'm having a meeting with them tomorrow. It may be that I will see them later today if they are here and available.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West with his questions.

Mr. Lewis: I'd like to ask a question related to the last, but of a new kind. Since the Premier is in Ottawa for three days at least this week, and presumably the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) as well, is this not the time for the Minister of Education to attempt a personal cabinet intervention, if, as many believe, the parties are in fact very close together, thanks to Mr. Shime, but need one last nudge for settlement? Is this not the time for a responsible cabinet to bring the parties to a settlement?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, in order to answer the question from the leader of the NDP, I would have to have an opportunity to talk to both of the parties and Mr. Shime. I haven't had that opportunity at this very minute and, therefore, I can't really answer his question.

Mr. Cassidy: It might have helped if the minister hadn't been in Florida for so long.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We will be doing something about that today.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE ON ENERGY

Mr. Lewis: I want to follow up another question which was asked earlier of the Premier.

Can I ask the Premier quite specifically is he opposed to any further increase in the price of oil at the wellhead in Alberta? Is he opposed to any further increase at all?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as I said to the Leader of the Opposition our position, I hope, will be very clearly stated and defined. I expect that will be done shortly after 10 o'clock Wednesday morning.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): By way of supplementary, was the Premier misquoted in today's Star and Globe where he was quoted as saying he was not going to tolerate any increase in price?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't have a copy of my text here, because I departed from it very substantially Saturday evening.

Mr. Bullbrook: What did he mean?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think what I did say Saturday evening—and I hope it left the impression that Ontario has always played its role in the national sense and will continue to do so—was that we recognized certain responsibilities in this regard and that there did come a time when we must say no.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bullbrook: But can we rely on the Premier to be less equivocal in Ottawa than he is in Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, the member can rely on my being less equivocal. The only thing I can't rely on is that his people won't come to the defence of his federal party colleagues once again.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: That's interesting, because since it appears to be clear—one never knows with Tories—that the Premier is going to oppose an increase, what then follows for Ontario? Will the Premier give then to the Ontario Energy Board or to some creation of the Legislature the right to roll prices back if the oil companies increase them, or will the government legislate a maximum level of price?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Of course, Mr. Speaker, the leader of the New Democratic Party doesn't totally understand what price increases are involved, and I say that very respectfully. The last price increase—and I am the last one to defend the oil companies—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: The last shall be first and the first last.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, except for Syncrude, because we are part of that now, we all are. I would say that of the \$1.8 billion, if that is the figure that has been collected as the result of the increase of a year ago, the oil companies have received something less than \$100 million. So it is not a question just for Ontario, if a price increase were to go through and even though we were to oppose it. If there is a price increase and if it is in the form of royalties or corporation tax or export tax how does one roll it back? It is a totally different situation. Perhaps the leader of the New Democratic Party could prevail upon the Premier of Saskatchewan, for one province at least, to reduce the amount of royalty. That might be one way of keeping the price down.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary from the member for Sarnia?

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes. Can we understand the Premier's last response to the leader of the New Democratic Party to mean that in connection with his last negotiations the Premier not only did in the people of Ontario, but he did in the oil companies at the same time?

Hon. Mr. Davis: If the member for Sarnia is that concerned about doing in the oil companies, I understand. I mean it is his constituency and I understand him being totally in support of the oil companies.

I would say this, Mr. Speaker, that what has happened is not as it was portrayed both by the producing provinces and by the federal government as of a year ago, where part of the rationale for the increase in price was to have greater security of supply. This meant keeping the "explorers" in business, and the facts demonstrate very conclusively, Mr. Speaker, that this has not, in fact, happened. The great bulk of the sums have gone to the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan and the member's friends in the federal treasury.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Riverdale in a final supplementary?

Mr. Renwick: That's where it has gone.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: And the Premier has no friends in the federal government, is that right?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, yes, we do, but we maybe disagree with them.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Riverdale has a supplementary.

Mr. Stokes: Roy McMurtry speaks for the Premier.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He speaks very well.

Mr. Renwick: Will the Premier be more precise about the figures in the equation which he has used on a number of occasions, that an increase of \$1 in the price of energy in the Province of Ontario will result in the loss of several thousand jobs? Can the Premier be more precise as to the other side of that equation? What are the number of jobs which are in jeopardy if there is a \$1 increase in energy?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, that will all be made available at the conference and, without knowing what will be developed here at 8:30 tonight, there may be some of that information at that time.

Mr. Singer: Tell us why—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier certainly has done a little more homework on the eve of this conference than he did on the eve of the last one.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): He has a new minister.

Mr. Lewis: It doesn't mean he won't sell us out anyway, but this time he will do it knowledgeably.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Questions?

Mr. Lewis: I have one last question on this subject matter. Is the Premier then saying, in terms of the tough stand that Ontario obviously intends to take, that there is no justification to the oil companies' argument that they need an increase for further exploration purposes?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there could be a very legitimate justification for their arguments; I don't know. All I can say is that perhaps that could be accommodated with the existing \$6.50 price if the two levels of government that are directly involved were to rationalize their take.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Mr. Lewis: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

DOW CHEMICAL ACTION

Mr. Singer: I have a question of the Attorney General.

In view of the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada relating to the government of Manitoba and its lawsuit against Interprovincial Co-operatives Ltd. and Dryden Chemicals Ltd., where the Supreme Court of Canada said the suit for pollution did not lie at the behest of the province, could the Attorney General tell me if he has reconsidered Ontario's position vis-à-vis Dow Chemical and whether or not the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada doesn't, in fact, take that lawsuit out of court?

Hon. J. T. Clement (Provincial Secretary for Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I cannot really come to a good conclusion on the Dow Chemical matter until the statement of defence has been received.

Mr. Singer: No statement of defence after four years?

An hon. member: The member ought to be retained as counsel.

Hon. Mr. Clement: As to the decision in the Supreme Court of Canada, I have not had the benefit of reading that particular judgement, so I have no comment to make. Was it reported fairly recently? Could the member for Downsview help me on that?

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Today?

Mr. Singer: Oh no. The story appeared in the Star on March 27.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): This year.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's last month.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Oh, I see. Well, I don't read my law in the Star. I usually wait for it to be reported in the law reports. When I receive that copy of the Dominion Law Reports, I will be glad to confer with the member on it.

Mr. Breithaupt: Does the minister think the case will be reported?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, does the Attorney General really mean to advise the House that until cases are published in the law reports that the law officers of the Crown have no opinion about current proceedings in law and decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada that may

materially affect Ontario's position? Is that his legal approach?

Hon. Mr. Clement: No, I wouldn't infer that at all. The member asked me the question and I said I hadn't read it; and I won't go by the reports in any of the media until I see the law reports.

Mr. Singer: When is the Attorney General going to get them?

Hon. Mr. Clement: My subscription ran out.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Parkdale.

COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTRES

Mr. J. Duksza (Parkdale): Could I have the attention of the Minister of Health?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Duksza: What are the details of the latest directive from the ministry and the policy in respect of funding community health centres? Specifically, what is the difference between supporting the existing community health centres and the proposed ones?

Hon. F. S. Miller (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I don't want to appear speechless. I just lost the most important thing a politician can have, his voice, and I have to speak into this mike a little more carefully today.

Mr. Speaker, I am unaware of any directive on community health centres having been issued. There are some rumours running around the countryside which I think are quite erroneous up to date.

There are two aspects of the funding: One is capital and the other is operating. For some years we have not paid any capital funds towards community health centre buildings, but we have been working with a lot of groups of people around the province who indicated they wanted a different form of payment. We are still working with quite a few groups, and within my ministry I am also reassessing the overall policy.

Mr. Duksza: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Very specifically, there has been a verbal communication between the Ministry of Health and the South Riverdale group not to renew contracts. To me that sounds like a major change in policy in terms of supporting community health centres.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right—and it's happening across the province.

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, the member can become more specific and go to his own riding. I've talked to the group within his own riding within the last few days personally. He may be aware of that or not; I don't know. However, if in fact someone's contract is in jeopardy, it is not because of policy, it is because of a question as to whether we are getting our value for the money spent.

Mr. Duksza: Mr. Speaker, I don't think the minister has answered the question. The verbal directive from the ministry to the South Riverdale Community Centre has been not to renew contracts, not on an individual basis, but as a general policy.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if I may. I wish we could get this clarified. In talking with Dr. Aldis, who is the head of the branch which has been assisting in the development of community health services, I understand there has been a directive which says, in effect, to hold ground for the time being.

An interpretation of that directive, which the minister himself gave me, was that for on-going projects there would be no cutting out of funds, but for proposed contracts there would likely be, or might be. Is that an accurate statement of the situation?

Hon. Mr. Miller: That's an accurate statement, Mr. Speaker, yes. Every contract is reviewed each time it comes up.

Mr. MacDonald: Right.

Hon. Mr. Miller: And the statement I tried to make a moment ago is there is no policy to refuse to renew an ongoing programme that is worthwhile. There is always the odd chance that our staff may have some questions about the value of an existing programme. But that is not policy; that would be their interpretation, not mine.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Fort William.

Mr. Duksza: Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order please, there have been several questions on this topic. It is not in order to debate it.

Mr. Duksza: The minister did not answer my question about one specific case.

Mr. Speaker: Ask the question then, please.

Mr. Duksza: Yes. I asked specifically whether there is any question of renewing

contracts in the South Riverdale Community Centre?

Hon. Mr. Miller: I can't answer that, Mr. Speaker, but I'll find out.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Fort William.

AMETHYST HARBOUR MARINA

Mr. Jessiman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. The ministry conducted a programme this past year on the north shore of Lake Superior to investigate the harbour situation.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Like to buy a share in a dredging company?

Mr. Jessiman: The summer and winter residents at Amethyst Harbour are very disturbed that this harbour may be used as a public marina. Would the minister make a statement either to confirm or deny this?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, the study to which the member refers is the north shore Lake Superior recreational study and that was an interministerial study that was done in the Lake Superior area. The committee itself was chaired by a member of my ministry.

I might say that I received a number of letters from the member for Fort William, and also from the local people. Since receiving those, Mr. Speaker, I have contacted my staff at Thunder Bay. They have informed me that on further examination they are going to recommend to that particular committee that the recommendation to establish a marina at Amethyst Harbour be withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. P. Taylor: Carleton East, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, Carleton East.

Mr. Cassidy: We call them the Bobbsey twins, Mr. Speaker.

PORTER COMMISSION MEMBERS

Mr. P. Taylor: A question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister give this House assurance that the Porter commission will consist of people who will directly reflect most consumer and environmental interests?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes I can, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

LAURENTIAN HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Health. I would ask the minister how he responds to the resolution passed by the regional council of Sudbury asking for a public inquiry into the mess created by the mismanagement of the board at the new Laurentian Hospital in that city?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, that question would seem to imply that if there is mismanagement of the board, it is my fault. I don't think the member implies that, does he?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Of course.

Mr. Martel: Now, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Cassidy: He did it in Haileybury; what about Sudbury?

Mr. Lewis: Look what he did in Timiskaming, for heaven's sake.

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite aware that there has been a series of disagreements between the administration of one hospital in Sudbury and the board of that hospital. I understood that an agreement had been reached between the two parties very recently. As recently as last week the chairman of the board of that hospital was brought down to Toronto at our request and talked to our ministry. At the same time we dispatched a person of high competence to the Sudbury area to work with the board that is trying to amalgamate St. Joseph's and Laurentian. I believe he is assessing the situation first-hand. We will be in touch with the regional council after that assessment is made.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary.

Mr. Cassidy: While we are on the subject, can the minister explain why he has refused to release the report which says that the Haileybury hospital should be closed down in the Timiskaming area?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Again, Mr. Speaker, that assumes the member thinks it should be in Haileybury. I can only tell him that I have assessed that many times and I am of the conclusion that the proper site has been selected.

Mr. Shulman: Why won't the minister release the report?

Mr. Cassidy: Will the minister release the report?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. That's far different from the original question.

Mr. Martel: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: On the original question?

Mr. Martel: On the original question. In view of the fact that the minister now has someone in the Sudbury region who he says is competent to look into those matters, could he not look into what plagues the whole delivery of health services in the Sudbury area so that we can get on with finding the solutions there?

Hon. Mr. Miller: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it's the members who represent the area.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister is being very political.

Mr. Renwick: They didn't pack the board with NDP members there.

Mr. Martel: The minister's got a point, though—like Don Collins for openers.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: There are other ways, but that's the most pleasant.

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, the member has very excellent facilities in the Sudbury area. I think he knows that. We are doing our best to bring in what we call a rationalization of them. I think we are having a certain degree of success in that area. The opening of the new hospital will permit a further rationalization.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

COMMUTER TICKET INTERCHANGEABILITY

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. What progress has been made since the minister stated nearly a year ago that he would be working with the federal Minister of Transport and the Canadian Transport Commission to co-ordinate fare schedules and fares between federal rail services and GO Transit? What progress has been made during the last several months in that matter?

Hon. J. R. Rhodes (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Absolutely none. The federal ministry is so busy trying to develop a national transportation policy it won't even discuss it with us.

An hon. member: Too busy dredging harbours.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They are not as interested in magnetic levitation as the minister is.

Mr. Singer: I wonder what happened to Krauss-Maffei.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member for Cochrane South.

Mr. Singer: The member for Scarborough West has consented to stage one of Spadina.

COCHRANE DISTRICT HOME FOR THE AGED

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Yes, I have a question of the Minister of Community and Social Services. Will the minister investigate the reasons for payments to the Gregoire Insurance Agency by the Cochrane District Home for the Aged board of management to see if these represent premiums for insurance, and will he further investigate to see if a conflict of interest may exist for board member Palma Gregoire?

Mr. Stokes: Not them again.

Mr. Speaker: I think in the confusion the hon. minister wasn't identified. I didn't get the name of the minister.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): I heard the last part and I would be pleased to look into the situation.

Mr. Ferrier: All right. Thank you.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Even if the minister doesn't know what it is.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

EDUCATION COSTS IN CAMBRIDGE

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Minister of Education: Will the minister take steps to lessen the discrepancy in the education costs among the merged area governments in Cambridge, which I understand is due to the various assessing methods that were used previously before regional governments and

which evidently cannot be rationalized by the application of the equalization factors? What is the minister prepared to do about this?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would like to give me some more information on the matter I would be very happy to look into it. I am not aware of exactly what he is talking about.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

ADOPTION OF VIETNAMESE CHILDREN

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A question of the Minister of Community and Social Services, Mr. Speaker: Has he or his ministry issued directives to the various Children's Aid Societies in Ontario to vastly accelerate their adoption home studies of those persons wishing to adopt Vietnamese orphans—particularly those who applied three months or more ago and have not had their home studies take place—in order that a greater number of these children could be allowed into Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, at the present time we have at least 120 applications where home studies have been completed by families who have indicated an interest in adopting children from Southeast Asia. This was prior to last week. Since that time, of course, we certainly have taken steps to make sure—assuming children will be coming in—that there certainly will be no problem in finding suitable homes.

Mr. B. Newman: Supplementary: Let me ask the minister, is he putting any quota on the number of Vietnamese children that will be permitted into the Province of Ontario? I hope not.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, on that question, we are guided by the number of children the government in Saigon would allow to leave. Until the present time, it indicated that the children had to be adopted by families beforehand. However, in case of an emergency, there are some ongoing discussions with the federal government, especially the Department of External Affairs and the Department of Manpower and Immigration. As far as we are concerned in Ontario, we've done I believe, just about everything we could possibly do. We've set up a team; we've sent a team to Hong Kong and it arrived this morning.

Mr. Bullbrook: Is that where the member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea) is? He was there before.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We've also established a treatment centre in the city which will be staffed by doctors, nurses and social workers who will look after the children once they arrive. It could well be that many would need medical and nursing services. As far as our government and our ministry is concerned, we've taken every step possible to accommodate the children when they arrive.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Huron-Bruce.

BRUCE COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education. Would the minister reconsider his ministry's decision to chop the entire capital projects plan of the Bruce County Board of Education, in view of the fact that some of the schools are under tremendous pressure because of the rapidly increasing population in the Douglas Point area?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Good question.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to tell my friend, as a bit of background, that this year when we asked the school boards for the kind of capital programmes they might have in mind, the total came to something like \$293 million which I might tell—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Just like it was back in the 1960s.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It's more than it ever was in the 1960s and one would never know that there are declining enrolments or anything else happening in the educational scene today in Ontario. We've been slowly cutting back and weeding out and asking people to be sure they're asking only for things that are definitely needed; therefore, a lot of boards have not got what they asked for in their presentations three or four months ago.

Insofar as Bruce county is concerned, I was reading some correspondence from them last week and I'm going to take a look to see exactly what the situation is. I want to see whether perhaps they got some things in the past two years while we weren't able to make arrangements for some other areas to get them; maybe it's balancing itself out in that area. I'm not sure of that at this minute.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister if it's correct that a number of counties in the province received capital funds even though they weren't requested? Is that so?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would think that would not be so, Mr. Speaker. Nobody would be getting anything that wasn't requested on the capital allocation forms.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Huron.

Mr. J. Riddell (Huron): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if, when he is reconsidering the Bruce county situation, the minister would also reconsider the Huron county situation? Last week, I was talking to the heads of science departments there and they informed me that they're going to have to stop dissecting animals in the science classes because they can no longer afford to purchase the animals which they dissect. Would he reconsider the Huron county situation?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, my friend is not bringing forward a situation concerning capital building which was what his colleague was talking about. He is talking about actual operating funds for the school boards and I would venture to say that the Huron County Board of Education has adequate funds to operate and do all the things it wants within the educational framework of the province.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Stormont.

TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. C. Samis (Stormont): A question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism. In view of his extended absence from the House, I wonder if he could bring us up to date on what representation he has made to his federal counterparts regarding the condition of the textile industry in Ontario, specifically eastern Ontario?

Hon. C. Bennett (Minister of Industry and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, for some months I have been meeting with my counterpart in Ottawa regarding the problems of the textile industry in Ontario generally. May I also say that we have been consulting with the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce for the Province of Quebec and the minister related to that particular portfolio in the Province of Manitoba, those being three very significant provinces looking after the textile industry. We have made our position very clear with Mr. Gillespie, that we believe it's essen-

tial for the government of Canada to place upon textile imports either a quota system or a higher tariff position.

The only information I can give to the House at this point, Mr. Speaker, is that a week prior to the Easter recess, Mr. Gillespie's ministry indicated they would once again take a review of the situation but they were not that hopeful of introducing any more restricted importation laws relating to the textile industry.

I have also, Mr. Speaker, been able to meet with the unions and the textile manufacturers of Ontario and Canada. We have discussed the situation very clearly, which has been able to afford my ministry extra material for input to the federal government in relationship to the discussion on tariffs and quota systems.

Mr. Samis: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the statement made by the minister in Quebec, Mr. Saint-Pierre, demanding further meetings with Mr. Gillespie, has the minister been in contact with the minister in Quebec in the last week?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, my people in the ministry have been the ones who have been prodding the Province of Quebec along into doing something for this particular operation in our provinces. We have had a constant relationship involving the Ministry of Industry, Trade and Commerce in Ottawa, the Quebec ministry, my ministry, and the Manitoba ministry to try to review the situation on a continual basis.

My understanding is that only a few days ago my people met once again in Montreal with the representatives of the Quebec government and the ministry to review the co-ordinated position of Ontario and how we are going to present the case further to Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener.

INQUIRY INTO DUMP TRUCK OPERATIONS

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications:

Following the appointing of the inquiry into the haulage industry, can the minister advise us when we might have a report on this as, of course, the members of the association are most concerned that the season is now upon us in which a number of temporary permits can be issued?

If the time frame is going to be somewhat late, will the minister consider a moratorium, for this spring at least, on the issuing of further permits?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I received a copy of the same letter that the hon. member is referring to and I am now considering it. I just received it this morning from Mr. Natale and we are looking at his proposal to see if we can perhaps come up with some sort of moratorium. I don't know, but perhaps we might.

Mr. Breithaupt: Could the minister perhaps consider making a statement this week on his view of the situation?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, I will have something this week.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

MOPEDS

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

Why has the minister granted permission for 3-hp motorized bicycles capable of achieving 30 mph to be driven on public highways by 14-year-olds without licence, without insurance and without helmets?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, rather than going into details as to why it was done in the first place, may I say to the hon. member that I have had some second thoughts about that particular legislation. I have had discussions with a number of organizations across the province—safety organizations, police organizations, concerned families, groups, and individuals. I am presently looking at the legislation with a view perhaps to making some modifications in it.

It was done in the first place because we felt that the moped, as it is known, the motor-assisted bicycle, could be used on the streets similarly to the 10-speed bicycle. I am not so sure whether that is correct or not, especially considering some of the actions and some of the manufacturers who have taken it upon themselves to attempt to take advantage of that legislation and put out what in essence would be a motorcycle, but would fall within the terms of what we have outlined as a motor-assisted bicycle in the Act.

Mr. Stokes: Supplementary: Would the minister take a look at the recommendations made by the select committee on snowmobiles

and all-terrain vehicles where we considered the moped to be an all-terrain vehicle? And will the minister look at some of the recommendations that we have made in that regard for the proper control of those particular all-terrain vehicles?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, Mr. Speaker. One of the things we are doing right now is looking at the report in some detail as it applies specifically to the motor-assisted bicycle.

Mr. Germa: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Could I ask the Minister of Transportation and Communications if Unity Bank made representations to his ministry to have this legislation amended?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I would have to say no, because I am not familiar with the Unity Bank; so I would say no, they haven't, to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River.

MERCURY POLLUTION

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health: It appears that working in that ministry is injurious to the minister's health, but we won't go into that. Can the minister indicate to the House whether his ministry is continuing taking blood samples, hair samples and so on, of the Indians in the Wabigoon-English River system in northwestern Ontario to test for mercury? If they are continuing this, and I hope they are, can the minister indicate if those tests show that the level of mercury in those people has gone up or gone down in the two or three years they have been testing them?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, we are not doing the testing right now, and let me explain this. The federal government took over that role some while back. We are performing the tests for them in our laboratories but they are actually determining who shall be tested. They are going out into the reserve and examining people and taking either hair or blood samples. We do the tests on them once they submit them to us. We give the answers back to the federal government's Dr. Connop. I believe it is, in the area and he in turn notifies the people as to their level.

I have been looking over the test results that have been coming along of late, particularly those on younger children and mothers, and those two groups have been pretty good. We are still very concerned about some of the test results we have seen

from people who have fairly high exposure to the fish in the area. I know that other ministries are looking at this problem too. To date, as members know, we have had no symptoms of any mercury poisoning but I would be the first to say that we often would wonder why, because of some of the levels that were established.

Mr. Stokes: That is not what the Japanese experts said.

Hon. Mr. Miller: I am quite aware of that and I have looked into it, but they also didn't see the people, don't forget that. It was one of those questions where an expert said one thing and there was a disagreement even among that group of people.

We are not trying to pretend there isn't a problem, let me assure the members of that. I am only saying that the tests the federal government has done in Winnipeg—not by the Province of Ontario—on those people who are willing to go to hospital have shown no symptoms of the disease. That in no way lowers our determination to see the problem resolved, and I am sure it is only going to be resolved by getting people who eat a lot of fish to eat less of it or else eat fish from another source.

Mr. Stokes: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: No, time is just about up. A new question?

OPTOMETRISTS

Mr. Duksza: Yes, a question of the Minister of Health: Will the minister tell the House of his intention with respect to regulations for optometrists? Very specifically, is he going to allow optometrists who are employed by various companies—25 per cent of all optometrists in Ontario—to continue the job, or is he going to allow the regulation which the college is proposing, to tell them to stop working for the companies?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member knows we talked about this at great length during the health disciplines bill. At that time, I believe an agreement was made with the College of Optometry to bring forward certain regulations, the details of which I can't regurgitate on a second's notice, but I believe they guaranteed that employees of companies that sold eyeglasses would be given alternative employment. I believe this was one of the agreements. I have seen some of the members nodding their heads. I haven't personally reviewed the

regulations. They have been submitted by the college quite recently and we will be circulating them to all other colleges shortly, so that they will be public once we have, let's say, sort of changed the verbiage to standardize it.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that when the House rises for the dinner interval this evening it will resume sitting at 8:30 p.m.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the select committee on company law be authorized to sit concurrently with the House in order to prepare its report.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I got wind of the possibility of that motion being introduced at lunch time today. I don't think it is really fair to the members of the House who want to take part in the proceedings or listen to the proceedings that are going to take place this afternoon. After all, the wind-up of the Throne debate is coming today and certainly I want to sit here and listen to my colleague, the hon. member for Sarnia.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): His swan song.

Mr. Singer: As important as the committee is I think we should get the full benefit of his words of wisdom. I understand the Premier is going to be winding up for the government and we wouldn't want to miss that.

Mr. Lewis: No, the Premier never winds up. It will be the House leader.

Mr. Singer: I don't know. Maybe it will be the House leader but whoever it is it might be interesting.

Mr. Lewis: The Provincial Secretary for Resources Development does all the winding up.

Mr. Singer: I think it's all very important and I think the members should be here and not be expected to be at a meeting of any select committee. I would ask the House leader if he would withdraw the motion. It's unfair to the members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): If I may say a word on this, Mr. Speaker. We were bereft of the wisdom of the member for Downsview during last week when we were called into plenary session and sat four days, all day, seeking to get this particular report through before the election is called. We've spent two years on the thing now and the committee—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The election is next year.

Mr. Lawlor: —in its wisdom, with representatives of two parties in this House, came to the conclusion that the only way in which we'd be able to do so is to utilize every second we have at our disposal. This afternoon seemed to be an appropriate time and spot. All the committee agreed with it and I think that the House leader should go ahead with it.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

TOWNSHIP OF GOULBOURN ACT

Mr. Morrow moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Township of Goulbourn.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF SAULT STE. MARIE ACT

Mr. Gilbertson moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

HURON COLLEGE ACT

Mr. Walker moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Huron College.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

LANDLORD AND TENANT AMENDMENT ACT

Mrs. Campbell moves first reading of bill intituled An Act to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing the bill which I introduced last year. It is to provide for mandatory landlord and tenant review boards in municipalities with populations of over 50,000 persons. These boards would have the power to determine the amount of rents and to order tenants removed from premises for non-payment of rent or wilful damage to premises.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in response to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (concluded)

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): I don't see much point, really, in having a windup to a Throne debate on the day the budget comes in. I don't suppose there are very many people in the Province of Ontario who care very much what anybody thinks about the Throne debate or the Throne Speech today, given that by 9 o'clock tonight they will know about their tax decreases; they will know about the massive housing programme of the government; they will know about the additional social benefits the government is going to bestow on the elderly and the infirm; they will know all about the reasons the provincial government can't proceed with programmes in the magnitude they would like because the Ottawa government won't give them the money out of the inflated coffers; and they will know a bit about the fact that the Province of Ontario is going to stand fast against any proposed increase in the price of fuel. Therefore, it is pretty obvious that anything I might have to say with regard to what was contained in the Throne Speech will take very much a back seat compared to the things we know are going to come out of tonight's budget speech.

I do though, nevertheless, want to take a moment or two to talk about some of the things that have aggravated me since the government announced in its Throne Speech its ideas of how a government might meet the crisis that has been confronting the people of the Province of Ontario. I can recall, Mr. Speaker, a number of years ago, in a

windup something like this, taking time to look at the various cabinet ministers and discuss their inadequacies. I would have liked to have done that today but there aren't very many of them here to look at. That seems to be the normal procedure these days for the government; the moment the question period is over the cabinet rises and departs for some of the other more comfortable places in the legislative building and you don't see them around very much.

Perhaps that's the reason, or at least one of the reasons, they are incapable of dealing with the problems that confront the people of the Province of Ontario. It is becoming more and more apparent to a lot of us here that the cabinet doesn't really care very much what the members of the Legislature think; that the cabinet of this Premier (Mr. Davis) and the Premier personally, the Premier of the province, do not really believe that we, as elected members, were given the responsibility of bringing to the Legislature the concerns and the views of the people who live within the constituencies we represent.

I think that is probably one of the greatest aggravations in the Legislature these days. I think it is a shame the cabinet can't find the necessary time to spend in the Legislature, even if it were on a roster system, a rotating system where half or a third of the cabinet would devote some of their time to the Legislature in order to hear what it is the people in Wentworth, the people in Sarnia, the people in other parts of the province want them to hear with regard to their legislation and their programmes; and in some instances with regard to the fact there are no programmes to meet their needs.

As you look along the cabinet benches, Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting, too, to think about the cabinet ministers and the way in which they conducted the business that they had given to them as a responsibility.

Starting at the extreme left end, you find the Minister of Housing (Mr. Irvine), and I've got to say to him—I'll talk a little more about it in a moment—if there is a single position in government where there has been a subject failure it has to be in the Ministry of Housing. In thinking about all the various cabinet posts, it's very difficult for me to think of any other single cabinet minister who has failed so miserably in carrying out his responsibilities to the public of the Province of Ontario.

The next gentleman is the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handelman). One thinks about the responsibilities given to that particular ministry; the

obligation it has to protect the public against rising prices, which are unjustified and unwarranted; the obligation of that ministry to provide warranty protection for homeowners, which haven't come forward; the obligation of that ministry to act on behalf of and to speak for the consumer in the Province of Ontario. When you weigh that over and against what has come forth from that ministry you can truthfully say that, next only to the Minister of Housing and seated appropriately on his left, the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations has failed to protect the consumers of the Province of Ontario against the unwarranted profit-taking which took place during the last two years in a period of high inflation.

Then you look at the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Meen). There's a man who was given a responsibility that no man should have had given to him, the responsibility of looking after two pieces of legislation, both of which were doomed to fail right from the very beginning. He is the man who had the land transfer tax and the—

An hon. member: Land speculation tax.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): They'll do away with the land transfer tax.

Mr. Deans: Yes, I'm going to mention that. He also had the land speculation tax thrust upon him. I don't blame him for that; that was obviously the decision made by the Treasury board. But the fact of the matter is that neither of these taxes has acted in the way in which it was intended they act. Neither of these taxes has played an important part in keeping down land costs as they were intended to do. In fact, those major new taxes, which this ministry was charged with the responsibility of administering during this last fiscal year, in both instances have failed.

You can skip the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Potter) because he hasn't done anything.

You go then to the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Rhodes). I doubt if there has been more of an embarrassment thrust upon the government than that which has been brought about by the inadequacies of the Ministry of Transportation and Communications and the inability of that minister to deal adequately with the problems of commuter transportation and the problems of public transportation. I refer to the who's fiasco that developed over the Krauss-Maffei pilot project at the CNE and

the inability of the government to extract itself with some degree of efficiency and honour from a situation that it got itself into without giving adequate consideration to the cost to the public of Ontario, or for that matter without taking into account the available modes of transportation which could have been and ought to have been encouraged to develop in this province.

There is no question that right within the Province of Ontario at this point, as there is all around the world, there are many conventional methods of public transportation that could and should have been used to try to cut down on the use of the private automobile in the major metropolitan areas. There are available to us, even on this day, a number of fairly rapid surface transportation methods for transporting people and goods between major municipalities in this province, or for that matter right across this country, that have not been used to greatest advantage by the Ministry of Transportation and Communications. I say to that minister that another ministry in which the effort was made but was wrong-headed and obviously doomed to failure, and did fail, was his ministry.

The Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. Auld) is incapable of understanding the dilemma of the major universities and colleges in the Province of Ontario; the difficulties—and now we have one minister fewer; the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) is leaving.

Mr. Bullbrook: The member was just getting to him.

Mr. Deans: I am just getting to him and he is leaving.

The Minister of Colleges and Universities seems incapable of grasping the significance of the cutbacks that he has made; and he doesn't seem to understand that education is of course a costly matter and that there has to be a far greater degree of input from the various universities and colleges across the province before decisions are made with regard to their expenditures. This doesn't seem to be the way of the government, and the Minister of Colleges and Universities, though a lightweight in the cabinet, a lightweight politically, hasn't been able to bring forward the kind of legislation and put forward the kind of muscle within the cabinet that would guarantee that there was some voice heard.

We come to the Minister of Agriculture and Food. What can be said about him? What can be said about the ministry? Here is the

one ministry with the opportunity to take a very long and serious look at the entire food industry. He can begin right from the source. He can talk sensibly and knowledgeably, one would hope, about the situation right from the farm gate to the retail outlet. He could have investigated, had it been his desire, the rising costs which resulted in great hardship for a great many people across this province; but that wasn't the way he was going to go. The minister refused, and it's only in the last three or four days that the minister has recognized his responsibility and has begun to move toward determining such things as what causes the rising prices in the milk industry. That could have been and should have been carried over into so many other of the food producers and food product industries.

That minister is one minister who should in fact resign, because over the last 3½ years we have seen a rapid escalation of costs with an equally rapid escalation of profit margins within the food industry at the retail level. The farmer has obviously not been receiving his share. It has been evident to us, to the farmers and to the public that the opportunity for the farmer to gain a reasonable share wasn't there as long as the middle man in the industry was taking out of the profit and adding to the cost. This ministry had a responsibility to conduct the kind of investigation that we are talking about, perhaps on an even larger scale than the one it is currently about to conduct in the area of milk pricing, but no action was forthcoming.

We go down the field to the Chairman of Management Board (Mr. Winkler) who precipitated, who encouraged, who, by his dog-in-the-manger and dogmatic attitudes, almost brought this province into a strike situation with regard to his own employees, who was unable—

Hon. J. White (Minister without Portfolio): I am glad the member is having—

Mr. Deans: Oh welcome back. What have we got? One Minister without Portfolio. That's the best the government can muster.

An hon. member: That's enough.

Mr. Deans: He used to have a position of prominence; now he is in charge of the re-election, and we can see how that's going.

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): It depends on who is giving the speech.

Mr. Deans: That's right, it does depend. Why doesn't the member sit in his own seat?

Mr. Speaker: Order please, the hon. member for Wentworth has the floor.

Mr. Deans: The Chairman of Management Board has no earthly idea about labour relations and no idea of negotiations. He continues to negotiate with a big stick in his hand. He doesn't appreciate the need of the civil service to be able to conduct its negotiations in a reasonable and sensible way. He forces them right to the wall. He almost causes a strike in the Province of Ontario and then he expects everyone to be grateful that the strike didn't take place.

An hon. member: What one?

Mr. Deans: It was certainly no thanks to him that we weren't forced to suffer through a prolonged strike within the civil service, and it's further evidence of what we have seen over a number of years, the inability of the government to sit down and negotiate sensibly.

The Premier I'll leave to other people. I speak in terms of the inefficiency and inadequacy of his entire cabinet, and I suppose in the final analysis the Premier has to assume the responsibilities for the inefficiency, for the ineffective way the cabinet reacts, in fact for the entire misappropriation by this government of its mandate and its responsibilities.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, through all of the various ministries, finding one or more reasons why they have failed to carry out their responsibilities. But I'm not going to do that. In the half hour that's left to me I want to deal primarily with three matters that are related to things that have occurred in this Legislature which ought to have been dealt with in the Throne Speech and which were not.

I want to deal with housing; housing as a right in the Province of Ontario and housing as a government responsibility in the Province of Ontario. I want to talk a little bit about this government's attitude toward housing; the way in which this government, through its Minister of Housing has failed to provide in any way the kind of leadership, guidance or initiatives that will ensure that this generation and generations to follow will have an opportunity to live in a house of their own at a cost they can afford.

I want to talk about something that has been discussed in this Legislature on previous occasions, something that some members may find a bit repetitious, but I think it important to say it at this point because much of what was said by many of us some months ago about the government's policies in housing,

particularly as they relate to land, have resulted in higher costs to the consumer; costs which have forced the actual outlay on a month-to-month basis to rise to a point where it is outside the reach of the average worker in this province.

I want to remind you, Mr. Speaker, of a debate that took place in the Legislature over land which was assembled by this government in 1967 for housing purposes. It was land assembled in the Hamilton area, but it was land which, in fact, could have been assembled anywhere. I want to recount for you, Mr. Speaker, the details of how this took place.

You will recall, as I do, Mr. Speaker, that in early 1967 Kronas realty owned some 700 to 800 acres of land on Saltfleet Mountain and they offered it to the government. Kronas had paid \$1,500 an acre for that land and had assembled approximately 800 acres.

The government refused in May, 1967, to buy the land at the reasonable markup asked for by Kronas. Kronas then went out, and in partnership with a firm called Jon-Enco Ltd., proceeded to assemble additional land. The additional land was finally sold to the Ontario government.

The part about it that causes the greatest aggravation is this: The average cost per acre for the land that was assembled on Saltfleet Mountain ran at about \$2,000. The selling price for that same land to the Ontario government not 12 months later was \$4,000 per acre. This meant that the land had been purchased by the Ontario government for twice what the developer-speculator had paid for it.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): It's called free enterprise.

Mr. Deans: Not the original owners, who were farmers in most instances; or Kronas realty, which acted as an intermediary; or Jon-Enco, which finally purchased or optioned much of the land; none of these put a single penny into development of that land. They didn't even cut the weeds between the time the land was optioned and the time it finally became owned by the Province of Ontario.

The purchase price for that land, when averaged out over the year on all of the acres purchased, came to approximately \$3 million. The final selling price by Jon-Enco to this government—to this government here, the Conservative government of Ontario—was \$6 million.

I said at the time that this could do nothing but drive up the cost of land in the area; that

this could do nothing but drive up the cost of building lots; and drive up the cost of accommodation.

I want to show you if I may, Mr. Speaker, what exactly has happened as a result of this government's actions. It has to stand condemned for them, because these actions have caused so many people—working day in and day out to earn a decent living in the Province of Ontario—to be forced out of the housing market.

In November of 1974 there was an advertisement placed in a number of newspapers in the Hamilton area with regard to a HOME programme that was being drawn for under a lottery system in two areas. One was in the east end of the city of Hamilton, on the mountain, and known as Lawfield Gardens; and the other was in the west end of the city of Hamilton, on Hamilton Mountain, and known as Gourley Park. It is no more than three miles from Lawfield Gardens to the Saltfleet satellite development. That's the one where the \$6 million was paid for the land.

In the lottery draw held in November of 1974, the minimum gross annual income that would enable an applicant to qualify was \$8,700.

An applicant with a minimum income of \$8,700 would have qualified for a certain number of the homes under this programme.

The land costs ranged from a low of \$38 per month per building lot to a high of \$81 per month per building lot.

The house prices in Lawfield Gardens and Gourley Park surveys were in the neighbourhood of \$18,500, up to a maximum of \$21,000.

We then turn to the land that I speak about, not three miles away and drawn for four months later. Four months later they drew in a lottery on Saltfleet Mountain. The lowest income for eligibility purposes was \$11,430; that was up from \$8,700 in November, 1974. Within four months, people who could have qualified no longer qualified, not marginally but to the extent of having to be making \$3,000 more in order to get into the programme. The reason for this increase is entirely within the cost of land.

On this government programme on Saltfleet Mountain the cost of the land, on a monthly basis, ranged from \$102.93 to a high of \$135.27 per month for every month for the rest of the remaining five years just to rent the land. The housing costs were marginally down as a result of the federal government reducing the building sales tax.

The cost of the actual buildings themselves was marginally down. The cost of the taxes was comparable in fact a little lower. The cost of the land itself had gone, in four months, from a low of \$38 for land on Hamilton Mountain to a low of \$102.93 for land on Saltfleet Mountain.

What I'm saying to you, Mr. Speaker, is that this government hasn't even begun to understand the problems of housing when it can answer me as the Minister of Housing did in the House when I asked did he feel the increase in cost was justified and didn't he feel he was forcing many families out of the housing market and didn't he understand the housing programme wasn't meeting the needs of the majority of the people who lived in the Province of Ontario, and didn't even meet the needs of the average income earners in the Province of Ontario. The minister said they were lucky to get housing at all, that they were fortunate; and that that land was inexpensive compared to what they might have to pay elsewhere.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, why is it that this government can't see the error of this kind of drastic increase and why is it that the government can't recognize that there is not an obligation on the part of the person purchasing the building to pay off or pay up the amortized cost of the land over the period of time that the building mortgage might be amortized? Why can't they simply pay the interest charges on the land, because the land will remain in the hands of the Crown as the land belongs to the Crown? It will never belong to those people. There's no reason at all why those people should be paying the actual purchase price of the land when they're not buying it. All they're doing is leasing, for the duration of their lifetime, that particular piece of property.

The government could have opened the programme up to so many other people if it had been prepared to take an entirely different view of the housing needs of the people of the Province of Ontario.

I want to tell you something about it, Mr. Speaker. The government has only now begun to move in housing and, unfortunately, every single step that it takes is a disaster for the average income earner. The government is prepared to provide assistance for housing for people who earn in excess of \$20,000 a year. It is prepared to provide assistance for housing for people who earn between \$12,000 and \$20,000 a year but there is nothing in the Province of Ontario, either private or public, to assist people who

earn on an average less than \$12,000 a year to live in a house of their own.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): That's right.

Mr. Deans: Absolutely nothing! What happens to those people is this; they are then required to go and rent in an already sparse accommodation market, an accommodation market that doesn't have a sufficient number of rental accommodations available for the numbers of people who need them.

This government by its action forces those people into a position where they are at the mercy of the owners of those apartment buildings.

I asked a question last week, and I ask it again, what is the relationship between the Minister of Housing, or for that matter the government as a whole, and the apartment owners of the Province of Ontario that this government refuses time after time to take any action at all to protect people who cannot fit into its inadequate programmes against the unwarranted and unjustified charges levied against them by the owners of apartments and by the developers in the Province of Ontario?

The common sense approach to this is that the needs which have to be met first are surely the needs of the people who cannot, through no fault of their own, avail themselves of the private market.

Surely the needs in the Province of Ontario are to ensure that there is accommodation available for wage earners in this province who earn at the average wage level. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the average wage in the Province of Ontario isn't \$12,000 a year. That means the average wage earner can't get into the government-sponsored programmes.

It requires a number of things to occur for those people. It requires them to work at two jobs. It requires their wives or their husbands, depending on who happens to be the wage earner in the family, also to hold down a job. It requires that those jobs be permanent in order that people are able to take advantage of the HOME programme and the other programmes of the government of the Province of Ontario.

If one happens to be in that 60 per cent of the population which falls below \$12,000 a year and is unable to fit into either of those programmes, it is too damn bad says the government of this Premier. "Go out into the private market; be taken advantage of by the apartment owners of the Province of On-

tario. We don't care about you," says the Premier and the Tory government. That is what aggravates me and that's probably what aggravates a great many members, including some back-benchers of the government.

If they would just take a moment or two to take a serious look at what this government has done to the people of this province maybe they would understand that there is a desperate, emergency need for action by the government to provide accommodation in this province for that 60 per cent, and to take action now to protect that 60 per cent against the usury of the many people who own apartments as a business in this province.

Mr. Speaker, let me suggest to you, as it has been suggested a number of times in the past, that as a interim measure the government of the Province of Ontario should institute a form of rent review. There should be an opportunity for tenants to go before this review board and ask whether or not the rent increase being foisted upon them is justified, taking into account the added cost to the owner. If, in fact, it is justified, and the owner produces the justification, that rent increase, of course, would go through; but if it is proved that the requested rent increase is not justified, this board must have the power to inform the owner that he cannot apply it.

That is an interim measure, and while this is in force and effect in the Province of Ontario there has to be a direct involvement by the government of the province in the development and building of public housing units for rental purposes.

At such time when there is a sufficient number of them people living in this province will have an alternative market to turn to and an opportunity to live in decent accommodation without having to pay to the landlord far more than the accommodation is worth or far more than is justified by the actual costs of operating whichever building it happens to be in whichever municipality it is located.

I have sat on only one select committee one single area of total failure on the part of this government, it has to be in housing; it has to be its attitude toward housing. It's not a matter of whether the government is going to build another house or bring in another programme; or whether at 8:30 today it is going to tell us it is going to spend half a billion dollars, up from the \$430 million which has been already guaranteed to be spent in the current fiscal year. It is not enough.

It has to be an entirely different attitude toward the needs of the people of this province. It has to be a response to what is recognized by governments across the world as a requirement of life. It has to be a response by the government to one of its major obligations, that being to ensure there will be accommodation for people of a reasonable standard at a cost they can afford. This government has failed in that regard and it is the worst failure ever because it is in one of the most vital areas.

I have said many a time and I say it to the members again, I don't care what the cost of colour television is. I couldn't care less. I don't much care if wall-to-wall carpeting goes up in price. I don't care if they charge another \$50 or \$100 for a holiday in Mexico. I couldn't care less whether they charge more for any of the luxury items. Put the price of beer up, I don't care. But I am going to tell the House, I care about the cost of housing and I care about the inability of people in this province to get accommodation at a price they can afford.

I say to the government that if it is going to do anything at all, ever, in the lifetime of this government, then for heaven's sake let it make that its priority of all priorities and make sure that it amasses every single resource at its disposal, because the measure of this government will be its failure, or perhaps its capacity to provide decent accommodation for the people over whom it governs.

I want also to speak for a moment or two about regional government—municipal affairs in general but regional government in particular. I am disappointed that the government chose to lump together Treasury and municipal affairs. It is far too large a job for one person no matter how hard a man tries. I say this to both the incumbent and his predecessor—it was a major undertaking.

Mr. Bullbrook: They offered.

Mr. Deans: The fact of the matter is that they ought not to have been put together.

Mr. Bullbrook: They offered.

Mr. Deans: There is a desperate need in the Province of Ontario for a ministry that deals solely with municipal matters in order to allow for easy and quick access for municipalities; but not only that, in order that the municipalities have a sense that the government recognizes the important place and role they play in the development of the Province of Ontario. It isn't good enough to have to wait in turn to see the Treasurer to talk about

planning, to talk about municipal matters, to talk about the development of sewerage systems within municipalities; and it isn't good enough to be shunted off to the Minister of Housing to talk about planning or over to the Minister of the Environment to talk about regional—

Mr. Bullbrook: It will be changed back within two years.

Mr. Deans: It will be changed back after we form the government, right.

It is not good enough to be shunted off to other ministries to find the answers to what are in effect municipal problems.

I want to deal, really briefly, with what has occurred in the Hamilton-Wentworth region in regard to regional government. The members will recall I had some grave reservation about the structure as it was set up at the time the bill came in. They will recall that I said I thought Hamilton would tend to dominate the region and that the outlying areas wouldn't have sufficient power, because their size was so small, to withstand the city of Hamilton and its wishes.

(They will recall that I said I thought common sense said that Burlington should be part of the Hamilton-Wentworth region and it should be Hamilton and Burlington—Burlington and Hamilton offering some kind of counter-balancing effect one with the other—in order that there wouldn't be the kind of problems developing such as the spilling out of Hamilton into the more rural areas.

There are some real problems developing in the region and the problems are all in the area I spoke about.

I say to the House that I am not a part of that problem, because I have spent many long hours trying to find solutions to it, speaking with the chairman of the region, speaking with numerous council members until the wee hours of the morning trying to find ways to ameliorate and find ways to resolve difficulties that have arisen.

I don't think there are many who would deny that, but I am going to tell the House something. There is a desperate problem developing in the regional municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth and that desperate problem centres on a need for a great deal more co-operation. There is something very sad about a situation that requires regional councillors to stand up and march out of a meeting in order to stop the passage of something which they feel is going to be detrimental to their municipalities. There is something desperately wrong when all you can see as

the result of regionalization is the movement out from the city of all of the worst features while no benefits seem to flow or accrue to the more regional areas.

Prior to regionalization, the rural communities enjoyed fairly high taxes, fairly low services and fairly intimate representation. They now enjoy equally high taxes—higher, in fact—they enjoy no better services and they have very limited representation because of the way in which the region is structured.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Make it one tier.

Mr. Deans: My colleague says to make it one tier. That would make it worse. What we would have happening if we had one tier would be the city of Hamilton making up its mind, as it is now doing, to dump all of its garbage in a corner of Binbrook. That's what we would find happening. We'd find the city of Hamilton deciding that since it can't sell its own ward populations on having—

Mr. J. R. Smith: One at King and James Sts.

Mr. Deans: If the member for Hamilton Mountain wants to enter the debate, I'll sit down and let him speak. Does he have something to say? Any time the member has spoken in this House, what he has said has been said so inadequately as to be almost incomprehensible. But if he'd like me to sit down I'll let him speak.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman Management Board of Cabinet): I have listened to a few falsehoods from the member for Wentworth today.

Mr. Deans: Does the Chairman of Management Board have something to say too?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes. Mr. Speaker, since I have been given the invitation, I listened with interest from another place—

Mr. Deans: The minister wasn't even here.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —in regard to what he said about some members on the front benches, and it indicates to me a total absence of knowledge.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member for Wentworth has the floor.

Mr. Deans: Thank you. It certainly is a pleasure to have the Chairman of the Management Board drop in to hear the debate. He's the only front-bench member here at

the moment. Anyway, let me go on for a moment.

My colleague from Hamilton Mountain says to make it single-tier. What he doesn't seem to appreciate is that when the city of Hamilton has been given any part of the rural community under its wing, as happened in Barton township, the residents of the annexed area got absolutely nothing by way of service but they got given to them all of the most disgusting things. The dump that is located now on Limeridge Rd. got there as a result of that becoming part of the city of Hamilton, and the city of Hamilton wouldn't even provide the people with water. And the member for Hamilton Mountain was the alderman!

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. J. R. Smith: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deans: Why doesn't the member sit down?

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. J. R. Smith: On a point of personal privilege.

Mr. Deans: What personal privilege?

Mr. J. R. Smith: I think the hon. member for Wentworth is away off base. If you look at the record concerning that particular dump—

Mr. Deans: That's not a point of personal privilege.

Mr. J. R. Smith: —he's away off base and it's misrepresentation of the facts.

Mr. Speaker: It is not a point of personal privilege.

Mr. Deans: Well, the member is going to have to prove that. I did not misrepresent the facts. Tell me.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Now the member is inviting it. Strange, strange.

Mr. Deans: I am eager to have it on the record.

Mr. J. R. Smith: Mr. Speaker, if he had a very good memory he would recall it was this member, as one of the aldermen for that particular ward of the city, who took an active role when he was elected in convincing the corporation of Hamilton it was to its advantage to abandon the landfill operation and embark upon incineration, which eventually developed into the SWARU. Eventually that

became a reality. After due time, the chaotic and very serious pollution conditions at the old Barton township dump were rectified to some extent and great improvements were made. I do think, though, that particular dump was founded by Barton township as a township dump and not by the corporation of Hamilton, but when the area was annexed by the city it came under the jurisdiction of the municipality of Hamilton. But it doesn't really matter one way or the other.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth will continue.

Mr. Deans: I am glad to have had that interjection because I will deal with it. First of all, if it was the hon. member who convinced the city of Hamilton to abandon landfill sites as a means of dealing with garbage, could he please then explain why it is that they're going to acquire a 20-year landfill site in the township of Binbrook?

On top of that, can he also explain—perhaps he'll do it by press release since I haven't got enough time to hear him out—why it is that the people who live adjacent to the dump were promised for 15 years that it would be closed? And for 15 years they did without water. For 15 years their wells were polluted. For 15 years they had to go out with a bucket in their hand to get some water out of a truck that went by once a day. What did the member do to correct that?

Anyway, that's the reason regional government doesn't work and why there is such distrust. The people who live in the areas that are now being affected by the decisions of the city of Hamilton recognize that in all of the time the city has been there, it has never lived up to its obligations. That's why we've got problems today.

But let me go back for a moment anyway. What I want to suggest is this: If the member feels so strongly about the abolishing of landfill sites, then he has a great opportunity to be of some use to this Legislature and to the people of the area. He can lean forward and, when his absent colleague, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. W. Newman), is back, he can say to him that maybe it isn't such a good idea for him to approve the development of a major sanitary landfill—and I use that word with tongue in cheek—site in the township of Binbrook. Maybe it isn't such a good idea for them to develop this sanitary landfill site at the most southerly corner of the region, where every truck that has to go there will travel the entire north-south distance from one regional boundary to the

other to get from the treatment plant to this place where they are going to dump their garbage.

Maybe it would be a good idea if he could convince his colleague, the Minister of the Environment, and show a little bit of spunk and guts, that the government ought not to have rejected the request of the regional municipality for additional moneys to improve and to make work the SWARU system in the city of Hamilton; and that maybe it would be a good idea if this government lived up to its responsibilities and provided the dollars necessary to put this pilot project into suitable and adequate working condition to ensure that the people who live outside the city won't have to put up with 20 years of landfill in their particular municipalities.

If the member wants to contribute something of any significance during this brief stay that he has had in the Legislature, perhaps between now and the next election he could bring those things to the attention of the minister in order that it can be done, so that when we take over the government there will at least be something left to work with.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Yes, smarten up.

Mr. Deans: In addition to that, let me say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this government's record in the areas of garbage disposal and in the areas of treatment of garbage is a pretty pitiful one. I am obviously not going to get through everything I wanted to say today, but that's okay.

Let me tell the House about this government's attitude toward the recycling of garbage. I have a letter here from a group of people who are in the recycling business who have approached the government for assistance to maintain themselves during this economic downturn to try to make sure that recycling is, in fact, the order of the day in the Province of Ontario, that waste of natural resources doesn't continue to occur, and that we do take full advantage and make full use of all of the products that have been used and can be reused.

Do you know what has happened, Mr. Speaker? The Minister of the Environment doesn't even deal with their problem. One after the other, recycling operations that were set up, hopefully to comply with what appeared to be a direction being taken by the Minister of the Environment, recycling operations that could have saved in the long run many millions of dollars in terms of the waste

of resources in this province, are being allowed to go out of business, because the Minister of the Environment is not committed to a programme of recycling and because the Minister of the Environment doesn't really care what happens.

One final point on regional government: Let me say that in the area of regional transit I don't think anyone would deny that the request put forward by the area municipalities in Hamilton-Wentworth region is reasonable. They shouldn't have to pay for something from which they derive no benefit. They ought not to be expected to pay on an equal basis for a regional transit system that doesn't benefit them one whit and isn't likely to in the foreseeable future. They are reasonable people and, no doubt, would be prepared to provide some assistance from their tax coffers in order to try to expand the system and then pay for it on a user basis in accordance with the availability of the service. I think the government has an obligation to respond to that in a positive way.

Let me just turn to one final matter for five minutes, and then I will be finished. I want to say something about labour relations in the Province of Ontario. I think that, second to housing, this government's attitude toward labour relations is probably the largest failure that it has before it.

Like many members of the Legislature I have looked around the world for places to model labour relations after. I have come to the conclusion that what works in one jurisdiction won't necessarily work anywhere else. Throughout the world there is a variety of different ways in which labour negotiations and labour relations are conducted but the main thrust, the main component, of any reasonable labour relations legislation or environment has to do with both sides' attitude toward the government—whether they believe the government is fair; whether they believe the government is acting in accordance with the best practices in dealing with inflation; whether the government is putting forward labour laws which are practical or workable; whether the government really cares whether or not the system works.

I think the evidence of the government's own inability to understand the problems is available to us, if we want to look at it, in the Public Service Bargaining Act. I think it is evident that the government, although it has moved ever so marginally to a more progressive position, didn't understand and doesn't understand the need to enable people to negotiate at the bargaining table for all

matters which include, of course, matters of working conditions.

I want to suggest that the government needs to have a different outlook toward labour relations. It has first of all to believe that the negotiation process is here to stay; that it is, in fact, a better process than the one which was in effect before when it was everyone for himself; that it makes good sense and that the majority of corporations are perfectly happy that there is a negotiation process available to them. It then has to set about, as a government, to establish reasonable minimal standards of hours of work, safety and wages and benefits.

The government has to make it understood by everyone that the public sector employees are employees of everyone, and that no one should expect these employees would be prepared to work for less than they would expect to be paid under similar circumstances elsewhere or, for that matter, to work in conditions which are any less tolerable than the conditions under which other people have to work.

I think there is such a thing in Ontario as essential services and they could be defined fairly readily. Some are obvious, some are not so obvious but I think it's entirely possible to assign them.

Mr. Bullbrook: I am glad to hear the member say that.

Mr. Deans: I have said it before.

Mr. Bullbrook: Some of the member's party did.

Mr. Deans: I say there are such things as essential services and I think the government would find, if it were to sit down with the public service, that it would not be difficult to define what things were essential services. They would be quite content to sit down and discuss the matter given the opportunity.

I also think it should be understood by everyone that by simply banning the right to strike one doesn't eliminate strikes. That's been tried in a number of jurisdictions across the world and one can ban the right to strike if one wishes; one can make it illegal. All one has done is make what was once legal illegal. It still happens. When people become sufficiently frustrated, when people become sufficiently aggravated and upset about working conditions and the attitude of their management toward them they withhold their services whether they are legally entitled to or otherwise. I don't condone that. I recognize it as a fact of life and

we have to recognize things as being facts.

I think the government has also got to straighten out the anomalies in the labour laws in the Province of Ontario. It can't have, on the one hand, the right to strike while on the other hand there is the right to have strike-breakers. It creates a situation which results in intolerable conditions on the picket lines and causes much of the turmoil and conflict which develops in the Province of Ontario.

The government has also got to recognize and state publicly, in order to gain the support of the great majority of people, that there are a number of ways in which conflicts will be resolved. They can be resolved at the bargaining table as is now the case in 95 to 96 per cent of the negotiations that take place. There is a place for conciliation, for mediation, for arbitration. There is even a place for final offer selection for anyone who wants to use it.

(There's no question there's a place for any form of settlement of any dispute that takes place and I don't think anybody with any brains would deny that. Two parties, having a dispute, reach a point where they cannot resolve it themselves and choose to have someone else resolve it for them. They also must have available to them the right to choose whichever method they want to choose in having it resolved.

I also want to say that for as long as there is a province, there will always be people who will go on strike. The sooner everyone understands that the sooner we stop making an issue of it, the sooner we sit down and start to create an atmosphere in which collective bargaining can take place meaningfully, the sooner we set up the kind of research facilities that will provide arbitrators, mediators, and conciliation officers with a full range of services and knowledge that they require to resolve disputes, the sooner we will cut down the number who do end up on strike from four or five per cent to one or two per cent.

I think it's a matter of attitude, and I don't think this government has the attitude that is necessary in order to resolve the many problems.

There are a number of other things that have to be done in the labour relations field, which I don't intend to go into fully today. But I think we have to recognize that safety and health in the plant are a provincial responsibility, not a matter for negotiation, and that the laws have to be sufficiently stringent to protect the health of

the worker and his family during the times that they are at work.

I think we also have to understand that, while the Workmen's Compensation Board may be by some people's standards a model, it doesn't go nearly far enough. A person who is off work because of illness is just as much in need of a continuation of wages as a person who is off work as the result of a broken leg or an injury incurred at work.

There has to be a new attitude toward workers in the province to bring about the kinds of changes that we think are necessary. We believe the members of our party probably know as much about the labour relations field as any member in this House. We think we could help to resolve that particular area which is causing so many people so much concern today.

I want to say in closing that there are going to be a number of things said tonight by the government. No doubt they will attempt to create the confrontation between Queen's Park and Ottawa that will allow them to go to the polls, probably on the pretext of establishing a mandate for tougher negotiation.

They will, in fact, make some marginal changes in social benefit. They will, in fact, make announcements of further expenditures in housing. They will no doubt make a marginal reduction in tax costs tonight, whether by way of rebate or by direct reduction of the income tax. They'll do away with the land transfer tax—in fact there are a number of things that they will do.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Do away with the land transfer tax? Is that right? Is that what is going to happen?

Mr. Bullbrook: Over someone's dead body—right?

Mr. Deans: The problem, of course, is that the government has a credibility problem. They have a problem of trying to convince the public of the Province of Ontario that they mean what they say; that they will do what they claim they'll do.

I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Party, the official opposition, also suffers from a similar credibility problem. If it could be said truthfully, I think the public believes our party does what it says it would do.

Mr. Bullbrook: A fine speech ruined.

Mr. Deans: Anyhow, I want to end by saying you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that on the day my leader spoke he moved an amendment and that amendment said as follows: "That this House regrets the failure of the government to provide political leadership." That's really what I've been talking about.

This House regrets the failure of the ministries of Health, Labour, Natural Resources and Environment to establish and enforce adequate standards for occupational safety and health—and that is a responsibility of government.

There is the failure of the Chairman of the Management Board and the ministries of Labour and Education to develop labour laws and collective bargaining procedures in the public and private sector to prevent the continual breakdown of negotiations and subsequent strikes. And I've suggested some things that might help in that field.

There is the failure of the Minister of Housing to pursue policies which would combat the drastic decline in house building now occurring; to provide housing for low and middle income groups within their capacities; to control rents and rental accommodation; and to prevent the conversion of rental accommodation to condominiums. I've made mention that we believe that that is perhaps the single, greatest failure of the government.

There is the failure of the Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell) to control the expansionary policies of Ontario Hydro.

My leader moved further the failure of the Premier to provide the leadership required to combat the social and economic hardships which are affecting the citizens of Ontario, and I say to the House now that I welcome the government making a decision after the budget this evening that we should go to the public of Ontario and ask them whether they don't agree with us that this government has failed in almost every single area of responsibility, that this government has taken on fanciful programmes rather than practical experience, that it has turned to things which were doomed to failure from the beginning rather than applying common sense and brains to things which have been practised and for which there is knowledge available.

I am going to say to the House that if there is a single failure of this government the failure has been this, that the government of Ontario, recognizing the needs as it has, has not once in 3½ years responded with

positive programmes aimed at resolving the needs where they exist. For this reason I hope—though perhaps I hope in vain—that the people of the House will see fit to reject what was, in fact, a very empty document, the Throne Speech of 1975.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity of joining in the debate in reply to the Throne Speech by Her Honour, and following my friend from Wentworth, who I think we'll all agree exudes a great deal of sincerity in connection with the matters that he speaks of.

I had the opportunity, sir, of joining him and the Minister without Portfolio representing London South, before the Stanford Fellows here about three or four weeks ago and I must say I was tremendously impressed with both their contributions and I must say prideful of the fact that the response that was directed afterwards was, I thought, one of high esteem for the quality and calibre and sincerity of the members who were on that panel.

I want to say first if I may that I want to take this opportunity of expressing in the journals of this House my deep appreciation, my continuing appreciation, to the people of the Sarnia riding for the opportunity that they have afforded me over the past eight years of being their representative in this chamber. It's a strange riding—I regard it as a sophisticated riding—strange in the context of thinking that they can send to us Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor and at the same time send me, because that shows an ambivalence of purpose that one can't always explain.

I think, frankly, that Her Honour, I must say on behalf of my constituents, of whom she was one at one time, graces that office with a charm and dignity almost irreplaceable by any man. I want to say that I had the opportunity of beginning my political career, for what it was worth, sitting as the desk-mate of her mother on the Sarnia Board of Education; obviously at that time an elderly lady, Mrs. Mills, who, again, graced that particular office with charm.

Mr. Speaker, if I may, I want to convey through the Chair to the significant occupier of the chair my congratulations on his elevation to that responsibility. I want to say to you that many of us—and I say it frankly—looked upon the appointment originally with some reservations, and I for one, expressing a personal opinion, now negate any reservation that I had in connection with the appoint-

ment. I think the Speaker has attempted to show a sincere and dedicated approach to the office that he has, a very difficult office, especially in the context of our national reputation as being one of the more difficult Houses to control; a reputation, by the way, well considered by those who put it forward.

I often wonder, frankly, whether the reputation isn't only referable to the 29th Parliament. My recollection of the 28th Parliament is a much happier one, if I may speak frankly, Mr. Speaker, than of the 29th Parliament. To me, there has been a change, a flavour in the process.

I recall coming in here originally and I look back with great fondness upon the associations that I made at that time and the associations that will continue, I trust, as long as I continue. For example, I couldn't say that I have not had any strong words with or debate with the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Dymond), who occupied the portfolio of Health for many years; yet, at the same time, that particular gentleman never at any time left me with any residue of doubt that he knew it was debate and solely a debate. I would say the same about the former Treasurer who represented the riding of Huron, now occupied as a result of a by-election—an indicator of some consequence—by my colleague now sitting here in the Liberal benches.

I recall distinctly one day when the level of debate descended pretty low, about as low as you could get in the 28th Parliament, that I called him a seed merchant from Exeter, and he referred to me reciprocally as the long finger with the big mouth. Immediately thereafter, knowing I had gotten second best in that particular repartee, I went outside prepared to take issue with him. He accosted me with, "Let's have a cup of coffee, Jim."

I recognize it's very difficult when you get into the debate, not to say some things at the time that you're not too happy about, but I must say some of the debates in the 29th Parliament have left me almost agast. I can recall one time being barracked at by the hon. member for Middlesex South (Mr. Eaton) to such an extent that perhaps I shouldn't have said it, but I turned to the Speaker and said, "Will somebody ask that lady to be quiet?" No sooner had I finished my speech and walked out there, I think he intended to physically assault me.

An hon. member: He was going to hit the member with his purse.

Mr. Bullbrook: I immediately called for the member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson) because he does all my small fighting. But in any event, we do have these problems. The member for Timiskaming (Mr. Havrot) sometimes loses control of himself. They remind me a bit of Batman and Robin over there. I can't tell which is which half the time. But, in any event, there has been a change in flavour in the House.

I want to say, as I've said before, Mr. Speaker, that I attribute to some extent the change in flavour to the change in Premiers. I want to talk about that afterwards because I interjected the other day, perhaps improperly, that the present Premier couldn't carry Mr. Robarts' political shoes. I meant that in the context of the recognition of constitutional responsibilities and national thrusts and national responsibility, and I truly believe that.

I want to talk about what the member for St. David (Mrs. Scrivener) said the other day and was so quickly supported by the Minister of Housing and, in his direct but always equivocal way as could be, by the Premier. Quite frankly, I can never tell what the Premier is supporting at any particular given time. I trust this will change in Ottawa, come Wednesday.

In any event, there has been this change of flavour that we know about. Some of it has to do with the feeling that is not singularly appropriate to the present Premier, but the feeling that the legislative process isn't that very important. I'm not going to bore you with statistics again, Mr. Speaker; I have tried to bore people with statistics before about the use of the legislative process, because frankly I am a great believer in the use of the legislative process. I am a great believer that strangely enough, from this mean and medium of 117 of us, there can evolve good legislation if we permit it to evolve.

I'm not going to bore the House with the statistics about the sterilization of the committee process as it should be used, but somewhere along the line the bureaucracy has crept in to such an extent that we are not really given the opportunity of coming to grips with what we want to say or coming to grips with legislation that we would like to see. We're faced with the dominance of a volume of press material—spewed forward, as my colleague from Rainy River (Mr. Reid) says, talking about the chairman of the public accounts committee, spewed forward by a bunch of faceless names earning \$18,000 to \$20,000 a year.

An hon. member: I could name a few.

Mr. Bullbrook: And it costs us \$15 million, they tell me, for press people.

I just want to read the hon. members one I got this morning. It is just a tremendous example of where government is going. It's a news release from the Ministry of Industry and Tourism, Communications Services, Hearst Block, 900 Bay St., Queen's Park, Toronto, Ont. M7A 2E3—just in case the hon. members want to write to them.

It reads: "Ontario, in spring, is a floral thing."

An hon. member: Oh.

Mr. Bullbrook: That's what it said. It is a discussion—

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): The Minister without Portfolio (Mr. White) must have written that.

Mr. Bullbrook: When I read it first of all I said I knew the people of Ontario were against them but now the damn elements are against them.

In any event, it's an exposition about the beauties of Ottawa and Niagara Falls written by some press officer. Some of it really is almost insensitive. Some of it, I think, would corrupt. Listen to this for a moment:

For many thousands of people living within a 100-mile radius of the Honey-moon Capital, the trip to see the peninsula in full bloom has become an annual pilgrimage which ends in a festival of fun.

That borders on obscenity. Not only should we not be publishing that type of thing, I think—who is the censor man? Is he still involved?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why it's old Don Sims. I don't know whether Don would approve that or not.

Mr. Bullbrook: In any event, is Don Sims—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Don's doing it.

Mr. Bullbrook: I'll send him a copy of this. Don would know what that means.

In any event, that's the few words about the Falls. They go on to Ottawa. This is something:

Ottawa's Festival of Spring is the culmination of the spring flower parade which starts around the end of March as the first hardy crocus bud pokes its nose above ground.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It's got a stem 15 ft long. I might be interested.

Mr. Bullbrook: It goes on:

More than a half-million of these first spring harbingers form this vanguard. Next come the high-stepping golden daffodils—more than a million of them storming the capital's parks and hills—followed by their less jaunty cousins, the narcissus, in hot pursuit.

Mr. Breithaupt: At \$15 million?

Mr. Bullbrook: The hon. members don't believe me. The narcissuses are in hot pursuit. I knew there was something Freudian about that and I looked up what narcissus was. This fellow, whoever he or she or it is, has to go. He has to go. That's part of what the change is all about. That is kind of a funny part.

I want to tell the House about an unfunny part for a moment. An unfunny part transpired in this House about four weeks ago when a certain member—the member for St. David, should I say—whom we can tolerate flitting around this House, acting the part of everybody's mother-in-law; this we can subscribe to, but this type of speech wasn't something that can be laughed off.

He says—she says, I'm sorry, that was a Freudian slip—she says: "The introduction of dirty tricks into Canadian politics." This is a pre-arranged speech. One can tell because the first line says: "Thank you for that kind introduction." The second paragraph reads:

Realizing that this year of 1975 is International Women's Year, as declared by the United Nations, it might have been appropriate for me to discuss the issue of women's rights.

In the context of the introduction of dirty tricks, I wonder why she didn't consider that at the time.

I want to tell the hon. members what her speech was basically about. As the majority of the members know, it had to do with the need for housing.

The former speaker, quite eloquently, and colleagues of mine, just as eloquently and just as sincerely motivated, have attempted to put forward their ideas in connection with housing in this province, because it's a sad commentary when we hear so much about housing. We recognize the need. We transport ourselves back, as we must, to the times when we had just turned 20 and the times

when we were beginning to raise a family. We try to transport ourselves inside the minds and the skins of those people who face that kind of responsibility now in the context of high, usurious interest rates and in the context of almost unconscionable profits by certain people in the industry. She begins by saying this:

Basically, the parameters of our housing policy are based upon three main objectives:

1. That housing is the basic right of all residents of Ontario.

I won't talk to you about the other two, Mr. Speaker. When one starts with a platitude in connection with a concrete problem, I am not going to continue on.

But let me read something that she said. She then talked about certain people who are in the employ of the Liberal caucus in Ontario. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, without reservation as a lawyer that they could sue her for libel without any difficulty at all, having regard to what she said in this speech. She says:

Sadly, we are all familiar with the Watergate mess in the United States. Part of the investigation into the Watergate uncovered what has become known as dirty tricks.

She then goes on to say that the federal government has withheld certain moneys from the provincial government which has stultified and sterilized their ability to provide housing adequate to the needs of the people of Ontario.

Many of the people in this House who have a responsibility to the self-same people of Ontario immediately pointed out that \$103 million had been voted in the last two years—correct me if I am wrong—which was expended. Many people pointed out that in a budget of \$8.9 billion, 1.1 per cent had been allocated in the field of housing.

I want to tell you this, Mr. Speaker, Do you know what the Watergate mess was about? The Watergate mess was about break, entry and theft. The Watergate mess was about illegal wiretapping. The Watergate mess was about a conspiracy to cover up criminal activities. To think that a member of this House, then supported by her minister and supported by the Premier, would try to get away with equating that type of activity by high officers of government with

even what she accused the federal government of, were it right or not.

I want to say that's what's wrong with this House. That's when I interjected that the Premier couldn't carry John Robarts' political shoes. Read his opening address at the Confederation of Tomorrow conference. The Minister without Portfolio (Mr. White), who is one of his closest friends, knows that the attitude of John Robarts always was that we will not in any way fracture this Confederation.

This is what that member does in this type of speech. She talks about plumbing the depths of the gutters. I don't talk about that. I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, if I may, there was only one explanation for that type of speech: Either an over-zealous speech writer somewhere and a lack of responsibility on the person who delivered the speech, or stupidity, clear unadulterated stupidity — nothing else. Nobody can possibly try to carry forward an analogy of what happened in the United States with her accusation, and so I sometimes become concerned.

I become concerned when the Premier doesn't stand in his place and say, "I refute that. I will not have anything to do with it." Mr. Robarts would have done that. He would have. He would have said, "I will have nothing to do with saying that there were motives of that nature on the part of the federal government." Once you do that, you can't negotiate in the context of your responsibility to the province and the nation, Mr. Speaker. You can't do it. You can't bring that type of slumming into the high offices and the seats of the mighty. It can't be done, but the Premier is prepared to do it. He apparently is prepared now. He is prepared now to come forward, he says. The headline reads: "Davis Promises to Fight Price Increases of Oil and Gas at Federal-provincial Talks." I applaud him for that.

I don't know whether he will do it; that's the problem. He didn't do it a year ago. The problem a year ago was that he didn't understand what was going on. Today he said to us, in effect, that the industries didn't get enough share of that. Now he's going to take it upon himself to blame the federal government.

The federal government imposed, I believe, a \$5 a barrel export tax. They use that to equalize the difficulties east of the Ottawa River. The distribution of the remainder of the funds was something that should have been negotiated; if, truly, the Premier of

Ontario is correct and sincere when he's quoted as saying he believes in a national commitment, then he's got to recognize this.

First of all, there is a body that is called upon to accept the responsibility for national commitments, and that's the government of Canada. And if the government of Canada must pass legislation for the protection of all the people of Canada, then they must.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, were my leader the Premier going to Ottawa there'd be no reservation. Don't worry about the country cousins. Do you think for one moment, Mr. Speaker, that we're their country cousins? Far from it. There would be hard bargaining on the part of the Premier of Ontario, Robert Nixon. I'll tell you why, because he's already called Alberta exactly what it is, the Valhalla of Canada, at the present time. Do you think there isn't need for hard bargaining when you look at the budgetary problem that the Treasurer will have tonight?

Let me read you what goes on, if I may:

Personal income tax: Alberta, 26 per cent; Ontario, 30.5 per cent; British Columbia, 30.5 per cent.

Gift tax: Alberta none. Yes, we have it and so does British Columbia.

Gasoline tax: In Alberta 10 cents a gallon; here, 19 cents; British Columbia, 15 cents.

Alberta has no succession duties; we have them and so does British Columbia.

Property tax relief, where it's so much needed. Education tax has been abolished in Alberta, and on residential and farm land.

The corporation tax in Alberta, 11 per cent. Ours is 12 per cent.

Sales tax, none. Sales tax, which draws into the Treasury of the Province of Ontario at the present time \$1.5 billion, and they don't have any in Alberta. If that doesn't call for effective bargaining, nothing does.

And we're not going to be fooled here in the Liberal Party by being told that we're the country cousins of the people in Ottawa. We never have been. We never will be. We recognize the responsibility that we have to these people in the Province of Ontario. I for one, frankly, get sick and tired when I hear people talking about the ability of the Liberal Party to govern. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, what the Throne Speech would have said had I been assisting in the writing of that Throne Speech.

The hon. member for Wentworth peripherally talked about labour relations in the Province of Ontario, and I want to say to you this: Unions, management, the consuming

public, everyone, are sick and tired of strikes. They're justifiably sick and tired of strikes. But the collective bargaining process must continue, on this I totally agree with the hon. member for Wentworth. But there must be something done to look into the field.

The Premier speaks about the need for leadership. Look at that document, how can you debate the Throne Speech? A debate, I think, is defined as an exchange of ideas through dialogue. There's not an idea in that Throne Speech that we can exchange. There should be something in that Throne Speech. Listen for a moment what might have been said, just for a moment if I may—what could have been said by Her Honour.

She could have said: My government will immediately establish a select committee or a royal commission to examine alternatives to strikes, including centralized bargaining, non-stoppage strikes, co-determination, productivity bargaining and final-offer selection.

These are just some of the possibilities that are being experimented with throughout the world. We don't say that they're that good; we don't know. But we've done nothing in eight years. I have really been nauseously repetitious in this House in asking for the appointment of a select committee to look into labour relations—not because of some inventive genius on my part, but because of the fact that you don't have to look beyond your nose to recognize that it's the one poor relation of government, and that people are thirsting for some type of answers.

And surely to goodness we have an obligation to give them the answers. Not only was there nothing mentioned about it in the Throne Speech — I am afraid we will go on forever with nothing mentioned because, I say again, albeit repetitious, we can do the job. If we are given the opportunity we can do the job.

I have sat on only one select committee of this legislative assembly, albeit it was a quasi-judicial one, but I recognize the job that the members of that committee did. They went in with no predisposition save the perhaps understandable predisposition that the personal integrity of the Premier of Ontario should not be attacked. We didn't attempt to attack that personal integrity. If we went into that committee it was with that predisposition because we don't believe the present Premier is personally without moral fibre; we recognize quite the contrary. But he can't continue to play the Pontius Pilate approach and say, "It is not there, because I don't see it. I don't know anything about Fidinam and the \$50,000. I don't know anything about Ger-

hard Moog. I have never spoken to him about this matter." But other people in his place and stead have and that is why people are becoming sick of this government also. He can't continue to say it is the other man all the time.

I say to members frankly this: I laugh when they talk about the inability of the Liberal Party to put forward an alternative. The Liberal Party can put forward an alternative in every portfolio. I would think of all the ministries, were I given the choice of a ministry in the next government by the then premier, I would say, "Please give me the Attorney General's job." It has been atrophied and decimated by the last two incumbents who have done nothing. At least during the first four years of our sitting in this House we had the opportunity of seeing a quiet, staid but able man recognize that the law is a vital and viable instrument of social need and social good but these people don't know that.

It is a sad thing to see the Minister of Culture and Recreation (Mr. Welch) take upon himself that type of responsibility. I feel he has more talent. He could have been a fine Attorney General and Secretary for Justice and Minister of Justice. Being Attorney General isn't sitting in one's place every day with bon mots or having some commission look into the Landmark scandal. Being the Attorney General is a recognition that one is the chief law officer of the Crown who has a responsibility both for the enforcement of the law and the administration of justice. In that context these people have done nothing. One saw it today, for example, when my colleague from Downsview put forward a question, "What is the Attorney General going to do about the Dow suit?" The Dow suit is a charade; it has been.

As an aside, the two great things upon which the Premier built his last campaign—do members recall?—were the attack on the environment, by the Dow suit, and the sanctity of our roads, by the Spadina Expressway, both of which have crumbled fully. The response of the Attorney General (Mr. Clement) today to my colleague from Downsview on the question decided by the Supreme Court of Canada in the Manitoba suit was if, in fact, the Supreme Court of Canada has said that the province has no jurisdiction in connection with interprovincial pollution of water, then this is the focal point of the Dow suit.

To answer that my subscription to the DLRs is not up to date is truly funny at first and then it becomes almost a tragic

comedy. One recognizes one can't have a fellow as Attorney General who, in effect, is playing games with one. The Attorney General must, of necessity, be the person who almost is the tuning fork of the legislative process and the judicial process, having regard to the protection of the people.

Were I Attorney General there would be some practical things I would do. I would insist, for example, that the courts sit all year round. I would insist, for example, that there be an increase in the complement of the courts. I would insist that semi-judicial appointments be not made by orders in council as they are now because they become the instrument of my colleague, the member for Lambton, playing games in Sarnia which he shouldn't do.

I wrote a letter to the Attorney General which said let him appoint everybody to the liquor board. That's his baby. That's his style. But, for goodness sake don't appoint the registrar of the Supreme Court because he happens to be a party hack buddy of the member for Lambton who doesn't, in effect, know what's legally up or down, because we went through that. This is what I mean. You just can't play games with that type of portfolio. It's an important one.

You see, Mr. Speaker, a Liberal Attorney General in the context of the Morgenthaler decision would have to go to the Premier and he'd have to say to him, "I can't abide that decision"—not about abortion, I don't want to talk about abortion now. We'll talk about that some other time. We'll talk about the law.

I'm not talking about whether the decision as far as abortions go is correct. I'm talking about the lack of availability of the section 45 defence to Dr. Morgenthaler which had been established by precedent long before his case, but more importantly, I want to read to you what happens to be a cornerstone of the law in the Dominion of Canada. Let me read it to you. It's from a statute that you might know. It says:

It is hereby recognized and declared that in Canada there have existed and shall continue to exist, without discrimination by reason of race, national origin, colour, religion or sex, the following human rights and fundamental freedoms, namely, the right of the individual to life, liberty, security of the person, enjoyment of property and the right not to be deprived thereof except by the due process of law.

And the due process of law in the Criminal Code in connection with Dr. Morgenthaler's

case is a trial by jury and he was deprived of that.

I don't say that it's the function of the Attorney General of any province, or the Minister of Justice of Canada, to interfere with the decisions, be they unanimous or split, by the Supreme Court of Canada. Quite to the contrary. It would be disrespectful and out of order entirely to do so. But what can be done is this. We can change the law. That's our job.

When we see that something wrong is done we change the law. We can't change the law when one is the Attorney General for Ontario, but what you can do is this: You must protect, under that Bill of Rights, the people of Ontario. And you must bring to the attention of the Attorney General for Canada what his responsibility is, as you see it, in the legislative field.

I think that's what a Liberal Attorney General would do. He would go to his Premier and he would put that forward and I believe a Liberal Premier would say, "Yes, do that. Please do that. I want that protection for my people." And if, by some strange imagination, by some abortion of common sense itself, we had a Premier—which wouldn't be the next incumbent but we had a Liberal Premier who wouldn't accept that type of advice, you know what you'd do? You would resign. You would resign on a matter of principle.

That's something that's crossed my mind over the last eight years—not one resignation from that cabinet on a matter of principle. Resignations because you're not going to run again; resignations because you're tipped with scandal; but never a resignation where you hear a minister say: "I'm sorry, I must resign. It's a matter of principle with me." You're left to only one conclusion; either there is no discussion or there are no principles. That's it.

I think that's how my colleagues would govern. I think that's how the Leader of the Opposition, soon to become Premier of Ontario, would want them to govern.

Much more can be said in support of the amendment as put forward by my leader. I want again to read it into the record, if I may. It was moved by the Leadership of the Opposition and seconded by the member for York Centre (Mr. Deacon):

That this House regrets the failure of the government to enunciate a programme to moderate the combined effects of unemployment and inflation on our people and the economy; the lack of a housing programme that will significantly reverse

the downward trend in housing starts; the absence of a clear commitment and programme to stop the waste in government spending caused by duplication of services, overlapping of government jurisdictions and bad administrative judgement; the absence of action to improve general labour-management negotiating procedures, which have been so detrimental to our economy in the workforce; the failure to enunciate a policy for the retention of agricultural land in production with compensation for landholders affected; and therefore that the government no longer has the confidence of this House or the people of Ontario.

I said once before in this House, I think in winding up this debate, that the result of the motion and the amendments is a foregone conclusion. I said before that were the people of Ontario here to take our places en masse it wouldn't be a foregone conclusion.

The Premier of Ontario is staggering his way out. I, like many others, enjoy him personally. I, like many others, in a professional responsibility as a politician and as a representative of the people, recognize that he unfortunately just doesn't have it.

The fact of the matter is that if we do not form the next government immediately, we'll probably be the most strengthened opposition in the history of this province and there is no doubt that we will then form the government thereafter.

My particular guess is that we will form the government as a result of the next election, and we'll be given the opportunity of putting forward truly Liberal positions in truly effective fashions.

Hon. Mr. White: Name one.

Mr. Bullbrook: I have just named a whole portfolio for the minister. I think he was asleep.

Hon. Mr. White: No, the Liberal policy—

Mr. Bullbrook: I find it difficult to tell when the minister is asleep and when he isn't asleep. When I came here eight years ago, he was a wide-eyed young man.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Upwardly mobile, and now he is on the way out.

Mr. Bullbrook: I find him very slitful now.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Before he put on a sweater.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, we have talked about housing and about labour relations, but I want to say that the Premier of Ontario is clutching for an issue with which he can go to the people of Ontario and say, "You need me". Now, he's going to try that issue in Ottawa. He's going to attack the federal government. He's going to say in effect: "All right, you haven't taken on Lougheed enough."

Hon. Mr. White: What's the Liberal policy on oil prices?

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): They don't have a policy on anything.

Mr. Bullbrook: The problem is, of course, he didn't take on Lougheed at all over the last six weeks. When Lougheed was talking about the fact that the rest of the country were bargain hunters and consumers, when Lougheed was saying Sarnia is a little town in Ontario sucking Alberta dry; where was the Premier then? He was silent—in Florida or up here, I don't know where, but he was silent.

Now, at the 11th hour, he decides that the villain will be Ottawa. Well, like the next proposition, he can't make that stick with the people of Ontario. And the next proposition is, we'll make the teachers villains. We'll get the situation to such a point that the people of Ontario will say, "To hell with those teachers, no matter what," and they will forget some of the things that the Premier did and that he is truly the author of the difficulty.

In the last four years—let me give you one statistic, Mr. Speaker—the educational cost at the local level of the Province of Ontario has gone up 38 per cent. The administrative cost of the Ministry of Education in those four years has gone up 222 per cent.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Bullbrook: That's what the people of Ontario are going to know, because we are going to tell them. There's no way he is going to fool them this time. The fact of the matter is that there is going to be a new government; it's going to be a Liberal government, and it's going to be an effective government. And the Tories will sit in pallor and trembling, when they read the Thorne Speech that we will present.

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): That's brave talk.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for London South.

Hon. J. White (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, let me join previous speakers in congratulating you, sir, on your election to this high post and on the dignified and dedicated manner in which you carry out those responsibilities. I must say that I am one of 117 people indebted to you for your contribution to these deliberations.

Mr. Speaker, the Webster dictionary defines the word "traitor" as one who betrays his country by violating his allegiance, and allegiance is defined as "duty owed to one's state." The Oxford dictionary defines the word "traitor" as "one who violates his allegiance or acts disloyally" to his country. By these definitions, sir, Rene Levesque is a traitor. Any citizen of a country who would assist internal or external forces to destroy that country must be considered a traitor.

George Drew, I am going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, would have called him a traitor; and so would Tom Kennedy. Leslie Frost would have called him a traitor, as indeed he is; and so would this Premier (Mr. Davis). The Leader of the Opposition, who aspires to be the Premier of this Province, calls Rene Levesque a reasonable man.

Mr. P. Taylor (Carleton East): The Premier hasn't said a word.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): The Premier hasn't said a word, and he has had the same opportunity.

Hon. Mr. White: And that, I think Mr. Speaker, illustrates in a nutshell why the leader of the Liberal Party here will never be the Premier of Ontario. Because one can't be that accommodating to the forces that attempt to destroy your nation.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister would call out the OPP.

Hon. Mr. White: One can't be that pleasant in a face to face situation in front of hundreds of people—

Mr. P. Taylor: Does the minister want to go back and throw bombs?

Hon. Mr. White: —even as one attempts to prove what a lovely, personable, co-operative human being he is.

Mr. Reid: The minister is really that desparate, is he?

Hon. Mr. White: I hope the members on this side, if not both sides of this House—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): I want to tell the minister something, Mr. Speaker.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: That is not only unprincipled and vicious, but that is racist. Somebody is going to tell him that, and I am going to tell the minister that. I have to sit here and listen to that kind of rubbish.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: What kind of nonsense is that?

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Lewis: Regardless of what one believes of Rene Levesque—

Hon. Mr. White: Of course he is a traitor to this country.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is a disgrace to this House.

Hon. Mr. White: He is a traitor to this country.

Mr. Speaker: Order; order please.

Mr. Lewis: Oh stop it; for heaven's sake stop it! The minister uses a French-Canadian figure in an effort to smear. What is wrong with him?

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Breithaupt: Let's debate Ontario's problems.

Mr. Lewis: Good Lord; to what depths has he sunk? It happens that Levesque is a penitent separatist and a man committed to social change and social reform.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. White: He is trying to destroy Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Could we have a little order in the chamber please? Order please.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, you should call him to account. You shouldn't allow the Legislature of Ontario to be used for racist stuff.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lewis: That is what the minister has done; and somebody should—

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I think this debate should end—this part of it. The hon. member for London South.

Hon. Mr. White: I am going to deal with this.

Mr. Lewis: If he wants to criticize the opposition there are a thousand ways to do it without using racism.

Hon. Mr. White: I haven't got an ounce of malice in my body for any race, and I have nothing but respect for my French-Canadian colleagues—

Mr. Lewis: Oh no, that is why Rene Levesque is the choice.

Hon. Mr. White: —as I have demonstrated in a hundred settings.

Mr. Lewis: Sure, some of his best friends are French Canadians; I know.

Hon. Mr. White: The race of the person urging the breakup of Canada has nothing to do with this matter at all.

Mr. Lewis: Oh stop it, stop it.

Hon. Mr. White: And the minute a person of English or other descent attempts to break up this country, I will have to call him a traitor, as I have done today.

Mr. Lewis: That was a really unnecessary opening.

Hon. Mr. White: And I will have to conclude, too, that people who are afraid to use that strong word are no friends of Canada.

Mr. Reid: Who wrote this for him, the member for St. David?

Mr. Lewis: His Tory friends applaud.

Hon. Mr. White: People who are afraid to use that strong word do not deserve and cannot, in fact, assume the leadership of a great province like Ontario.

Mr. Breithaupt: What has this got to do with the Throne debate?

Mr. Lewis: How does he measure a traitor? How does he measure the betrayal of Ontario in the last four years by the Tories?

Hon. Mr. White: There has been no betrayal of Ontario—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for London South has the floor.

Mr. Lewis: Don't give us Oxford dictionary definitions.

Hon. Mr. White: There has always been loyalty towards Canada from our party. There has been a furthering of Ontario's interests, but never to the jeopardy or danger of Canada.

Mr. P. Taylor: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for London South has the floor.

Hon. Mr. White: Now the hon. Leader of the Opposition is a very decent, honest fellow.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I don't even want that kind of a comment from the minister. What kind of a judge is he?

Hon. Mr. White: But he hasn't got the muscle or the moral fibre to head up this province; and he's proving it week by week. By the time the election comes, whenever that may be, I have no doubt that the people once again will turn to the present Premier and his colleagues—

Mr. Breithaupt: Call it today.

Hon. Mr. White: —and once again assure themselves of Ontario's appropriate place in this Confederation; once again assure Ontarians the highest standard of living in the country and the lowest unemployment rate—

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): The lowest level of debate too.

Hon. Mr. White: —the highest quality of life—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He is a joke.

Hon. Mr. White: —given any measure that is appropriate in the year 1975.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The worst speech that has been given in the Legislature in a decade. Almost the one he made in 1969.

Mr. Lewis: He should resign on principle.

Hon. Mr. White: Now sir, I am going to spend a moment or two on some of the comments of the speakers opposite. The member for Wentworth urges once again that the existing Treasury ministry be broken in half. I think he is finding less and less support for this position among municipal politicians and others. It was less than three years ago, Mr. Speaker, that that ministry had 3,700 employees and now it has about 700 employees.

It was less than three years ago that there were many boards and commissions reporting to them with additional employees; and now there are none, with the exception, I think,

of OMERS and the Ontario Economic Council. The ministry itself as a control ministry exercises a variety of responsibilities. Some are inseparable in any effective sense. When the Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs sits down with the municipal liaison committee, he can commit this government insofar as responsibilities and resources are concerned. This has proven to be a tremendously powerful combination of duties and one which has redounded to the benefit of the municipalities of this province. To destroy that combination now would be a very important retrograde step.

I want to spend just a minute saying that my colleague (Mr. McKeough) who has taken over the reins of that very important ministry and who has moved in very very quickly to make it his own—

Mr. Deans: The minister means he has returned to his former post.

Hon. Mr. White: —is the kind of a man who is touched upon in the novel by Trollope, "The Prime Minister," where the Prime Minister of the day calls him one of his cleverest ministers and says something to the effect, "I need a great man for the great ministry." This is what our Premier has in the person of the Treasurer of Ontario (Mr. McKeough) whose budget is coming down today. We have a great man for the great ministry, and the great ministry cannot be nibbled away by the acceptance of thoughtless or uncomprehending suggestions such as that made by the member for Wentworth.

Mr. Breithaupt: That has a nice ring to it.

Hon. Mr. White: My hon. friend said that he spent very long and very late hours sitting up until early hours of the morning solving regional problems. I wish he'd stop. Every time he goes in to solve one of those problems, nothing but discontent and troubles flow from that attempt on his part. Let him save himself a lot of those late hours with those regional councillors and let them work that out. How about trying that for just a little while?

Mr. Deans: The minister won't find much support for that my friend.

Hon. Mr. White: It's the kind of help we don't need.

Mr. Deans: That is quite inaccurate.

Hon. Mr. White: At the outset, Mr. Speaker, may I observe that while the Speech from the Throne has been attacked by some of the members here present for what it didn't say, it seems to have engendered considerable debate and a great deal of verbiage from the opposite side of the House over the past month. The obvious fact is, sir, that the speech very clearly enunciated the priorities of this government for the continued progress of the people of Ontario.

I think it would be well worth refreshing our memories with a summary of these priorities. There can be no doubt that the single most important issue in the minds of the government and the people of Ontario is inflation. I hear the opposition time and time again urge us to spend more money and decrease taxes. One day, I suppose, when the Liberals do announce their policies, we'll have an opportunity once again of costing them.

Des Newman assured us at Trent University—and the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) was there—that the leader of the Liberal Party had promised to have some policies before the election, did he not?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): We have them now.

Hon. Mr. White: The leader of the Liberal Party has promised one of his candidates he'll have some policies before the election, but we have yet to see them and so we can't really cost their effects.

Mr. Gaunt: The minister doesn't distinguish between platform and policy; that's his problem.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He put it even more succinctly. He said he couldn't perceive what the Liberal policy was but that the leader would reveal it at some point; meanwhile, he would give his policy.

Hon. Mr. White: Anyway, one day I suppose the Liberal Party will attempt one or two policies and one, or two programmes. Then we'll have an opportunity to cost some of these brave new world issues touched upon by the member for Samia.

Mr. Breithaupt: And poney up the tax rate because of them, I am sure.

Hon. Mr. White: Then we'll be able to tell the people what tax increases will be

brought about by my friend from Kitchener and others.

Mr. Ferrier: Will the government get the civil service to do it this time?

Hon. Mr. White: The government, sir, is committed to doing everything in its power to reduce the impact of current strong pressures on the economy, but I would emphasize it can't do it alone. My colleague, the Treasurer, will shortly outline some of the measures which the government is prepared to take. They will definitely require the co-operation of all Ontario citizens, if the battle against inflation and rising unemployment is to be won, as indeed we hope to do.

As far as this battle is concerned, I would add a reminder that a key weapon which the Throne Speech strongly advocates is the practice of moderation and restraint in prices and wages in both the private and public sectors. I am so amused, once again, when I hear one of the members of the opposition jump to his feet on the hustings and in effect say pay them more. "Bill Davis is a cheap-skate," is what they have said, when we ended up with something over a 20 per cent settlement.

How much would the opposition have had us pay in circumstances of that kind? And now the Leader of the Opposition talks about giving the teachers' federation even more monopoly powers, à la certain of the troublesome professions which now exact a heavy toll on our citizens.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister won't be around to have anything to do with it.

Mr. MacDonald: Why doesn't the minister take the same monopoly powers away from other professions if he doesn't think it is right?

Hon. Mr. White: Well I can't hear the hon. member and I suppose it is just as well.

Mr. MacDonald: I said why doesn't the minister take the same monopoly powers away from other professions if he doesn't think it is right?

Hon. Mr. White: My first speech in this House 16 years ago was on that subject.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: This is the minister's last.

Hon. Mr. White: Sitting behind the hon. member, I think I had a measure of support

from him; which frightened me a little then as it does now.

Mr. MacDonald: I didn't hear what the minister said. It was lost in the gurgle.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He has done more damage in the Conservative Party than any other member.

Hon. Mr. White: Let me briefly review, Mr. Speaker, other areas of emphasis as announced in the Speech from the Throne.

This government considers, as a matter of current priority to the people of Ontario, that administrative costs in government must be controlled and that a high standard of service must be maintained at the same time. The Chairman of our Management Board is doing exactly that. A half a dozen times in as many months he has brought in announcements of increased control, increased efficiency and increased effectiveness in the public service; never with any support or encouragement from across the hall.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's right. He's planning to run the schools, to run the municipal councils, to run the hospital boards.

Mr. Speaker: Order; order please.

Hon. Mr. White: The safety of our cities and streets must be ensured. We won't be deterred by any sarcastic references to law and order, because one thing we are going to guarantee is that this city of Toronto and the other communities of this province continue to be the safest in North America, as indeed they are. As a matter of fact, the ex-Deputy Attorney General was able to provide me some months ago with statistics indicating that crimes of violence had fallen off in Ontario in contrast to every other jurisdiction in North America. That is the kind of thing we are going to have more often.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Very good.

Hon. Mr. White: The rights of citizens in relation to the state must be protected. In this respect, I must say, we contrast vividly and dramatically with the socialists, who would in effect tell every other person how to run his life.

An hon. member: Every person, not every other person.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh no.

Hon. Mr. White: Intellectual elitism characterizes the members of the NDP.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Gracious. In this province we would sooner have socialists—

Mr. MacDonald: That is cheap rhetoric.

Hon. Mr. White: Almost all of them were born to some exotic strata in the pyramids, teaching or some other profession. Hardly a single one of them is in the category of those of us on this side who started to work at a tender age and slugged his way right up to the top.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: These intellectual dilettantes, called socialists, would impose a form of life on every other person in this community according to their somewhat bias and perverted standards.

Mr. MacDonald: Now I know why the minister is getting out of politics.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: Continued and improved security must be provided for our senior citizens. Ontario has the highest such standard in the world today.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No, that is right.

Hon. Mr. White: Together with our tax credits, an elderly couple receives something in excess of \$6,000; which is the highest in the world, bar none.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): If fertilizer was music, he'd be a brass band.

Hon. Mr. White: One anticipates making additional resources of every description, financial and otherwise, available to these pioneers who went through two world wars and a great depression and the aftermath.

I'm not going to apologize for any moneys raised by way of taxes to nurture these elderly people in this province. I think our members, if the others will not, should be telling our people of every age time and time again that we are going to have the highest standard anywhere in the world for our elderly men and women.

Persons in need must be compensated for social benefits discounted by inflation and here again every budget sees new measures—and, indeed, between budgets too—to increase the minimum standard to one that's decent, to one that's livable, to one that has a measure of dignity.

Greater opportunities must be provided for women and we have introduced a number of measures in recent weeks, some of which

the leader of the NDP chose to scoff at. We have introduced a number of measures and there will be more measures to be announced later in this International Women's Year to ensure that women have more and more opportunities in every aspect of human life here in this province.

Access to education must be ensured for all people in our society. Mr. Speaker, I saw a release from Statistics Canada three or four weeks ago showing that Ontario is providing something like \$1,070 per student in the primary and secondary schools, the highest in Canada by a very considerable measure, and almost double that paid in certain other provinces where the per capita expenditure is \$500 and some odd a year.

I do know that we have provided additional sums of money at the community college and university levels.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The government is also responsible for the low quality of education.

Hon. Mr. White: I do believe that we expend as much per capita as any other jurisdiction in the world with the possible exception of Kuwait. This is a history that goes back to the earliest days of the country when our Scottish pioneers brought over this reverence for learning. I do believe it has augmented the fortuitous location of resources in making this province the most prosperous jurisdiction in Canada and one of the most prosperous jurisdictions anywhere.

Mr. Stokes: In spite of the Tories.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Everybody agrees with him except the parents and the students.

Hon. Mr. White: Adequate housing must be provided. The member for Wentworth had quite a lot to say on that subject, much of it misinformed. As a matter of fact the member for Hamilton Mountain came over and was able to tell me the number of thousands of new houses created in that very same riding and the number of senior citizens apartments and HOME lots and such like. The member who is unfortunately out of the room at the moment—

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): As usual.

Hon. Mr. White: —apparently has no comprehension of what's happening in his own riding.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Nothing new about that.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is par for the course.

An hon. member: He doesn't know whether he is punched or bored.

Hon. Mr. White: I think he probably has no comprehension of the several announcements made by our Minister of Housing in the last couple of weeks, copies of which I have here. I will be dealing with that in a moment or two.

Farmers must receive more assistance and farm protection, greater encouragement, and we will have more to say on this subject. My colleague, the great warrior from Middlesex North, is sitting here beside me giving me moral support as always.

Mr. MacDonald: He is being pushed into battle. We will see when he gets there.

Hon. Mr. White: He is recognized as the great Minister of Agriculture. He will have some more assistance for farmers and farm production will have greater encouragement under his tutelage and under the leadership of our Premier. The role of cultural and recreational pursuits and traditions in the quality of life in Ontario must be supported. I vividly remember hearing John Roberts speak in late 1970 to the Empire Club. Unfortunately, most of it was extemporaneous and unfortunately most of it was lost.

Mr. Breithaupt: Lost to posterity.

Hon. Mr. White: Much of it was lost, but I do remember—

Mr. MacDonald: It's lost? They always record it and publish it. He can get it any time he wants.

Hon. Mr. White: —being deeply impressed when he described how the emphasis in the 1960s had been very largely on the quantity of life, so to speak, and how he had noticed a change in attitudes toward the end of the 1960s and thought that the 1970s would be characterized by more and more emphasis on the quality of life.

We see here, sir, in this jurisdiction the switch in emphasis which the government has placed more and more on the quality of the life of our people. Every month brings new measures to enhance the quality of life in the area of soil preservation, in the area of cleaning up our rivers and streams and air—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Paving over the farms.

Hon. Mr. White: —in contributions to a wide variety of cultural activities, now epitomized by our new Ministry of Culture and Recreation. And so, once again, in support of this changing order of priorities, we have moved in the forefront.

These, Mr. Speaker, are some of the areas in which strong emphasis is being placed by the government in its policies and programmes during this session. Already in the first few weeks several significant programme announcements have been made by the ministers of the Crown in support of many of these goals. I can assure you, sir, that there's no let up in sight.

A fair proportion of the debate on the Speech from the Throne was centred on housing. In the first days of this session the Minister of Housing announced to this House two more agreements with municipalities to accelerate production of another 17,000 units in Brampton and in Nepean township under the Ontario Housing Action Programme. In addition, he has reported that 24 developer agreements have so far been signed, covering 16,000 additional units and bringing a further 4,431 acres of land under development.

Mr. Deans: Statistics are meaningless.

Hon. Mr. White: Yet another major initiative under OHAP is a loan of \$8.8 million to Halton regional municipality—

Mr. Deans: Tell us about the income requirements. Tell us about the rental accommodations.

Hon. Mr. White: —to double the present sewage treatment capacity of the Burlington Skyway pollution control centre and pave the way for another 11,360 new housing units over the next five years.

Mr. Deans: How many people earning \$10,000 a year will get into those?

Hon. Mr. White: Further progress has been announced in measures to increase the supply of lower-priced accommodation by accelerating development of family rental units.

Mr. Deans: How many?

Hon. Mr. White: I need hardly remind you, Mr. Speaker, that while the members of this House all seem agreed that this is a crucial area of concern, unfortunately, it seems far less an item of priority on Ottawa's list.

Mr. Deans: That's right. Whenever something doesn't work, blame someone else.

Hon. Mr. White: The intemperate remarks, insulting in nature, spoken a moment or two ago by the hon. member for Sarnia in wind-

ing up for the Liberals concerning the hon. member for St. David's criticism of the federal government's intransigence in this area—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I think he called her everybody's mother-in-law.

Hon. Mr. White: —was not only incorrect, but was, once again, damaging to Ontario's cause.

An hon. member: Poppycock!

Hon. Mr. White: He said that the Liberals here wouldn't be known as the country cousins of the Liberals in Ottawa. We've never called them their country cousins. We call them their office boys!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: And, once again, the office boy from Sarnia was carrying the message. Of course, the federal government is starving us for housing funds. In an election year it can't be a coincidence.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Those fellows are really reading.

Hon. Mr. White: A further stage in the implementation of a comprehensive energy management programme, as announced on March 26—

Mr. Breithaupt: He will be finished soon.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: This is a \$75 million speech. Better listen to it.

Hon. Mr. White: —will effect economies within the government itself and also provide leadership and example to the private sector and the public at large. Simply, the goal of this programme is to reduce considerably the total demand for energy in Ontario. We hope to achieve this in four ways: Through better efficiency in the use of energy; through better management of energy distribution and consumption; by encouraging voluntary action on the part of industry and the general public; and through the adoption and practice of an energy conservation ethic throughout the province.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Lots of public relations.

Hon. Mr. White: A forceful illustration that the Canadian public has so far failed to take the matter very seriously appears in a survey by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, showing apparent changes in oil consumption in 16 of the world's most highly industrialized countries since the Middle East oil supply crisis made

itself felt. I must say that Canada's record doesn't look very good.

Mr. Breithaupt: Neither does Ontario's.

Hon. Mr. White: Fourteen of the 16 countries reduced their oil consumption over the previous year, ranging from 0.7 per cent reduction by Japan to over 19 per cent reduction by Belgium.

Mr. Breithaupt: They probably cut the speed limit.

Hon. Mr. White: The oil consumption was actually increased during the same period in Spain by 11.7 per cent and in Canada by 5.9 per cent. This is one of the things we're going to attempt to do, certainly internally, and to the extent that we can externally in this province.

Perhaps I should mention that once again our Premier, Treasurer and Minister of Energy will be going down on behalf of Ontario in the Confederation setting to protect—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): We hope they do a better job than last time.

Hon. Mr. White: —our people for the benefit of Canada and to protect our industries for the benefit of employment all across Canada. Once again, when we need some support from the Liberal clique in Ottawa, we find nothing but destructive moves by the member for Sarnia and his friends in the Liberal opposition.

Mr. Breithaupt: It's never Alberta's fault, is it?

Hon. Mr. White: So I would like to hear the Liberals say, before our Premier and his colleagues arrive in Ottawa, that the opposition here is in full support of our endeavours to keep the price of oil and gas right down where they are.

Mr. Deans: Tell us what the government's position is going to be.

Hon. Mr. White: I would like to hear the opposition say that. I would like to hear the Liberals here say that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Does the minister remember when, as Treasurer, he wanted to conserve energy and he said people should turn their thermostats down and put on their sweaters?

Hon. Mr. White: Well, I never did say that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We opposed him then. He had to back down on that. Remember?

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. White: Bearing in mind, Mr. Speaker, that the Province of Ontario is self-sufficient as an energy source and that at the same time we have one of the highest per capita rates of energy consumption in the world, it is plain that we must achieve the goal stated by the Minister of Energy, namely to reduce the growth rate in energy consumption in Ontario by one third over the next five years or, in terms of expenditures, by about \$1 billion a year.

Mr. Speaker, to continue in somewhat the same vein, I recall that the leader of the New Democratic Party expressed concern about what he calls the expansionary policies of the Ontario Hydro. It should be remembered that the generation development programme projected by Ontario Hydro over the next several years is without precedent in the kind of preliminary investigation and questioning that has taken place and which is far from over.

In fact, at the first full day's sitting on March 13, the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Grossman) announced the government's establishment of an independent commission of inquiry to hold public hearings into the long-range plans for Ontario's power needs. The minister's statement predicted that in an effort to meet the public's need to know what demands for electricity will be placed on Ontario Hydro in the future, and how these demands should be met, the hearings may be expected to take as long as two years.

Moreover, I would stress that the commitment to public participation in planning Ontario's electric power needs is ably demonstrated in the government's announced innovation of offering to fund potential participants, and this I must say is an innovation of very considerable significance.

Mr. Laughren: The Nyet line.

Hon. Mr. White: Legislation has been introduced to require environmental assessment of proposed major public projects from very early in the planning stages. Significant additions and increases to the Ontario Student Assistance Programme have been announced, making a total of \$47 million available in grants and bursaries in this fiscal year.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: More scholars to the dollar.

Hon. Mr. White: I really get to the Leader of the Opposition, don't I? It really pains him, doesn't it? To think that he can remember that from four years ago.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: More scholars to the dollar.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, why not?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Turn down the thermostat! Let him make that speech outside of this House and see how wrong he has been.

Hon. Mr. White: To think that he can remember my speeches from years ago, that touches me.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. White: The Ontario student loans plan and Ontario's special bursary programme offer new channels for assistance, primarily to part-time students and persons on social assistance or with low family incomes.

Now, sir, we have made a \$200,000 allocation through the Ontario Arts Council to support new cultural projects directly related to International Women's Year, and I was very interested to see that the women's organization who had put this request to us issued a press release about a week ago commending the Ontario government for once again taking the leadership in this area.

Mr. Laughren: Show us the legislation.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I have outlined several initiatives already undertaken in this session in some of the priority areas which were described in the Throne Speech. I can add that policies to meet the present labour relations climate, further incentives and support for the agricultural sector and to encourage farm production, as well as improved occupational and environmental health protection measures, to name some specifics, will be presented to this House by the ministers responsible.

So, Mr. Speaker, while the Leader of the Opposition may try to list what he regards as unfulfilled promises from past Throne Speeches, I would point more constructively to the overwhelming number of policies and legislative proposals that have been fulfilled.

I have every confidence that the policies and programmes which are being brought forward in this House, and which we shall continue to present for the consideration of members throughout the session, reflect a responsible approach by this government to the issues facing the people of Ontario.

In placing these priorities on record in the Speech from the Throne, the government has declared its intention to deal with these issues and we wish to get on with the job.

In conclusion, therefore, I have no hesitation in expressing my support for the Speech from the Throne put forward by this government and for what it means with respect to the quality of life and well-being of the people in Ontario. Neither do I have any hesitation, Mr. Speaker, in calling on all members of this Legislature to endorse, without amendment, the motion of the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. J. A. Taylor) as seconded by the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Lane).

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's a weak speech.

Mr. Speaker: The Throne debate being concluded, I shall call for the vote as follows:

Mr. Taylor moves, seconded by Mr. Lane, that a humble address be presented the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor as follows:

To the Honourable Pauline M. McGibbon, OC, BA, LLD, DU (Ottawa), BAA (Theatre), Lieutenant Governor of Ontario. May it please Your Honour:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has addressed to us.

Mr. R. F. Nixon moves, seconded by Mr. Deacon, that the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor now before the House be amended by adding thereto the following words:

This House regrets:

1. The failure of the government to enunciate a programme to moderate the combined effects of unemployment and inflation on our people and the economy.

2. The lack of a housing programme that will significantly reverse the downward trend in housing starts.

3. The absence of a clear commitment and programme to stop the waste in government spending caused by duplication of services, overlapping of government jurisdictions, and bad administrative judgement.

4. The absence of action to improve general labour-management negotiating

procedures which have been so detrimental to our economy and the work force.

5. The failure to enunciate a policy for the retention of agricultural land in production with compensation for landholders affected.

And, therefore, the government no longer has the confidence of this House or the people of Ontario.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's a good one.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Lewis moves, seconded by Mr. Deans, that the amendment to the motion be amended by adding thereto the following:

That this House regrets:

1. The failure of the government to provide political leadership in particular.

2. The failure of the Ministries of Health, Labour, Natural Resources and Environment to establish and enforce adequate standards for occupational safety and health.

3. The failure of the Chairman of Management Board and the ministries of Labour and Education to develop labour laws and collective bargaining procedures in the public and private sectors, to prevent the continuing breakdown of negotiations and subsequent strikes.

4. The failure of the Ministry of Housing to pursue policies which would combat the drastic decline in house building now occurring; to provide housing for low- and low-middle income groups within their income capacities; to control rents in rental accommodation and to prevent the conversion of rental accommodation to condominiums.

5. The failure of the Ministry of Energy to control the expansionary policies of Ontario Hydro and, further;

6. The failure of the Premier to provide the leadership required to combat the social and economic hardships which are affecting the citizens of Ontario.

As is usual procedure, first of all we shall vote on the amendment to the amendment which was moved by Mr. Lewis.

The House divided on the amendment to the amendment by Mr. Lewis, which was negated on the following vote:

AYES	NAYS
Bounsall	Apps
Braithwaite	Auld
Breithaupt	Bales
Bullbrook	Beckett
Burr	Belanger

AYES	NAYS
Campbell	Bennett
Cassidy	Bernier
Davison	Brunelle
Deacon	Carruthers
Deans	Carton
Duksza	Clement
Edighoffer	Downer
Ferrier	Drea
Foulds	Dymond
Gaunt	Eaton
Givens	Gilbertson
Good	Grossman
Haggerty	Handleman
Lawlor	Havrot
MacDonald	Hodgson
Martel	(York North)
Newman	Irvine
(Windsor- Walkerville)	Jessiman
Nixon	Kennedy
(Brant)	Lane
Paterson	Leluk
Reid	MacBeth
Renwick	Maeck
Riddell	McIlveen
Ruston	Morningstar
Singer	Morrow
Smith	Newman
(Nipissing)	(Ontario South)
Spence	Parrott
Stokes	Rhodes
Taylor	Rollins
(Carleton East)	Root
Worton-34.	Scrivener
	Smith
	(Simcoe East)
	Smith
	(Hamilton Mountain)
	Snow
	Stewart
	Taylor
	(Prince Edward-
	Lennox)
	Timbrell
	Turner
	Villeneuve
	Walker
	Wardle
	Welch

NAYS
Wells
White
Winkler
Wiseman
Yaremko-52.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 34, the "nays" 52.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment to the amendment lost.

The question now before the House is the amendment moved by Mr. R. F. Nixon.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to accept the same vote with respect to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed that the same division be recorded?

Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

We then come to the main motion, moved by Mr. J. A. Taylor, seconded by Mr. Lane. Shall the same division be reversed?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Reversed. Yes, sir.

Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

RESOLVED: That an humble address be presented to the Honourable Pauline M. McGibbon, Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Ontario:

May it please Your Honour:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects of the legislative assembly of the Province of Ontario, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has addressed to us.

Mr. Speaker: There being no further business at the moment I do now leave the chair.

It being 5:43 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

ERRATA

No.	Page	Col.	Line	Should read:
14	537	2	8	the then member for Riverdale, Mr. Macaulay
14	539	2	54	Marsh matter, and railway protection, for example.

APPENDIX

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

(117 members)

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Parliament

Speaker: Hon. Russell Daniel Rowe

Clerk of the House: Roderick Lewis, QC

Member	Party	Constituency
Allan, James N.	PC	Haldimand-Norfolk
Apps, C. J. S.	PC	Kingston and the Islands
Auld, Hon. James A. C.	PC	Leeds
Bales, Dalton A.	PC	York Mills
Beckett, Dick	PC	Brantford
Belanger, J. Albert	PC	Prescott and Russell
Bennett, Hon. Claude	PC	Ottawa South
Bernier, Hon. Leo	PC	Kenora
Birch, Hon. Margaret	PC	Scarborough East
Bounsall, Ted	NDP	Windsor West
Braithwaite, Leonard A.	L	Etobicoke
Breithaupt, James R.	L	Kitchener
Brunelle, Hon. Rene	PC	Cochrane North
Bullbrook, James E.	L	Sarnia
Burr, Fred A.	NDP	Sandwich-Riverside
Campbell, Margaret	L	St. George
Carruthers, Alex	PC	Durham
Carton, Gordon R.	PC	Armourdale
Cassidy, Michael	NDP	Ottawa Centre
Clement, Hon. John T.	PC	Niagara Falls
Davis, Hon. William G.	PC	Peel North
Davison, Norm	NDP	Hamilton Centre
Deacon, Donald M.	L	York Centre
Deans, Ian	NDP	Wentworth
Downer, Rev. A. W.	PC	Dufferin-Simcoe
Drea, Frank	PC	Scarborough Centre
Dukszta, Dr. Jan	NDP	Parkdale
Dymond, Dr. Matthew B.	PC	Ontario
Eaton, Robert G.	PC	Middlesex South
Edighoffer, Hugh	L	Perth
Evans, D. Arthur	PC	Simcoe Centre
Ewen, Donald Wm.	PC	Wentworth North
Ferrier, Rev. William	NDP	Cochrane South
Foulds, James F.	NDP	Port Arthur
Gaunt, Murray	L	Huron-Bruce
Germa, Melville C.	NDP	Sudbury
Gilbertson, Bernt	PC	Algoma
Gisborn, Reg.	NDP	Hamilton East
Givens, Philip G.	L	York-Forest Hill
Good, Edward R.	L	Waterloo North
Grossman, Hon. Allan	PC	St. Andrew-St. Patrick

Member	Party	Constituency
Haggerty, Ray	L	Welland South
Hamilton, Maurice	PC	Renfrew North
Handleman, Hon. Sidney B.	PC	Carleton
Havrot, Edward M.	PC	Timiskaming
Henderson, Lorne C.	PC	Lambton
Hodgson, R. Glen	PC	Victoria-Haliburton
Hodgson, William	PC	York North
Irvine, Hon. Donald R.	PC	Grenville-Dundas
Jessiman, James H.	PC	Fort William
Johnston, Robert M.	PC	St. Catharines
Kennedy, R. Douglas	PC	Peel South
Kerr, George A.	PC	Halton West
Lane, John	PC	Algoma-Manitoulin
Laughren, Floyd	NDP	Nickel Belt
Lawlor, Patrick D.	NDP	Lakeshore
Leluk, Nicholas G.	PC	Humber
Lewis, Stephen	NDP	Scarborough West
MacBeth, Hon. John P.	PC	York West
MacDonald, Donald C.	NDP	York South
Maeck, Lorne	PC	Parry Sound
Martel, Elie W.	NDP	Sudbury East
McIlveen, Dr. Charles E.	PC	Oshawa
McKeough, Hon. W. Darcy	PC	Chatham-Kent
McNeil, Ronald K.	PC	Elgin
McNie, Hon. Jack	PC	Hamilton West
Meen, Hon. Arthur K.	PC	York East
Miller, Hon. Frank S.	PC	Muskoka
Morningstar, Ellis P.	PC	Welland
Morrow, Donald H.	PC	Ottawa West
Newman, Bernard	L	Windsor-Walkerville
Newman, Hon. William	PC	Ontario South
Nixon, George	PC	Dovercourt
Nixon, Robert F.	L	Brant
Nuttall, Dr. W. J.	PC	Frontenac-Addington
Parrott, Dr. Harry C.	PC	Oxford
Paterson, Donald A.	L	Essex South
Potter, M.D., Hon. Richard T.	PC	Quinte
Reid, T. Patrick	L-Lab	Rainy River
Reilly, Leonard M.	PC	Eglinton
Renwick, James A.	NDP	Riverdale
Reuter, Allan E.	PC	Waterloo South
Rhodes, Hon. John R.	PC	Sault Ste. Marie
Riddell, John	L	Huron
Rollins, Clarke T.	PC	Hastings
Root, John	PC	Wellington-Dufferin
Rowe, Hon. Russell D.	PC	Northumberland
Roy, Albert J.	L	Ottawa East
Ruston, Richard F.	L	Essex-Kent
Samis, George	NDP	Stormont
Sargent, Edward	L	Grey-Bruce
Scrivener, Mrs. Margaret	PC	St. David
Shulman, Dr. Morton	NDP	High Park

Member	Party	Constituency
Singer, Vernon M.	L	Downsview
Smith, Gordon E.	PC	Simcoe East
Smith, John R.	PC	Hamilton Mountain
Smith, Richard S.	L	Nipissing
Snow, Hon. James W.	PC	Halton East
Spence, John P.	L	Kent
Stewart, Hon. Wm. A.	PC	Middlesex North
Stokes, Jack E.	NDP	Thunder Bay
Taylor, P.	L	Carleton East
Taylor, James A.	PC	Prince Edward-Lennox
Timbrell, Hon. Dennis R.	PC	Don Mills
Turner, John M.	PC	Peterborough
Villeneuve, Osie F.	PC	Glengarry
Walker, Gordon W.	PC	London North
Wardle, Thomas A.	PC	Beaches-Woodbine
Welch, Hon. Robert	PC	Lincoln
Wells, Hon. Thomas L.	PC	Scarborough North
White, Hon. John	PC	London South
Winkler, Hon. Eric A.	PC	Grey South
Wiseman, Douglas J.	PC	Lanark
Worton, Harry	L	Wellington South
Yakabuski, Paul J.	PC	Renfrew South
Yaremko, John	PC	Bellwoods
Young, Fred	NDP	Yorkview

MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

HON. WILLIAM G. DAVIS	<i>Premier and President of the Council</i>
HON. ROBERT WELCH	<i>Minister of Culture and Recreation</i>
HON. ALLAN GROSSMAN	<i>Provincial Secretary for Resources Development</i>
HON. WILLIAM A. STEWART	<i>Minister of Agriculture and Food</i>
HON. JAMES A. C. AULD	<i>Minister of Colleges and Universities</i>
HON. RENE BRUNELLE	<i>Minister of Community and Social Services</i>
HON. THOMAS L. WELLS	<i>Minister of Education</i>
HON. JOHN WHITE	<i>Minister without Portfolio</i>
HON. LEO BERNIER	<i>Minister of Natural Resources</i>
HON. ERIC A. WINKLER	<i>Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet</i>
HON. JAMES W. SNOW	<i>Minister of Government Services</i>
HON. RICHARD T. POTTER	<i>Minister of Correctional Services</i>
HON. JOHN T. CLEMENT	<i>Provincial Secretary for Justice and Attorney General; acting Solicitor General</i>
HON. JACK MCNIE	<i>Minister without Portfolio</i>
HON. MARGARET BIRCH	<i>Provincial Secretary for Social Development</i>
HON. CLAUDE BENNETT	<i>Minister of Industry and Tourism</i>
HON. W. DARCY MCKEOUGH	<i>Treasurer of Ontario, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs</i>
HON. ARTHUR K. MEEN	<i>Minister of Revenue</i>
HON. WILLIAM NEWMAN	<i>Minister of the Environment</i>
HON. SIDNEY B. HANDLEMAN	<i>Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations</i>
HON. FRANK S. MILLER	<i>Minister of Health</i>
HON. JOHN R. RHODES	<i>Minister of Transportation and Communications</i>
HON. DONALD R. IRVINE	<i>Minister of Housing</i>
HON. DENNIS R. TIMBRELL	<i>Minister of Energy</i>
HON. JOHN P. MACBETH	<i>Minister of Labour</i>

PARLIAMENTARY ASSISTANTS

- Mr. John R. Smith (Assistant to the Minister of Education)
Mr. Leonard M. Reilly (Assistant to the Minister of Industry and Tourism)
Mr. Gordon W. Walker (Assistant to the Minister of Health)
Mr. Robert G. Eaton (Assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food)
Mr. Dick Beckett (Assistant to the Treasurer and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs)
Mr. D. Arthur Evans (Assistant to the Minister of Energy)
Mr. Lorne Maeck (Assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources)
Dr. Harry C. Parrott (Assistant to the Minister of Colleges and Universities)
Mrs. Margaret Scrivener (Assistant to the Minister of Housing)
Mr. Frank Drea (Assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations)
Mr. John M. Turner (Assistant to the Provincial Secretary for Justice and Attorney General, and acting Solicitor General)
Mr. Nicholas G. Leluk (Assistant to the Minister of Culture and Recreation)
Dr. Charles E. McIlveen (Assistant to the Minister of Transportation and Communications)
Mr. Edward M. Havrot (Assistant to the Minister of Transportation and Communications)

CONTENTS

Monday, April 7, 1975

Liquor advertising, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. B. Newman ..	563
Federal-provincial conference on energy, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Stokes	564
Ottawa teachers' dispute, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Morrow, Mr. P. Taylor, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Lewis	565
Federal-provincial conference on energy, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. Renwick	566
Dow Chemical action, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Singer	568
Community health centres, questions of Mr. Miller: Mr. Duksza, Mr. MacDonald	568
Amethyst Harbour marina, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Jessiman ..	569
Porter commission members, question of Mr. Grossman: Mr. P. Taylor ..	569
Laurentian Hospital management, questions of Mr. Miller: Mr. Germa, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Martel	570
Commuter ticket interchangeability, question of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Deacon	570
Cochrane District Home for Aged, question of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Ferrier	571
Education costs in Cambridge, question of Mr. Wells: Mr. Good	571
Adoption of Vietnamese children, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Bounsall, Mr. B. Newman	571
Bruce county board of education, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Gaunt, Mr. Riddell	572
Textile industry, questions of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Samis	572
Inquiry into dump truck operations, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Breithaupt	573
Mopeds, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Burr, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Germa	573
Mercury pollution, question of Mr. Miller: Mr. Reid	574
Optometrists, question of Mr. Miller: Mr. Duksza	574
Township of Goulbourn Act, Mr. Morrow, first reading	575
City of Sault Ste. Marie Act, Mr. Gilbertson, first reading	575
Huron College Act, Mr. Walker, first reading	575
Landlord and Tenant Act, Mrs. Campbell, first reading	575
Conclusion of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Deans, Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. White	576
Recess, 5:43 o'clock	603
Appendix: Alphabetical list of the members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario ..	604



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, April 7, 1975

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 7, 1975

The House resumed at 8:30 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

The hon. House leader.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, I have a message from the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, signed by her own hand.

Mr. Speaker: By her own hand, Pauline M. McGibbon, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1976, and recommends them to the legislative assembly, Toronto, April 7, 1975.

NOTICE OF MOTION No. 2

Clerk of the House: Government notice of motion No. 2.

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves that this House approve in general the budgetary policy of the government.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

BUDGET ADDRESS

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I shall refer later on to those many people from the outside who gave their advice in the pre-budget discussions. Some of them are with us tonight and I welcome them to the House.

There are a number of people here also, sir, who I would like to recognize—many who worked on the preparation of the budget; Treasury staff, Management Board and its officials, and my colleagues and their staffs from a number of ministries; to them my thanks also.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Is the minister trying to spread the blame?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There are three former Treasurers here tonight—or at least two. The other one—the fire horse—will be here later after discharging certain responsibilities in his riding. Each of these gentlemen, my predecessors—the Minister without Portfolio, the member for London South (Mr. White), Mr. Charles MacNaughton, and the member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan)—were distinguished Treasurers of this province.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): That should be “extinguished.”

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Budget-making today is easier because of the sound moves which they made and which have resulted in the excellent financial position of our province today.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): The minister doesn't even have to throw them a fish tonight.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Lastly, sir, my personal budget maker is here, my wife. Her patience and understanding have been more than necessary these last few months.

Mr. Cassidy: She probably has it better than the minister.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Her concerns as to whether I was married to her or the provincial budget did surface once or twice and the hon. members may be sure that I shall hasten to balance that account forthwith.

Sir John A. Macdonald once jokingly referred to his employment as a cabinet maker; a treasurer in the same spirit, or a minister of finance, especially in a year of economic problems, might be tempted to list his occupation as rain-maker.

Many in this House and in the province, perhaps, might wish for a little magic—a little miracle working on budget night 1975.

I am not aiming, sir, for miracles or magic. Realism and practicality will accomplish what is needed.

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal briefly with the economic outlook

on which the budget plan is based. Along with other major economies, Canada has experienced high rates of inflation for some time, while more recently it has begun to feel the effects of a world-wide weakening in economic growth. The development of policies to meet this twin challenge requires the fullest understanding of current and prospective economic developments in Canada and Ontario, and on the broader international scene.

Consequently, the government has engaged in extensive consultations with representatives of a wide cross-section of the economy. As part of this dialogue, I met with representatives from industry and commerce, from finance, farming and small business, as well as consumers, the labour movement, the legal and accounting professions, and independent economic research organizations. I would like to express my appreciation for the contribution they have made.

Without going into the details of these discussions, there was general agreement on two main points: first, that the Ontario economy is basically sound; and second, that the present slow-down is temporary and the economy has good potential for a revival in the near-term future.

I believe—and there is widespread but not unanimous agreement on this—that with sound policies at all levels of government, with reasonable international recovery, and with responsible conduct by the private sector, we can anticipate an economic upturn in the latter half, and especially in the last quarter, of 1975.

The most commonly expressed concern was that the strength of inflationary pressures constitutes the main threat to Canada's economic stability and international competitiveness in the years ahead.

The budgetary policies I am about to announce articulate this province's determination to do its part to make the recovery a reality both in the near and long term.

I will list briefly some of these key policies:

I propose a substantial reduction in the retail sales tax.

I propose the elimination of the retail sales tax on production machinery and equipment.

I propose payment of grants to first-time home buyers and other measures to increase the availability of housing in Ontario.

Our budget plan, sir, involves the use of the province's resources in a balanced set

of general and selective actions which will stimulate the economy immediately and will work to increase investment and productivity. In so doing, it will relieve longer-term inflationary pressures. It also provides leadership in combating inflation through the achievement of the government's social and economic objectives within a framework of overall restraint in the growth of the public sector in Ontario.

I would like to draw attention, Mr. Speaker, to the appendices and budget papers which accompany this statement. Provincial-local and federal-provincial matters are dealt with in the appendices as well as the details of tax and other changes. The economic outlook is discussed in budget paper A, which also examines the impact on the Ontario economy of increases in natural gas and oil prices. Budget paper B provides an overview of provincial and local government spending.

I believe the economy needs only temporary stimulation to ensure its recovery to a higher level of performance by the end of 1975. Three areas which most require strengthening are consumer spending, investment and housing.

I shall deal first with my proposals to stimulate consumer spending. All consumers have felt the effect of inflation on their purchasing power and those on fixed or low incomes have had difficulty in making ends meet. The impact of waning consumer confidence has been felt throughout the whole economy. Automobile sales have been slow and the sales of major appliances and home furnishings have been affected by the housing slow-down. Therefore, I am proposing two sets of measures to reinforce incomes and purchasing power.

To stimulate consumer spending, the basic retail sales tax rate will be reduced from seven per cent to five per cent, effective midnight this day. This tax cut will remain in effect until December 31, 1975.

Mr. Cassidy: Then it goes back up, eh?

Mr. Martel: Must be an election issue.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The benefits of this action will spread rapidly throughout the economy. Initially, it will stimulate spending on cars, stoves, refrigerators, colour televisions and so on. This increased activity will flow into distribution, manufacturing and other industries and generate increased production and jobs.

The tax savings to the consumer will be substantial. For example, the saving on the

purchase of a new automobile will be about \$100, and on appliances and furnishings for a new home up to \$125. The direct benefits to consumers from this tax cut will amount to \$230 million this year.

In addition to benefiting indirectly from increased consumer spending induced by the tax cut, Ontario businesses will enjoy \$100 million in direct cost reductions on the purchase of taxable items. To supplement this action, I shall propose tonight additional incentives to strengthen business investment and productivity.

The second set of actions which I am proposing tonight will bolster consumer incomes through selective income tax cuts, enriched guaranteed annual income payments and new health benefits.

Over the past three years, the Ontario government has implemented major tax relief and income support programmes. In 1972, Ontario launched a comprehensive property tax credit system to channel tax relief to those most in need. This was achieved by linking property tax burdens to the ability-to-pay principle of the personal income tax system. In 1973, this programme was broadened to include sales tax credits and pensioner tax credits, and in 1974 further enrichments were made to offset the adverse effects of inflation.

In 1972, the value of Ontario tax credits was \$182 million; in 1974, the value had risen to \$375 million. Ontario's tax credit system has served as a model for other provinces and is the first major application of the refundable tax credit approach to achieve meaningful tax reform in Canada.

In addition to providing major tax relief, the government has implemented other selective measures to assist those who are least able to cope with rising costs during this period of high inflation. The Provincial Guaranteed Annual Income System, GAINS, was introduced in July 1974, for those who have reached retirement age and those who are unable to participate actively in the economy due to disability or blindness. Last year, this programme delivered over \$84 million in direct financial benefits to more than 300,000 people in Ontario. A complementary programme of free prescription drugs was implemented in September 1974, providing \$17 million in benefits to pensioners in Ontario and to all provincial social assistance recipients.

Mr. Speaker, income guarantees for the elderly and disadvantaged and income protection for low-income taxpayers remain a

foremost priority of this government. Tonight I shall announce three important measures which will provide increased income support, new health benefits and further tax relief to Ontario citizens.

First, I am proposing to raise the Ontario GAINS guarantee to \$240 a month per person effective May 1. This brings our guaranteed income standard to \$2,880 annually for single pensioners, and to \$5,760 for a married couple.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The best in Canada.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Not in the world?

Mr. Cassidy: The government won't protect them against rising rents.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This will increase GAINS payments to 303,000 beneficiaries who are currently on the programme, and extend new benefits to an additional 7,000 pensioners. The higher guarantee will deliver an additional \$13 million in benefits, raising the total value of GAINS payments for this fiscal year to \$138 million. As a result, Ontario will offer the highest guaranteed annual income to pensioners anywhere in Canada.

Mr. Martel: The trouble is it starts at 65.

Mr. Cassidy: What about low-income families? What about them?

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): I can almost smell an election.

Mr. Cassidy: What about the Portuguese workers?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member is out.

Mr. Lawlor: Are we going to have an election tomorrow?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) can go home too.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I am proposing to extend the free prescription drug programme to all pensioners in Ontario, effective Aug. 1, 1975. The drug benefit plan, introduced last September, has made available free of charge nearly 1,400 essential prescription drugs to 340,000 low-income pensioners and to 306,000 social assistance recipients. This programme has operated efficiently at a relatively low cost of \$59 per pensioner on an annual basis. Accordingly, I am proposing to extend this

programme to all Ontario residents aged 65 years and over at an additional cost of \$15 million this year. Ontario's free prescription drug programme will benefit one million people, or one out of every eight people in the province.

Mr. Martel: Again the Treasurer is playing follow-the-leader.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Finally, I am proposing to remove 450,000 people from the provincial income tax rolls in 1975. As a result of the last federal budget, these people were removed from the federal tax rolls—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The Chairman of Management Board is applauding in the wrong place.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —yet remained liable for Ontario income tax. I am proposing to eliminate completely the Ontario income tax liability of these individuals in 1975 at a cost of \$11 million.

Mr. Singer: Now I heard the minister.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Now it is the member's turn.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: As a result, a family of four with income of \$6,033 will pay no income tax. Moreover, this same family will receive \$262 in Ontario tax credits. Above the \$6,033 income level, tax credits will be more than the Ontario income tax liability up to an income level of \$8,275, where the Ontario tax credits will exactly offset provincial income tax. Beyond this tax-free threshold level of \$8,275, the family of four becomes a net taxpaying unit.

Similarly, no income tax will be levied and substantial tax credits will be paid to single individuals having up to \$3,583 income, married couples with up to \$5,323 income, or single pensioners with up to \$5,547 income.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Let him tell us where he gets the money.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: From the member.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Above these income levels, Ontario's tax credits will offset provincial income tax liability to produce a tax-free threshold of \$5,570 for a single individual, \$7,480 for a married couple and \$8,890 for a single pensioner. These high tax-free thresholds ensure that Ontario's income tax and tax credit system remains the most generous in Canada.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Is there any other place

the member for Downsview would rather live?

Mr. P. Taylor (Carleton East): Where is the Premier (Mr. Davis)?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I would call the attention of the members to two important collateral benefits of this income tax reform. Elimination of the provincial income tax liability for these 450,000 low-income individuals means their Ontario tax credit refunds for the 1975 year will automatically increase. Equally significant, by reducing their 1975 taxable income to zero, it means that these people will be entitled to full premium assistance next year under our health insurance plan. This represents a further significant advance in the total equity of Ontario's tax structure.

In summary, the income security measures I have outlined will deliver an additional \$39 million benefits in the 1975-1976 fiscal year. They provide further protection against inflation to low-income families and help Ontario's elderly citizens to enjoy a reasonable standard of living and freedom from the burden of drug costs in their retirement years.

In total, my proposals to reinforce incomes and purchasing power will cost \$369 million in 1975-1976.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): And a big deficit!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I shall now introduce important proposals designed to help the province's small businessmen and farmers.

The place of the small business in our economy is an important one. Over half of all Ontario corporations have gross revenue of less than \$100,000. By providing special assistance to nurture the early growth of these small enterprises, we ensure a dynamic and diversified economic base for future generations.

The farming community plays an equally important role in our economy, and special measures are needed to encourage farming and to maintain food production.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): The minister is starting to realize that, is he?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: My new proposals for small business include the enrichment of Ontario's small business tax credit and a measure to compensate small business for the cost of the collection of the retail sales tax.

Mr. Cassidy: They have been waiting 20 years for that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Order.

Mr. Cassidy: When they started to desert the government, it started to play up to them. That is called greasing the electoral machinery.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In addition, the province will renew its request that the federal government adopt our 1974 budget proposals concerning venture investment corporations. Federal participation is essential both to ensure that this incentive is sufficiently powerful and to prevent unnecessary differences between the Ontario and federal tax systems.

In the 1974 Ontario budget, my predecessor introduced an investment-related income tax credit for Ontario small businesses. Corporations qualifying as small business are able to claim a tax credit equal to five per cent of the increase in their invested capital in Ontario to a maximum of \$3,000 annually. I now propose that Ontario double its small business credit limit from \$3,000 to \$6,000 annually.

Mr. Sargent: Big deal!

Hon. Mr. Keough: We're interested in small businessmen, not big punks like the member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Cassidy: Like Gerhard Moog, eh?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This generous enrichment of the incentive will cost about \$15 million in 1975-1976. It will alleviate the burden which inflation is imposing on growing companies.

Mr. Speaker: the government has received many requests from small business organizations and associations to compensate vendors for the cost of collecting the retail sales tax. I have been persuaded by the merit of the arguments advanced regarding the time-consuming tax of collecting, recording and remitting of sales tax by small vendors.

Mr. Cassidy: The Treasurer has been persuaded by the impending election.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Consequently, I am now proposing the following compensation

to all vendors for collection of retail sales tax, effective July 1, 1975: three per cent of the tax collected per return, and maximum compensation of \$500 in each fiscal year. This should substantially offset collection costs of small business. Vendors with sales of about \$300,000 per year will receive the maximum amount of \$500. The cost of this measure in 1975-1976 is estimated at \$11 million.

The government will also make a major effort to streamline and improve its tax administration during the year ahead. Our objectives will be to reduce the costs of compliance, to simplify forms and procedures, to follow wherever possible the federal administration, and to speed up rulings and decisions. These changes, which should be of benefit to large and small business alike, will be carried forward by my colleague, the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Meen).

For my part, I shall propose later in this statement a number of policy changes which bring Ontario's tax legislation into closer harmony with that of the federal government.

In addition to the continuing support provided by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food through several assistance programmes, a number of important tax incentives have been introduced over the past four years to assist the farming community. These include:

Substantial reductions in property taxes for farmers through the farm tax rebate.

An hon. member: Sounds like a good budget.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Okay, they don't need you.

Mr. Roy: The Premier is just in time for the bad news.

Mr. Foulds: The member for St. Catharines (Mr. Johnston) didn't applaud that one.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Other measures to assist the farming community have included the forgiveness of succession duties for family farms, and reduction in the paid-up capital tax for family farm corporations.

This year my colleagues, the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) and the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier), will be introducing legislation to implement the following new programmes to provide support to the farming community:

The Agricultural Products Stabilization Act currently before Parliament will be supple-

mented as necessary by the province. We recognize that costs of production, such as fertilizer and energy, are escalating and that price stabilization measures per se may prove insufficient. Provision has been made in the estimates of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food for first-year funding of \$20 million.

Since 1973, the government of Ontario has repaid to Ontario farmers 50 per cent of property taxes on farms. The government now proposes to make the same rebate available to the owners of managed forests who are resident in Ontario. Fifty per cent of property taxes on forests which meet certain management criteria will be rebated, at a cost of \$2 million in 1975-1976.

Mr. Foulds: Is that Crown land or private land?

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): This sounds like a Household Finance budget.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The first in North America.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): It's a terrible budget. This isn't an economic document. It's a political document.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member should ask his Ottawa friends. They could tell him that answer. Don't let him talk to us.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Since 1969, Ontario has successively reduced the burden of succession duties, and in particular has exempted all transfers between spouses. However, in some circumstances succession duties can still be onerous on families operating farms and businesses. To ensure the continuation and growth of our family farms and businesses in Ontario and to allow for the impact of inflation generally, I propose the following improvements to our succession duty and gift tax, effective midnight tonight—

Mr. Cassidy: An improvement is an increase, not a decrease.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The basic \$150,000 allowance will be increased to \$250,000 and will become a deduction for all estates.

Mr. Cassidy: That's going to go down well with the people in my riding.

An hon. member: Don't die tonight.

An hon. member: No, wait until tomorrow morning.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The present forgiveness period for family farms will be shortened from 20 years to 10 years.

The succession duty payable in respect of assets of small family businesses will also be forgiven over 10 years. To qualify for forgiveness of duty, the business must remain in the family and must remain an active business. The basic exemption for gift tax will be raised from \$2,000 per recipient, and an aggregate of \$10,000 in any one year to \$5,000 per recipient, and a total of \$25,000 in any one year.

Mr. Martel: I don't know why he doesn't fix it so none of them will pay tax.

Mr. Cassidy: A real social need too.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The purpose of this change is to recognize the impact of inflation on asset values and to facilitate the transfer of capital to children and grandchildren—

Mr. Cassidy: It is a sellout to people who are wealthy, that is what it is.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —for example, for the purpose of a down payment on a home.

The once-in-a-lifetime special exemption for farmers under the Gift Tax Act will be raised from \$50,000 to \$75,000. Under a new provision Ontario family businesses will also enjoy a once-in-a-lifetime gift tax exemption of \$75,000.

These reforms will reduce the number of taxable estates—

Mr. Cassidy: This is socialism for the rich.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and ensure that every taxable estate in Ontario will enjoy tax savings at a cost of \$8 million annually.

To summarize this section, **Mr. Speaker**, the package of measures I have proposed tonight to strengthen small business and farming will provide \$56 million in important benefits.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: As I have already stated, I am confident that under the impact of the temporary consumer and housing measures proposed in this budget, the economy will be moving to higher levels of activity by the year end. Nevertheless, in the longer term our competitive position in the world economy remains a major problem. Consequently, I am proposing additional

measures which are designed to encourage investment and strengthen the productivity of the Ontario economy; reduce production costs and enhance the ability of Ontario to compete in export markets; and provide protection against a resumption of inflationary forces through increased productive capacity.

The federal government has enacted some long-term measures to assist the manufacturing and processing sectors. Ontario has supported this federal action by extending its fast write-off provisions to the end of 1976. I now propose a further extension of these provisions to the end of 1977 to allow more time to build up essential production capacity. I am also proposing additional incentives to expand investment and productivity in Ontario over the longer term.

Effective immediately, the retail sales tax will be eliminated on purchases of production-related machinery and equipment. The exemption will apply to purchases for the period ending Dec. 31, 1977.

Mr. Lawlor: How much is that going to cost us?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: To qualify, businesses must meet the following criteria: Orders for machinery and equipment must be placed on or after April 8, 1975, and before Jan. 1, 1977; and delivery must take place on or before Dec. 31, 1977.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Great stuff.

Mr. Lawlor: It never had any effect before.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This measure will encourage investment, broaden the industrial base and modernize Ontario production facilities.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on. Come on.

Mr. Foulds: How many jobs will it create?

Mr. Lewis: Does the Treasurer remember the investment tax credits?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the main thrust for that section came from the United Auto Workers, so before the members opposite sound off they had better check with them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): What a revolting development!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The leader of the NDP had better go back down south.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The construction, manufacturing, mining and logging sectors will experience major cost reductions. Examples of tax savings on important pieces of machinery used in these industries follow in the budget statement.

Mr. Lewis: None of them in the auto industry, it should be pointed out—none of them in the auto industry.

Mr. Sargent: Right.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This bold action will improve the competitive position of Ontario business in both domestic and foreign markets at an estimated cost of \$410 million over the full term of the programme.

Mr. Lewis: That's \$410 million to the corporations.

Hon. C. Bennett (Minister of Industry and Tourism): To the member's friends.

Mr. Lewis: The government's people.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: For the 1975-1976 fiscal year \$108 million revenue will be forgone, even taking into account the new reduced rate of sales tax. Over 25 per cent of this amount will benefit—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The leader of the NDP will save money on his house sale.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Not with this.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Save a lot of dough.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —export-oriented industries. I'll repeat that for my friend, the minister. Over 25 per cent of this amount will benefit export-oriented industries.

Mr. Lewis: A straight gift to the corporations.

Mr. Lawlor: A gift tax for corporations.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: A gift for the workers.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, currently, gasoline and diesel taxes apply on industrial, commercial and institutional uses of these fuels as well as on their use in licensed vehicles. I propose to further reduce costs of production by eliminating the gasoline and diesel fuel taxes on the industrial, commercial and institutional uses immediately. This move will also strengthen the competitive position of industries consuming

energy for productive purposes. It will alleviate some of the rising costs experienced through inflation and be of particular benefit to industries in northern Ontario.

This measure will also result in major cost savings to schools, hospitals and other institutions, and simplify our tax administration. The estimated cost of this tax relief is \$19 million in the current fiscal year.

Mr. Lawlor: Only \$19 million? That's pretty good; lower than last time.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The extension of the Pollution Abatement Incentive Act, proposed by my colleague, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. W. Newman), and enacted by the Legislature, is designed to stimulate investment in pollution abatement equipment. This measure, which will be in effect for a further one-year period, is expected to provide an additional \$1.5 million in tax equivalent grants to purchasers of qualifying equipment.

I am also proposing a two-year extension of the fast write-off on environmental protection equipment to parallel the federal extension. This incentive, which will cost about \$2 million in each of the two years, will encourage industry in the purchase of water and air pollution control equipment. These measures should further extend the basic protection of the environment from the effects of industrial wastes.

Mr. Speaker, it is the policy of this government, on evaluation of federal corporate income tax changes, to maintain consistency between the federal and provincial tax structures wherever feasible. In some cases, uniformity may benefit the corporate taxpayer by eliminating uncertainty and reducing the costs of compliance. I have studied the changes introduced in the federal budget of last November and I now propose that this province parallel the following changes.

In my 1972 budget, I announced that Ontario would not parallel the international provisions of the federal tax reform legislation at that time. Those international provisions were too harsh and threatened the desirable expansion of Canadian-based multinational companies. I expressed the hope that the federal government would recognize the need to moderate these provisions so that our multinational companies would be able to compete in international markets.

Mr. Foulds: How can he talk about our multinational companies?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member had better be nice.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The federal government has now recognized the need for changes in its international tax provisions. Recent amendments result in an acceptable set of rules for the taxation of international income and should curtail the use of foreign tax havens. I recognize that the federal legislation is complex. The intent of the new rules and the practical advantages to Ontario corporations, however, have convinced me that Ontario should parallel these provisions in its own legislation.

The federal budget moved the due date for the final payment of corporation tax from three months after corporate fiscal year-ends to two months. Small businesses were not affected by this change and can continue to make final payments within the three-month period.

For Ontario tax payment purposes, I propose that this federal action be paralleled. This will apply to corporations with year-ends after July 31, 1975, and will result in a forward adjustment in the province's cash flow of approximately \$100 million.

I am also proposing that Ontario parallel a number of other corporate tax changes contained in recent federal legislation.

Oil and gas royalties will be disallowed as a deduction for Ontario corporate income tax purposes. I estimate that this measure could produce \$30 million in revenue in this fiscal year.

The capital cost allowances on new multi-unit residential rental buildings started after Nov. 18, 1974, and before Dec. 31, 1975, may be claimed against other income.

A 15 per cent capital cost allowance will be applied to timber limits, rights or licences to cut timber after May 6, 1974.

The tax-free reserves of large financial institutions will be reduced from 1½ per cent to one per cent on eligible assets exceeding \$2 billion, effective Jan. 1, 1975.

There will be unlimited deduction for scientific research expenditures and carry forward of any unclaimed amounts.

And federal provisions relating to corporate reorganizations and rollovers will also be paralleled.

I do not propose to parallel federal moves in two important respects. The federal government has disallowed carrying costs on land held for development as a deduction against other income. This measure will not accelerate significantly the availability of serviced lots over the short term. Over the longer term, it may hinder careful planning

and indeed ultimately lower supply and increase the final price of such lots.

Mr. P. Taylor: What about land speculation?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Ontario will maintain its policy of allowing full deduction of all Canadian exploration and development expenses as a measure to encourage future expansion of the resource industries. This is in direct contrast to the recent federal changes, which limit the annual deductibility of development expenses to 30 per cent for mining and petroleum companies.

Mr. Cassidy: The UDI and the mining industry got to the minister.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, you will recall that in 1973 the Ministry of Housing was established to mobilize resources and to expand the supply of reasonably priced housing for Ontario residents.

Mr. Singer: Tell us about that.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Consequently, over the past two years the government has more than tripled its financial support to this ministry. For 1975-1976, the province's total funding for housing programmes and town-site development will amount to \$526 million.

Mr. Singer: How much remains unspent?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Unfortunately, our strong action has not been matched by the federal government.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): And the hon. members know it is true.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is the member for St. David (Mrs. Scrivener) sure she doesn't want to interject?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Indeed, it appears to have taken advantage of our increased financing to reduce its own commitment in this area. Over the past two years Central Mortgage allocations for Ontario have increased by only 7.5 per cent from \$412 million to \$443 million from 1973 to 1975.

Mr. Lewis: At least they spent it all.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: My colleague, the Minister of Housing (Mr. Irvine) will be providing full details of Ontario's housing actions. At this time, I shall highlight only the major programme enrichments for 1975.

Mr. Lewis: Bogus.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The 1975 budget allocation for the Ontario Housing Action Programme grants and loans to municipalities—

Mr. Lewis: An Ontario housing announcement programme.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —has more than doubled from \$19 million in 1974-1975 to a funding level of \$43 million in 1975-1976. Advances to the Ontario Mortgage Corp. will be increased from \$133 million to \$208 million for OHAP, HOME and socially assisted housing programmes.

Mr. Lewis: That was already announced last October.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In conjunction with the above initiatives, the government will also take steps to broaden the mix of new housing through its Home Ownership Made Easy programme for moderate-income families.

In support of our senior citizens and low-income family households—

Mr. Singer: We need more land.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —the government has augmented its budget in this area by some 57 per cent to a total of \$87 million. With complementary federal financing, this will generate 10,600 new senior-citizen and subsidized units for 1975-1976. Even if the necessary federal financing is not forthcoming, Ontario pledges to hold to this target.

Mr. Cassidy: We have heard it too many times before.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister have chutzpah!

Mr. Roy: They don't believe the minister any more.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In addition to expanding its basic housing programmes, the government is taking action on other fronts to increase the supply of serviced lots. Capital investment in water and sewer facilities has been increased from \$81 million in 1973-1974 to \$138 million in 1975-1976. This provides for expansion of sewage and water treatment plants and construction of major trunk lines to service new and growing communities.

Mr. Speaker, this government accepts the important responsibility of ensuring good housing for all of our people and we intend to discharge that responsibility.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): There were 25,000 fewer homes this past year.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The ministries of the government have joined in a concerted effort to assist the Ministry of Housing in tackling the urgent job of expanding the supply of housing. Regional and local municipalities also have a vital role to play in achieving this objective.

Mr. Cassidy: How many housing starts will there be this year?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I recognize that our municipal partners may feel their responsibility is primarily to their residents. But we trust them to take a broader view. We expect they will work with the Ministry of Housing so that the necessary new housing will be provided for our growing population.

Mr. Cassidy: How far is housing going to sink this year?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In my opinion, the federal programme of \$500 grants announced in November, 1974, is having only marginal effects in Ontario—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Picayune.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Picayune is a good word—because of the limited size of the grant, the restriction that the home must be a new home and the unrealistic price criteria. The legislation I will introduce tonight will be considerably more powerful.

Effective tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, anyone purchasing a first home in Ontario will receive a \$1,000 grant from the province, plus an additional \$250 in each of the two succeeding years, for a total grant of \$1,500.

Mr. MacDonald: That represents about five per cent of the price increase in the last year.

Mr. Cassidy: The prices will go up by \$1,000 between now and June. Mark my words.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This first home buyer grant programme will remain in effect until December 31, 1975.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. Treasurer has the floor.

Mr. Cassidy: The price will eat that up in two months.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member is sorry because he is not in on it, that's all.

Mr. Cassidy: The government has got rotten housing policies. We will put the figures on the record.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Order. I know there is lots of enthusiasm in the room tonight but—

Mr. Lewis: If the Treasurer had done this last week, I would have had more offers by now.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I would ask that the hon. minister be allowed to continue. The hon. Treasurer.

Mr. Cassidy: We are just giving him a break, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, this programme will cover new and used homes and apply regardless of the price of the home or the income of the purchaser. I estimate that this programme will pay out \$55 million in grants during the balance of this year.

The major features of Ontario's new first home buyer grant are contained in appendix B.

Mr. Lewis: Now listen to this; this is an interesting one.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In addition to the first home buyer grant programme, there will be other spinoff benefits to housing from the sales tax cuts I have already announced.

Mr. Sargent: Why doesn't the government open an office in Saigon?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I estimate that the reduction in the retail sales tax to five per cent will itself provide \$25 million in cost savings on building materials used in housing.

Mr. Lewis: The Treasurer missed a line.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Moreover, additional benefits will accrue through tax savings on construction equipment and through increased employment in the building trades.

Mr. Lewis: He missed a line.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: As mentioned earlier, Ontario has matched the federal capital cost allowance for rental units. In view of the shortage of rental accommodation, I strongly urge the federal government to extend this provision beyond 1975.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Your point of order?

Mr. Lewis: The Treasurer missed one line in his budget statement.

Mr. Speaker: That is not a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That's okay. We will subsidize the member.

Mr. Lewis: That's okay. I know the government is helping me.

Mr. N. G. Leluk (Humber): He's grand-standing again.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Treasurer will continue.

Mr. Lawlor: He changed his mind, that's all.

Mr. Lewis: He missed the line that says that the programme only lasts until December, 1975.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I read that. The member was too busy calculating it on that house of his in Scarborough. I certainly did it right there.

Mr. Cassidy: The Treasurer's programme will fall apart by the time he goes out to-night.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I further urge the federal government to reconsider its decision to disallow carrying costs on lands held for development.

Mr. Martel: Is this an election year?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the housing industry has demonstrated consistently its ability to expand Ontario's stock to meet the needs of our growing population. At this time there are signs of a resurgence in the industry. I believe there will be an ample supply of mortgage funds available at somewhat lower rates.

Mr. Cassidy: What about the tenants?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: These factors, combined with the powerful measures I am introducing in this budget will—I am confident—greatly improve the outlook, providing new homes and new jobs. With a comparable degree of federal commitment and municipal support, I expect that 90,000 new units will be started in Ontario this year.

Mr. Sargent: They don't believe him anymore.

Mr. Lewis: Ninety thousand? Now there's a target for you; there's a target.

Mr. Cassidy: What about Comay?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Before leaving the subject of housing, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MacDonald: That's 20,000 down from last year.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —let me spend a moment on the important related matters of land use planning, regional development and decentralization of growth in Ontario.

Mr. Roy: Oh boy.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: These long-run policies will shape the future of our society and will make a major contribution to the quality of life in Ontario in the decades ahead.

Mr. Bullbrook: Should sell tickets.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We have, sir, assembled land for three new towns. The creation of industrial parks will support our regional planning objectives. The government of Ontario recognizes the need to diversify industrial development more broadly throughout the province.

Mr. Bullbrook: Let him sell tickets. Don't fool around with credit.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This will relieve the pressures of growth on the metropolitan areas and expand job opportunities in the slower growth regions. Thirty million dollars has been set aside in 1975-1976 for the funding of industrial parks. This will provide for the completion of the Edwardsburgh acquisition and the purchase of land for industrial purposes in northern and eastern Ontario in a programme to be announced by my colleague, the Minister of Industry and Tourism.

Mr. Cassidy: Which they are recycling for the third time.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Within the next month, we expect to table the interim plan for the parkway belt west and the area to be covered by development controls in the Niagara Escarpment planning area. The cost of acquisition of the public-use lands in both the escarpment and the parkway belt is very high. For example, it is estimated that over \$500 million—

Mr. Lawlor: They left it so long.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —will be necessary for the purchase of such lands in the parkway belt west alone.

Before the end of the session I intend to place before the Legislature development

plans for northeastern and eastern Ontario, together with a planning strategy for the province. These will set out alternatives for our future development. Because the ultimate choices that are made will affect the lives and the livelihoods of many people, the government will seek the widest possible public response.

Mr. P. Taylor: What are they going to do for eastern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Now, sir, the measures I have just outlined are designed to generate immediate expansion in the private sector of the Ontario economy. Members will note that each of the major measures that I am proposing to stimulate the economy is temporary and is designed to avoid an over-response when the economy regains its customary momentum.

Mr. Lewis: Hopefully right after the election.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would also stress that this government has resisted the temptation to take up the current slack in the economy through increased government expenditures.

Mr. Singer: Oh, perish the thought.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Such a course would have been counter-productive by locking the province onto a higher spending plateau.

Mr. Singer: No way.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right after the election, right after.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In planning this budget, I have kept at the centre of my attention the long-run problem of productivity and the role that government spending at all levels has played in the inflation process. I am convinced that one of the root causes of the current inflation problem in Canada is excessive government spending and unnecessary growth in the size and complexity of the public sector.

An hon. member: And those guys would spend twice as much.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Federal, federal.

Mr. Cassidy: They have already spent a billion dollars tonight.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Roy: Oh, how cynical!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This has shifted an increasing share of our total resources out of private production uses in the economy and has eroded the taxpayer's hard-earned income.

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: With this budget, therefore, Ontario continues and extends its tough measures to curb the growth of government.

Mr. Roy: Oh, how cynical!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all members recognize that the high inflation of recent years has had a substantial impact on provincial and local government expenditures. Like the private sector, governments as employers and as purchasers of goods and services have been faced with rapidly rising costs of materials and with escalating wage and salary demands.

Mr. Singer: Yes sir.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Nevertheless, we have managed to control the growth in our spending so that the public sector claim on the total output of the Ontario economy has not increased.

In 1971, federal, provincial and local government spending in Ontario accounted for one-third of our gross provincial product. In 1974, the size of the public sector remained at one-third of the economy as a whole. By contrast, the public sector has steadily increased in size for Canada as a whole, rising from 36 per cent of gross national product in 1971 to 37.5 per cent in 1974. This record of public sector stability in Ontario versus growth in the rest of Canada is well documented in budget paper B.

Mr. MacDonald: That's a piece of nonsense.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In the development of the 1975 budget, a prime objective has been to continue our restraint on expenditure growth. Accordingly, the 1975 expenditure estimates tabled and to be tabled by my colleague, the Chairman of the Management Board, call for a 16.8 per cent increase in budgetary expenditure and an overall increase in budgetary plus non-budgetary spending of only 12.2 per cent.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Take a look at the federal.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I believe that continuing restraint on spending is an obligation

for all governments at this time, in order to set an example of responsible leadership to the community at large.

Mr. Shulman: This government has failed in that.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In this way more of our total resources will be available for expansion of private output and government operations themselves will not contribute to inflationary pressures.

Mr. Singer: Twenty-eight per cent.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The government's plan of expenditure control concentrates on its own operations and has four main elements:

Ministries have reviewed their civil service complement to achieve an overall reduction for the government of 2.5 per cent.

Ministries will be required to absorb within their 1975-1976 estimates all in-year cost increases resulting solely from inflation.

All programmes are being reviewed with a view to eliminating those, such as the Emergency Measures Organization, which have outlived their usefulness.

Mr. Singer: Did I write the minister's budget papers for him?

An hon. member: No, there are contracts on that.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Provincial building projects have been postponed wherever feasible, except in the highest priority areas of housing and environment.

Reduction in civil service complement is a cornerstone of our plan to control government costs and improve operating efficiency.

Mr. Foulds: How about reducing parliamentary assistants?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Management Board has reviewed the staffing in all ministries and has already achieved a reduction in the government's total complement to 69,221.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Let the member listen to this and tell it to his friends in Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Let the member for Ottawa East tell his friends in Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Since 1972 the Ontario civil service complement has grown by only 3.2 per cent, which is well below the growth rate in total employment in the prov-

ince. Over the same period the federal civil service has grown by almost 19 per cent or substantially faster than the increase in employment in the Canadian economy.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister is selling the farm.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That doesn't even include the LIP grants.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Reducing or even holding the line on civil service growth is not only a practical way to control costs but also a way to release resources to be put to a better use in the private sector. The cost savings from Ontario's complement cuts will amount to \$15 million in the first year alone and this measure will produce even greater economies in future years.

Ontario Hydro, all other provincial agencies and commissions and local governments, are being urged to re-examine their administration, overhead and staffing costs with the objective of achieving comparable savings.

Mr. Speaker, I should now like to devote a few moments to the local government sector. In 1974, total spending by local government in Ontario reached \$5 billion, or about the same level as the total provincial budget in 1970. The property tax contributed less than \$2 billion of this \$5 billion in local spending, most of the balance being provided by the province. Increased provincial financial support, in fact, has been the major factor in insulating ratepayers from the brunt of rapid spending growth by school boards and municipalities.

Present indications are that local spending in 1975 will grow more rapidly than in previous years. I have no illusions, given this kind of spending growth and the limited resources of the province, that mill rates can continue to be held. Last fall my predecessor warned local governments that the province could only increase its aid in line with its own revenue growth. The federal government has the fiscal resources to relieve the pressure on local government financing, but so far no progress has been made at tri-level conferences to secure new forms of tax sharing to meet the needs of local governments.

Mr. Cassidy: The government refused to reform the system.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: For the 1975-1976 fiscal year, the province has reviewed its financial assistance within the context of its revenue-sharing commitment.

Mr. Singer: And therefore?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Last year's transfers fell short of the level dictated by the revenue growth rate ultimately realized. The Ontario government will honour its revenue-sharing commitment, including the shortfall during 1974-1975. As a result, the province will be able to increase total transfers to local governments and agencies by a total of \$380 million, or an increase of 16.3 per cent over the previous year. This contrasts with the 13.2 per cent growth in the province's ongoing programmes. I am including a table which displays how this commitment is fulfilled.

Much of the increase will go to conditional grant programmes, such as school board grants and transportation subsidies. However, there will also be scope for the province to increase unconditional grants by \$65 million. Tomorrow, I shall table in the Legislature a comprehensive document on provincial assistance to local governments and taxpayers. This document contains complete details on the 1975-1976 revisions to the unconditional grant programmes.

There are two major revisions to our 1975-1976 unconditional grants package. To maintain high standards of law enforcement, the province will emphasize the per capita grant toward policing costs. The government will also enrich its special assistance to northern municipalities. People in northern Ontario experience considerably higher costs for many of their requirements. We believe, therefore, that reduced property taxes are the best way to provide compensating benefits to northern residents. The special northern grants will increase by almost 42 per cent over last year. As a result, sir, the average residential tax should be \$90 lower in northern Ontario than in southern Ontario in 1975.

Mr. Foulds: How many of the government members live up there?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, some local government expenditures are vital to our basic economical development. Other expenditures are less important at this time of escalating mill rates. Therefore, I take this opportunity to urge local governments, both school boards and municipalities, to restrain spending wherever possible. I have asked the Ontario Municipal Board to review the capital spending applications of the municipalities to see which capital projects can sensibly be deferred.

Some projects, such as sewerage, water, roads and transit, are obviously of higher priority than others. Municipalities will need

to undertake that kind of works if we're going to have the supply of housing lots needed in nearly all parts of the province.

Mr. Cassidy: Will the government stop North York's municipal building?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: As I indicated earlier, this is one of the most important long-term solutions to the cost of housing. Other types of projects, on the other hand, can perhaps be deferred unless they will have an immediate and desirable impact on local construction employment.

I also call on school boards and municipal councils to carefully examine their staffing, overhead and administration expenses.

An hon. member: Carefully choosing.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Restructured governments, in particular, should examine closely both complement and salary levels in relation to the changes and reductions in their responsibilities. Given the record of spending over the past four years, shown in budget paper B, I believe that regional and local governments can achieve substantial economies in both complement and payroll. Success in such spending restraint delivers dollar-for-dollar benefits to Ontario ratepayers.

Now, sir, the strong fiscal actions which I have put before you will cost the province some \$430 million in this fiscal year. In the absence of these substantial initiatives, our net cash requirements for 1975-1976 would have been about \$1.2 billion or only modestly higher than in 1974-1975. In total, therefore, I am estimating our overall cash requirements at \$1,669 million, which is well within the capacity of the province to finance.

Mr. Singer: Oh, yes.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How does the member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer) like that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Pension funds will generate \$1,125 million of internal financing and the balance will be raised through judicious use of cash reserves and capital markets.

Our fiscal plan will materially assist Ontario's economic recovery in 1975—

Mr. Cassidy: The Treasurer should get the Minister without Portfolio to write this for him.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and build a sound base for strong expansion in 1976. Given the anticipated upturn in the US economy and appropriate policies by Ottawa, I believe that the Ontario economy will rebound to higher levels of growth by year-end.

Sir, in conclusion, this budget sets out a powerful and constructive fiscal plan to counteract slack in the provincial economy without adding to inflationary pressures. It reinforces the inherent strength of our private sector through the controlled use of public resources on both the taxation and expenditure sides.

Mr. Roy: Did he miss anything?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It does, I repeat, cut the sales tax during 1975 to increase consumer purchasing power.

It establishes a \$1,500 home buyer's grant to stimulate the housing market in 1975.

It launches a longer-run incentive to expand investment and productivity and to create new jobs.

Mr. Sargent: It will sell an election.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It harmonizes provincial tax legislation with that of the federal government to produce greater certainty and lower compliance costs for Ontario business.

It raises the guaranteed income of Ontario pensioners and eliminates income tax on low-income families.

It enriches incentives and support to the small business and farming communities.

It reduces civil service complement and holds down government spending to facilitate private production, investment and consumption.

Mr. Lewis: It finishes the Treasurer's triple-A rating.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am confident, sir, that this budget will be an important factor in restoring Ontario to its accustomed prosperity and in ensuring that all of our people share in that prosperity.

Mr. Breithaupt moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the member ready to speak?

Mr. Lewis: Would I love it! Shall we go on?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House I would like to revert to introduction of bills.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed?

Introduction of bills.

ONTARIO HOME BUYERS GRANTS ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the Payment of Grants to First-Time Home Buyers in Ontario.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): What does that do for the man earning \$10,000 a year? What a bunch of garbage.

An hon. member: If I buy the member's house do I get a \$2,000 grant?

An hon. member: Help yourself.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

ONTARIO LOAN ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to authorize the Raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Bullbrook: Is that the worst budget the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development ever heard?

Mr. Roy: Next year we are going to change the colour of this.

RETAIL SALES TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Meen moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Singer: It's called the put-on-your-sweater-and-turn-down-the-thermostat Act.

Mr. Foulds: Where's the energy tax? The Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell) should be on his feet.

Hon. A. K. Meen (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes several major amendments to the Act to give effect to the tax changes just outlined by my colleague, the Treasurer. In addition it proposes a number of changes to ease compliance with the Act by vendors and taxpayers, including some amendments recommended in a joint submission by the Institute of Chartered Accountants and by the Bar Association of Ontario.

SUCCESSION DUTY AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Meen moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Succession Duty Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. MacDonald: This budget is the dismantling of the former Treasurer.

An hon. member: The boys on Bay St. are tearing their hair out tonight.

GIFT TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Meen moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Gift Tax Act, 1972.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Leader of the Opposition should have put out his platform before this—he has had it now.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It won't do it.

Mr. Foulds: Now.

Mr. Deans: That doesn't do much for people earning under \$10,000.

Mr. Lewis: The government could be calling an election this year with a budget like this.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Not necessarily.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, the amendments to the Gift Tax Act contained in this bill will implement changes which were proposed in the budget statement and will re-introduce Bill 183, with minor technical changes to provisions contained in Bill 183 of the last session.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order, please. There is too much noise in the chamber. Order. The hon. minister will continue.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, the amendments will also permit donors to take advantage of a change in the federal Income Tax Act effective in 1974 and will introduce changes in the administration of the Act as well.

MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Meen moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Deans: It doesn't do much for those earning less than \$10,000, does it?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, in addition to implementing proposals introduced by the Treasurer tonight, the bill also proposes changes to facilitate administration of refunds and compliance by registrants and taxpayers.

GASOLINE TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Meen moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Gasoline Tax Act, 1973.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes to amend the Act to clarify and ensure a parallel application of tax in the case of natural and manufactured gas and liquefied petroleum gases, but the major gasoline tax changes outlined in the budget statement we've heard earlier tonight will be implemented by way of amendments to the regulations under the Act.

INCOME TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Meen moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, to implement the budget statement and to parallel federal provisions, the bill provides that where an individual's income tax does not exceed \$61—that's provincial income tax—he will pay no such tax. To ease compliance, instalment payments for individuals of Ontario income tax are placed on the same basis as instalment payments required under the federal Act and, in addition, the bill implements an earlier announced policy to provide for tax credits for contributions made to political parties, candidates and constituency associations.

CORPORATIONS TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Meen moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Corporations Tax Act, 1972.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, in addition to providing for the implementation of budget proposals, this bill provides for amendments to parallel federal provisions, with some exceptions, but including technical amendments such as the rules governing capital gains, corporate reorganizations and rollovers. To ease compliance for the taxpayer, the statutory limitation on a lien for tax purposes has been advanced to fiscal years commencing after Dec. 31, 1967. Other budgetary measures effecting a further extension of the fast write-off of capital cost allowance in some cases will be implemented by regulation.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the House, I would like to say that tomorrow we will proceed with consideration of items No. 3 and 7 on the order paper, and on Thursday we will proceed with consideration of some of the very, very progressive tax Acts as introduced by the Minister of Revenue.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 9:50 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 7, 1975

Tabling estimates of certain sums required for the service of Ontario, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor	611
Budget address, Mr. McKeough	611
Ontario Home Buyers Grants Act, 1975, Mr. McKeough, first reading	625
Ontario Loan Act, 1975, Mr. McKeough, first reading	625
Retail Sales Tax Amendment Act, Mr. Meen, first reading	625
Succession Duty Amendment Act, Mr. Meen, first reading	626
Gift Tax Amendment Act, Mr. Meen, first reading	626
Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Amendment Act, Mr. Meen, first reading	626
Gasoline Tax Amendment Act, Mr. Meen, first reading	626
Income Tax Amendment Act, Mr. Meen, first reading	626
Corporations Tax Amendment Act, Mr. Meen, first reading	626
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	627



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, April 8, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 8, 1975

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I know members of the Legislature will want to join me in welcoming 35 grade 8 students sitting in the west gallery from the Central Public School of Sioux Lookout, Ont. I would point out that these students are led by their principal, Mr. Murray McFayden, and assisted by teachers Douglas Allen and Barbara Roy. I would further point out that they are assisted in coming to Toronto through the government's Young Travellers programme to the tune of over \$5,000, and these particular students have raised an additional \$5,000 to stay in the Toronto area for over six days.

Hon. M. Birch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome 22 students from St. Ursula's Separate School with their teacher, Mrs. Fitzpatrick; and I would ask the members to join with me in welcoming them to the Legislature.

Mr. G. W. Walker (London North): Mr. Speaker, in the east gallery are grade 8 students from Hillcrest Public School in London. They are under the instructorship of Mr. McKellar and Mr. Rawlins; and I would ask the Legislature to join in welcoming these 68 people.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry. The hon. Treasurer.

ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, since 1969 the Ontario government has made a determined effort to alleviate the relative burden of property taxes. This was done in spite of severe pressures on the province's own financial position.

However, tax reform, and notably relief of property tax burdens, had become one of the province's high priority objectives. The approach to moderating property tax burdens has been to introduce a number of complementary measures.

First, the property tax credits: These were designed to provide relief from existing property taxes to low-income people. These credits were significantly enriched over the past few years to protect those most vulnerable to inflation. In 1975, the value of these credits alone should reach about \$275 million.

Pensioner credits: An additional tax credit was made available to needy pensioners. This assistance has proved invaluable to these pensioners and is presently at a level of about \$50 million.

Grants to school boards: The province's overall support was gradually raised from 48 per cent in 1969 to 60 per cent in 1973 and is currently estimated at \$1.5 billion. This move represented a significant shift away from the property tax.

School board spending ceilings: In addition to higher support rates, the property taxpayer is further protected by successful spending constraints imposed by the province.

In a number of critical and high cost areas, the province introduced considerably more attractive cost-sharing arrangements. This was the case for such functions as water and sewerage, transit, social assistance, libraries and housing.

The most significant reforms of transfers to local government were made in unconditional grants. The 1973 property tax stabilization plan involved a very large enrichment. It contained a comprehensive package of different unconditional grants to deal with a great variety of circumstances. It dealt with the problem of unequally distributed local tax bases; it dealt with a general local financing problem; it further recognized the differential fiscal need of communities that pay for their own policing; and it made allowance for special cost problems associated with non-permanent population.

The Ontario government also recognized the special circumstances under which the people in northern Ontario live. They face high heating costs, they face high costs for most commodities because of long-distance transportation costs; and their local governments face similar cost disadvantages. The unconditional grants package, therefore, con-

tains a special support grant to northern Ontario municipalities to ensure generally lower property tax burdens in the north than in the south. In this way, northern Ontario households enjoy an offset-cost advantage over the south. This year, the special support grant to the north is being enriched considerably.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Oh cut it out.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): And we don't get the services either.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The above comprehensive Ontario approach to relief of property tax burdens prevented the large increases in property taxes that would otherwise have been inevitable.

The past two years witnessed the effects of inflation on local government spending which far outstripped the revenue growth of its relatively inelastic tax base. At present the local tax base, of course, fails to reflect the very real growth that has occurred in property values during the past few years.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): That's not the case in Sudbury. It's the minister's decision.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Nevertheless, the measures taken by the Ontario government made it possible for the provincial average mill rate in 1974 to remain below the average mill rate of two years previously. In addition, property tax credits provided yet further relief from these already lower mill rates. During the same period, personal incomes in Ontario experienced a large increase and so did a person's ability to pay. It is fair to conclude, therefore, that the Ontario government reform has resulted in a dramatic reduction in the relative burden of property taxes.

In respect to the 1975-1976 fiscal year, the province has reviewed its total transfers within the context of the revenue-sharing commitment. The total estimated basic transfers in 1974-1975 amounted to \$3,325 million, some \$37 million higher than originally anticipated. However, provincial revenue growth turned out considerably in excess of the 11.7 per cent predicted last year. In other words, transfers to local governments would have reached as high as \$2,392 million, if provincial revenue growth at 18.9 per cent had been taken into account.

The Ontario government, as I indicated last night, will fully honour its revenue-sharing commitment, including the shortfall during 1974-1975. As a result of considerable tax

cuts, notably in the retail sales tax, the province's revenue growth rate in 1975-1976 will be 10.3 per cent. Adding this growth rate to the full commitment for last year allows the province to increase total transfers in 1975-1976 by \$380 million. This amounts to an increase of 16.3 per cent over last year's total transfers.

Most of the dollar increase is accounted for by conditional grants, such as school grants, transportation, transit and social assistance. More modest residual increases to unconditional grants allow the province to deliver in 1975 some \$60 million or 23.5 per cent more in unconditional grants than during 1974. In addition, special payments to restructured governments will rise by \$5 million.

In designing the 1975 unconditional grants package, the government has emphasized greater simplicity for general support grants, the special cost problems for northern Ontario residents, the special position of the district of Parry Sound, as well as the unique and severe cost increases for municipalities with their own police forces.

In simplifying the general support grant by introducing a flat rate and removing the spending growth schedule, the government does not imply less urgency in restraint. The latter remains of the utmost importance.

The new general support grant I am introducing will provide greater certainty. It will be responsive to local tax effort and fiscal need and it will avoid many administrative complications. Northern Ontario residents will benefit from a 42 per cent increase in the northern Ontario special support grant. This will go a long way in further alleviating the differential living costs faced by those living in the north. A 69 per cent increase in unconditional grants toward policing will take much of the sting out of the rapidly rising costs which are confronting municipalities with their own police forces.

I am also pleased to announce another important reform. As hon. members know, we have already introduced a fixed split mill rate differential of 15 per cent in all regional governments. This means that residential and farm taxpayers have a 15 per cent lower mill rate than commercial and industrial taxpayers. Outside present regional governments, however, the split in mill rates still varies a great deal. This year the government will standardize the fixed split mill rate at 15 per cent throughout the province. This measure will greater simplify the apportionment process and make for significant administrative advantages, notably for local treasurers. It will

also enhance overall equity as the split in mill rates will no longer relate to the particular assessment mix in each municipality. I have decided that in 1975 only we will cushion the impact of this change on residential taxpayers to avoid increases in taxes in excess of five per cent on account of this change.

In reviewing the period 1969 to 1975, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to highlight to you that the province's total revenue has grown on an average by 12.6 per cent, while financial assistance to local governments has risen by 16.5 per cent per year. As a result, such financial transfers have increased from 24.5 per cent of provincial revenue in 1969 to over 30 per cent in 1975. This rise in the local share of provincial revenue in itself is worth over \$500 million in 1975 alone.

The document I am tabling today contains all the details on the 1975 unconditional grants package. It also provides tentative estimates for the entitlements to those grants for each municipality. In section 2 of the document we display for all municipalities the 1974 property taxes per household and the change in mill rates during the past four years. In section 3 we show, on a more selective basis, the 1970 and 1973 values for offsets against property taxes in the form of tax credits and rebates.

I am pleased to make this document available to all members of the Legislature, to all our local governments and anybody else who may be interested in the province's progress in tax reform and assistance to local governments.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

OTTAWA TEACHERS' DISPUTE

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) and the Premier (Mr. Davis), I wonder if the Provincial Secretary for Social Development can inform the House as to the progress being made in the continuing strike in Ottawa? Since his return from his holiday, has the Minister of Education had an opportunity to consult with his mediator, and what is the status of the negotiation at the present time?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I'm very happy to inform the Leader of the Opposition that the Minister of Education is meeting at this very moment with the Ottawa Board of Education and the teachers.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa East.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary. Would the provincial secretary advise how long the situation in Ottawa is going to be tolerated, and what is the deadline for taking action here? Secondly, why has the minister waited so long to intercede personally in this dispute?

An hon. member: She is not interceding personally.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to answer those questions.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Carleton East.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): I have a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: I'll get to the member for Scarborough West next.

Mr. P. Taylor (Carleton East): Thank you. A supplementary of the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. Auld): Can the minister give this House and the thousands of grade 13 students affected by this—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. J. R. Rhodes (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Sit down. That doesn't apply under the rules.

Mr. Speaker: To whom is the member for Carleton East's question directed?

Mr. P. Taylor: It's a supplementary on this issue, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West has a supplementary to the first question.

Mr. Lewis: I'm sorry. I think the burden of the question, although the member for Carleton East didn't complete it, is roughly the same. Is it true that the universities in the Ottawa area have given an ultimatum to the parties that the settlement must be reached by April 15 or those grade 13 students who seek entry to university will be denied such entry? If that is so, has any member of the social development group, particularly the Minister of Colleges and Universities, been in contact with the universities about the situation?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of that ultimatum, but I think the question could be more properly directed to the Minister of Colleges and Universities.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, since my colleague originally wanted to direct the question to the Minister of Colleges and Universities perhaps that minister could respond to it. Was he following this discussion at all?

Mr. P. Taylor: No, he was talking.

Mr. Roy: He doesn't know what's going on.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Colleges and Universities): A bit.

Mr. Lewis: Which bit?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well it's the important matter dealing with the educational future of the grade 13 students in the Ottawa area, since the universities have indicated that unless they return to their classrooms by April 15 the universities cannot consider their applications, in the usual course of events, to continue their education. Is the minister aware of this problem and is he going to assist the students concerned in any way?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I heard an hour or so ago that it was reported that somebody had said that the universities were taking this position. I have not yet been able to find out whether, in fact, that is true or not. I would remind the hon. members, though, that university admission standards are up to the universities. There was a somewhat similar situation a year ago as far as students from York were concerned and that seemed to be resolved satisfactorily. However, I will undertake to find out exactly what has been stated to be the position, if, in fact, the universities in the Ottawa-Carleton area have said this, or if any other universities have said this.

Mr. P. Taylor: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: One moment, the member for Carleton East.

Mr. P. Taylor: Is the Minister of Colleges and Universities aware of a document that apparently emanates from the Council of Ontario Universities dealing with this subject at great length, and that the universities acknowledged that because of the disruption of services some secondary schools and students in the province will be unable to meet the established schedule in this connection? Is he aware of that document and the im-

portant statements made in that document with respect to this problem; and can he give any commitment to the thousands of grade 13 students in the Ottawa area that they will not encounter difficulties in getting admitted to Ontario universities and colleges?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I'm not aware of that document. If the hon. member could send me a copy I would be pleased to read it. Is that a document of the committee of the Council of Ontario Universities or a document of the council itself?

Mr. P. Taylor: It's my understanding that it's from the Council of Ontario Universities.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would appreciate it if the hon. member would send me a copy of it, because I haven't seen one as of the mail that came in this morning.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Supplementary: Is the minister not aware that the usual practice for admission to university is for universities to take grade 12 results and the first term of grade 13 results? Why is there this apparent intervention by the Ottawa universities in this case when that's the usual procedure?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, that's the whole point. It is sort of a hypothetical question that has been asked as far as I'm concerned, and I'd like to find out the facts before I try to give an answer now.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: Hypothetical or not, I take it simply—I'm sorry go ahead; does the member want to get in on it?

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Yes, I just wanted to broaden the question, Mr. Speaker, and simply say that since the Ottawa universities have also indicated that they are reserving places for Ottawa students in the restricted programmes—the programmes with a restricted entry—will the minister ensure that similar arrangements are made to accommodate students from Ottawa who may be trying to get into universities in the rest of the province?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I simply repeat: I am going to find out what's going on, and then I'll have a statement.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: I take it, by way of a final supplementary Mr. Speaker, that it is the minister's position that he would not tolerate exclusion by universities on the grounds which are implied—whether or not he can pin it down. As minister he surely wouldn't tolerate it; he would tell the universities there are other ways on which to judge for purposes of entry? Yes or no?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I thought the member was stating my position.

Mr. Roy: He doesn't know it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He is only the Minister of Colleges and Universities.

Mr. Lewis: I would like to do that for him.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Roy: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: No, that was the final supplementary.

Mr. Roy: We have asked for supplementaries here.

Mr. Speaker: There have been enough questions on this now.

An hon. member: We have only had one supplementary.

An hon. member: It is an important issue to the opposition.

Mr. Roy: Supplementary, one final supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: One final final supplementary.

Mr. Roy: Could I ask the same minister, Mr. Speaker, if he would not limit his investigation of this to the Ottawa universities, but look specifically at Queen's University? It apparently has sent out a memorandum to the school boards in Ottawa indicating the problem and indicating apparently that there will be no special approach taken to the Ottawa student because of this strike?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I think I mentioned that I would find out whether it is simply Ottawa and Carleton or the other universities.

Mr. Roy: Look at Queen's.

Hon. Mr. Auld: One of the member's colleagues has mentioned some document from the Council of Ontario Universities, which I would dearly love to see because I

am not aware of it. I'll find out what's going on.

Mr. P. Taylor: It is coming right over.

Hon. Mr. Auld: But I'm not sure, from the questions being asked here, that the other members of the House have any more knowledge than I have on what the facts are.

Mr. Speaker: Has the Leader of the Opposition further questions?

ONTARIO NET CASH REQUIREMENTS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I'd like to ask the Treasurer, Mr. Speaker, in view of the net cash requirements of about \$1.7 billion that he told us about last night in the budget, what is his plan to borrow the \$575 million on which is indicated in one of his budget papers the financing is to be determined? Is that by any chance going to be a follow-up on his predecessor's trip to Yemen or Kuwait, or one of those places? Is he negotiating with that kind of offshore money; or is he going to go through the usual avenues in the money markets of New York?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I expect that we will, as the budget indicates, be using a judicious programme of using our reserves. We are certainly exploring a number of borrowing mechanisms, perhaps offshore funds. The Canadian capital market is particularly attractive, of course, and it's particularly strong, as is the American market.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What are these reserves that we may have access to? Surely if the Treasurer is getting \$750 million from the Canada Pension Plan, \$200 million from the teachers and \$130 million from OMERS, he doesn't have, really, many reserves other than go on the market and borrow the money for this massive deficit.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The province carries cash balances at all times.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is it possible that those reserves might even approach covering the \$575 million which is yet to be arranged, as well as \$1.5 billion that we must substantiate and support and guarantee for Ontario Hydro?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The reserves would be considerably more than the \$545 million which is mentioned in the budget. But of course it would be imprudent to run them down completely.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: When was the last time the government of Ontario went to the market to borrow for the purposes of the government, independent of Ontario Hydro?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Offhand, I would think three years ago.

Mr. Lewis: Three years ago? For what purpose at the time, does the Treasurer recall?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The government of Ontario, over the last 10 years—without giving chapter and verse—has been in the market and out of the market. We opened up the German market with the thought that it would ultimately be used by Hydro, as it was.

Mr. Lewis: Other than Hydro, are there any others outstanding?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, we borrowed it ourselves on our own account. We also went into the Canadian market about four years ago. We, of course, ran up I think something in excess of \$300 million of treasury bills.

Mr. Lewis: No, what about long-term borrowing?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We were in the Canadian market two or three years ago. The fact is that Ontario has in the last two years reduced its publicly-held debt by one-third.

Mr. Lewis: No. The Treasurer is begging the question. The question is when did he borrow—long-term borrowing, let me be specific—on the Canadian market for the purposes of the Province of Ontario, independent of Hydro?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Three years ago.

Mr. Lewis: Three years ago.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary, the member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: Does the Treasurer consider that we will probably have supplementary estimates of the same amount as last year and how is he going to finance those?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, if they are necessary they may well be financed in the same way as this year's excess spending was, by an increase in revenues. If the member would refer to the budget, he will find the very fine performance of the 1974-1975

fiscal year under the guidance and tutelage of my predecessor.

Mr. Lewis: Who isn't here.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Who seems to have left the House momentarily.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Don't forget the member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan).

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, and the member for Haldimand-Norfolk, who is in the great tradition of Ontario Treasurers as well. There is no question about that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I would draw the attention of the member for Rainy River to page C6 of the Ontario budget which showed that budgetary expenditures increased during the course of the year by some \$484 million—which is something in the neighbourhood of inflation last year I think that is a very good record indeed. Budgetary revenue increased by about the same amount and the budgetary deficit—the interim budgetary deficit—was actually \$34 million less than that predicted by my predecessor one year ago.

Mr. Reid: How much was the government short on that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: How much were we—we paid off last year some \$200 million or \$300 million in publicly-held debts.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Cassidy: The Treasurer is getting as bad as the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. White).

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would draw—while I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He is just like the Social Credit—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If the member would stop talking and just sit down for an hour and read this budget it would be of great edification to him.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Buying votes.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: And he might have some hope of understanding the finances of this province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I might also point out—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, it's great to hear the socialists are worried about provincial debt. We've now come full circle.

Mr. Good: Our children's children will be worried about it.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Our children will never pay off the Tories' debt.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that if members look at table C8—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. McKeough—they will find that the investments by this province estimated for 1975-1976 in such things as roads, public buildings, hospitals and universities, things which have a life expectancy of considerably more than one year—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The John Roberts Library?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, I suppose.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is that collateral for a loan?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I suppose—why doesn't the member sit down?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Why doesn't he just sit down and go and read the budget? He doesn't understand it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I know the government has \$50 million invested there and in books.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That investment in capital assets, sir, is nearly \$1,700 million which considerably exceeds the amount of the net cash requirements of this province. We are, in fact, putting into bricks and mortar and highways and things that make this province grow and be alive, \$1,700 million. We will go on doing that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why doesn't he say some more while he is on his feet?

Mr. Lewis: What grows with bricks and mortar?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would say this to my friend from Brant, that if he ever has any

hope of leading his party, let alone leading this province, he had better get away from his horse and buggy mentality and come into the 20th century fast.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. We would like to hear the question of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I have a further question of the Treasurer on this matter.

Mr. Lewis: The Treasurer shook the rats out of the rafters with that one.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The rats at the back row there are leaving the ship. Doesn't the Treasurer feel that his rocketship mentality, which in fact has added \$4 billion net debt to the province in the four years since the present Premier took office, is going to be anything but in the best interest of the taxpayers and the people of this province? How can we possibly stand the kind of fiscal irresponsibility that this Treasurer is putting forward in a situation that is as inflationary as it ever was?

Mr. Roy: Let him shout his way out of this.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is thoroughly irresponsible.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would simply say this, that the finances of this province are in good hands.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He is selling the farm.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The financial statements of this province reflect the integrity—

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): They certainly do!

Mr. Reid: We are almost bankrupt.

Hon. Mr. McKeough:—and they reflect the sound financial management of some 30 years of Progressive Conservative rule in this province; and it's taken us that long to get rid of the vestiges of the Hepburn administration.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Not very good.

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me that the question period has strayed away from questions and answers. Does the hon. Leader

of the Opposition have further different questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, it's not the 32 years we are worried about, it's the last four years that have gone down the drain. I thought with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I could direct this question—

Mr. Lewis: It is not the last four years, it is the last 24 hours since the Treasurer started to float his budget.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Haven't we seen that suit on the cover of the Sun?

An hon. member: Is this any way to run a hardware store?

HOME BUYER GRANT

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Perhaps we should ask the Treasurer this, but maybe it should be directed to the Minister of Housing. With the home buyer grant of \$1,500 announced yesterday, has he a procedure, through his ministry, or the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations or through the Treasury, to monitor the costs of housing so that the price of housing does not take a quantum jump of \$1,500 per unit overnight?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Does the member mean a price review board or something like that?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Well, the leader of the New Democrats sure hopes so.

Hon. D. R. Irvine (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, it's impossible to have a mechanism to determine whether housing will jump as the member has indicated. We expect the opposite; we expect to have a drop in housing costs and we expect to have consumer confidence restored.

Mr. Roy: Would the minister put that in writing?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: We will have buyers in the market who will take care of new and used vacant housing at the present time. It will assist us in the economy of Ontario and the economy of Canada. We expect to find that the related industries, which are very much affected by the lack of housing starts will now be in the very prosperity that we have expected for the last few months in Ontario.

Mr. Martel: The minister is not for real.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Leader of the Opposition that it would be helpful if he and his party were to get behind this very strong initiative in housing for Ontario—

Mr. Breithaupt: Certainly we won't get in front of it.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —and make sure that everyone understands that these home buyer grants will be very much needed in the next few months in order that we do have housing for all of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Since the minister is so sanguine about the possibility of the prices going down, is he going to undertake, as a part of his responsibility, if not a monitoring operation at least some spot checks, so that we will find out in the next day or two if, in fact, the prices have gone down as a result of this initiative or, what is obviously going to happen, they are going to go up by a minimum of \$1,500? Why doesn't he find out?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, we have a very progressive government, but I think it's very difficult, in the next day or two, to determine whether or not the cost of housing through Ontario will drop or go up as the Leader of the Opposition has indicated.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister could monitor this.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I expect we will be monitoring prices throughout Ontario continually and we'll find, as I have said, that housing will drop in cost because of the housing starts which will come on the market. It will be a buyer's market, not a seller's market.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): He is a dreamer.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary, the member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Is the minister aware that as a result of the home buyer grants, word has already gone down fraternity road—some three blocks from here—that any group of students who want to can have a free fraternity house by merely transferring the ownership from one to another?

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me that's not very supplementary to the original question.

The member for Ottawa-Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Can the minister explain, Mr. Speaker, why the government's concern with first-time home buyers only emerged this year and why it will evaporate two or three months after the anticipated date of the forthcoming election?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, we haven't indicated that it will evaporate as the member has suggested.

Mr. Breithaupt: When will it evaporate?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: What we are saying is that the programme will be in effect for a three-year period.

An hon. member: Three years.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: There is a \$1,000 grant for this year; \$250 the next year and \$250 for the year after. If the member will look at the budget he will find that stated quite clearly.

We do feel that it will assist a lot of people; the same as the federal programme with its \$600.

An hon. member: That's \$600,000.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: The federal government's grant of \$500 for home buyers will be supplementary to our grants. We feel the federal government hasn't gone far enough and we are indicating to the people that we are prepared to make sure that we do have housing available at affordable prices.

Mr. Cassidy: Would the minister not agree—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The original question had to do with any possible plan for monitoring the prices of homes. Some of the questions are getting far off that. Is your supplementary on this?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't ask a question which wasn't a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure of that. The member for Wentworth may ask a supplementary.

Mr. Deans: I would like to ask the Minister of Housing whether he can tell me how many families will now be able to go into the housing market as a result of this \$1,000 that will be made available to them, over and above the numbers that would have been able to go into the existing housing market?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, obviously that is a matter which can't be determined at this time.

Mr. Deans: But that is what the minister is doing it for, surely?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: It depends on the acceptance of the consumers and whether or not they wish to participate in this programme. We have made the money available and it is very obvious there are some very high-priced houses coming on the market right now because of these incentives the government is offering.

Mr. Deans: How many more people will be able to get a house as a result of this?

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? The Leader of the Opposition?

The hon. member for Scarborough West with his questions then.

ONTARIO MORTGAGE CORP.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I have a question I'd like to ask the Minister of Housing; perhaps he can tell me whether I am right or not.

The amount of money promised to the Ontario Mortgage Corp. last year was \$133 million according to the budget.

On Oct. 21, last year, the minister announced an additional \$100 million—\$50 million in 1974-1975; \$50 million in 1975-1976—indicating an expenditure of \$233 million for the Mortgage Corp. None of the first \$50 million was spent and in the budget yesterday the minister reduced the total expenditure for the Ontario Mortgage Corp. to \$208 million. Why has the minister reduced the expenditure in such a crucial area by \$25 million in such a few short months?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, whether or not we have reduced is a matter to be determined at a later date.

Mr. Lewis: It is part of the minister's commitment.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: What we are indicating to the members of this House is the fact that we feel we now have private investments which will come in and provide mortgage financing—which they should have done last year and didn't do—but we do have the confidence of the investment world whereby it will provide mortgages at reasonable rates.

An hon. member: Interesting.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: This is what we have to have.

Mr. Lewis: Right, but the minister can see the fraudulence of this part of the budget—

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Lewis: —which, in fact—

An hon. member: Come on.

Mr. Speaker: Do you have a question?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, a supplementary.

The minister can see the fraudulence of this part of the budget, which in fact amounts to a significant reduction in the government's commitment to mortgages from that which has already been announced in this Legislature. Is the rest of the supply package for housing equally fraudulent?

An hon. member: Yes.

Mr. Breithaupt: Say yes.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, a question like that doesn't deserve an answer, but because it comes from the leader of the NDP who can't understand—

Mr. Lewis: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —what housing is all about—

Mr. Cassidy: He understands. We are worried about the minister.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —and who doesn't understand that we are providing housing—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —I'll tell the member and every other member of the House that the mortgages will be provided where necessary. The programmes will be provided when necessary and the programmes will proceed as we have indicated.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Since the minister knows all about housing, evidently, why is it that his efforts last year were such a disappointment, surely, to himself and the citizens of Ontario, when the housing starts dropped off and when mortgage money was precisely what we needed?

The minister himself said that the companies would not contribute it. What makes him think they are going to get into that business this year? Just because they like him?

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): The member should consider the reaction of some municipal councils.

Mr. Lewis: It is the weakest part of the budget. It is nonsense in the budget.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition knows full well that there is more than the provincial government, there is more than the federal government, and more than municipal governments involved in housing starts. There is the private sector, which is responsible for the majority of the starts, and has been.

Ontario was the leader in housing starts as far as provincial governments in Canada are concerned. Ontario did better than the United States and overseas and the rest of Canada. Therefore, the government of Ontario led the way as far as housing starts are concerned. The federal government, if the members care to check it out, did very little in regard to providing housing starts throughout Canada and in Ontario.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The federal government contributed \$407 million to CHMC.

Mr. Lewis: Even the budget went down 10,000 starts.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Can the minister indicate to the Legislature how the 10,600 units of senior-citizen, socially assisted and rental-subsidy housing breaks down? How many units in each category?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, we had indicated this before. It was approximately 1,600 family units, 7,000 senior-citizen units —1,000 of that being in Metropolitan Toronto —we had a 2,000 figure community-sponsored, and we also indicated before that community-integrated housing would provide 1,500 starts, which is up a couple of hundred.

Mr. Lewis: What is the minister saying?

Mr. Deans: That was a statement.

Mr. Lewis: Does he mean that that supposedly new commitment in the budget was in fact the statement that he made in this House?

Mr. Deans: About a month ago.

Mr. Lewis: I guess about a month ago. Is that also an exact repeat of what he said before?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): It's a regurgitation.

Mr. Lewis: We are really beginning to isolate the components, aren't we? It amounts to nothing.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate that the leader of the NDP cannot understand that the housing—

Mr. MacDonald: The minister doesn't understand it; that is the problem.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —projections that I have stated in the House have now been related in the budget.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, I see.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: It is housing for Ontario which we projected a month ago, yes.

Mr. Lewis: Ten thousand six hundred a month ago—

An hon. member: But they never did anything about it.

Mr. Foulds: A recycled announcement.

Mr. Deans: The minister is a disaster, he really is.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

FUEL TAX CHANGES

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Treasurer, how did the \$19 million that he is returning by the changes in the fuel tax portion of the budget break down? He will recall that he said it would be of special benefit to northern Ontario. How much for institutions? How much for the resource sector? How much for other areas?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I haven't got that information here, Mr. Speaker, but I will be glad to get it for the member.

Mr. Lewis: Thank you very much.

ONTARIO UNEMPLOYMENT RATE

Mr. Lewis: What is the exact unemployment rate for Ontario on the basis of the new figures this morning?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Seasonally adjusted today, six per cent.

Mr. Lewis: Is that all?

Mr. Reid: Does the Treasurer have a prediction of what it is going to go to? Mr. Speaker, supplementary.

Mr. MacDonald: Isn't it interesting unemployment wasn't in the budget statement? There was no mention made of it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member for York South is muttering—

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): It wasn't in his public statement.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It certainly is. It certainly is in the budget statement.

Mr. Lewis: Not once in the public statement.

Mr. Renwick: Not once in the public statement.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It certainly is—what we refer to and what we expect is going to happen with unemployment this year. It's nice to hear those people over there worried about unemployment. I have been sitting here for two months and it is the first time they have asked that question. They are so worried about deficit financing they have forgotten about getting people back to work. That's their problem over there.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Martel: The Treasurer lectures almost as much as the Premier.

Mr. Lewis: You know, Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer's problem is that he forgets that the member for Peel North is still Premier through one more election. The Treasurer is just too anxious.

SALES TAX EXEMPTIONS

Mr. Lewis: Can I ask the Treasurer precisely how many new jobs will the retail sales tax exemption on production machinery and equipment—that exemption, concession, credit—provide?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It was 1971 when they predicted the exact figure—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We don't have a number on that.

Mr. Lewis: He never has. All he knows is that it is \$100 million for the corporations tax. How many jobs will it cost?

Mr. Speaker: Order please; order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I might point out that I think I said last night that it came from the

United Auto Workers. That is wrong, and I apologize to the House. It didn't come from the United Auto Workers. The suggestion came from the Ontario Federation of Labour and I want to put that on the record.

An hon. member: Does he?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: Shall I put on the record what the Treasurer told me about the OF of L?

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member for Scarborough West just doesn't understand. He just doesn't understand that to compete in the world today our industry has to be competitive, and if he would get that through his head he would be a great leader. But they have to be able to compete, and to compete their costs have to be low and that's important.

Mr. Lewis: They need \$410 million worth of public money as a corporate gift over 2½ years. This budget is a disaster in that area. It's a straight gift to the government's friends.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): The leader of the NDP is the only disaster around here.

Mr. Martel: They could be looking for campaign funds over there.

Mr. Lewis: My colleague, the hon. member for Wentworth, nudges me to ask the minister, since he was Treasurer pro tem, does he recall how many jobs the investment tax credit—the identical programme to this one—created in 1971 to 1973? And I urge him to be careful in his response.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I don't have that information with me.

Mr. Lewis: No, because they are throwing the money away.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would have really expected that my friend, the leader of the New Democratic Party, would have talked today about this year's budget instead of something that happened three years ago. He is living in the past. Come into the 20th century and join the rest of us. He's worse than the Grits. Both of them are in the same camp.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Could we get back to the question period? The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I don't mind being slandered, abused or vilified, but don't ever tell me I'm worse than the Grits!

Mr. Breithaupt: Even we've got to draw the line somewhere.

Mr. Lewis: I have some pride left.

Interjections by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Well, that's the only approximation of the Grits I have.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

HEALTH SURVEY OF ELLIOT LAKE MINES

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Minister of Health, when will the report on the health condition of the workers in Elliot Lake be tabled in this Legislature? Will it be in advance of Dr. Tidey of this ministry meeting with the workers on Friday in Elliot Lake? Will the minister meet with them earlier this week? Since they seek that report can he tell us about it?

Hon. F. S. Miller (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to table the report this week. I did listen carefully to the member's Throne debate speech the other day. He referred to Dr. Stewart and to other people. I took those comments very seriously and, in fact, invited Dr. Stewart, other members of the Workmen's Compensation Board and other ministries to a meeting last week to review the report that was prepared by my staff, and we did so. We found certain disagreements between the things that our staff were preparing and the things they said. I asked that they review the data in that report and reach an agreement and that's being done right now. Once this agreement is reached we will be ready to go public with it.

Mr. MacDonald: It is a more legitimate excuse than usual.

Mr. Lewis: It is amazing. They waited a year. No further questions.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Carleton East.

DRIVER LICENCES FOR HARD OF HEARING

Mr. P. Taylor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Minister of Transportation

and Communications: The minister has received a number of representations from various associations representing the hard of hearing, and in some cases the deaf, regarding the criteria for licensing drivers. Will the minister undertake to study these special problems faced by these people in order to determine whether or not the licensing criteria are fair and reasonable?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are already doing that. We have had a number of submissions from various associations interested in that very topic, the question of the deaf drivers or those whose hearing has been impaired. We are looking at all of these submissions and we are meeting with experts in the field to determine how we can fairly deal with this licensing problem.

Mr. P. Taylor: A short supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister say if there are any reliable statistics available to show the risk factor among the deaf and hard of hearing as compared to the risk factor in drivers suffering other forms of disability?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I'm not familiar with whether there are statistics available or not. My own personal feeling is that I don't recall seeing any statistics that would indicate that this is any more of a risk than any other form of disability.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

STUDENT PURCHASES OF HOMES

Mr. Shulman: May I ask a question of the Minister of Housing that was ruled out of order before, Mr. Speaker? Is the minister aware of and is he doing anything about the problem of groups of students buying a house in turn daily, transferring it back and forth or from each to each, and ending up with a free house at the end of several weeks?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: No, I am not aware.

Mr. Shulman: Okay.

Mr. Deans: Is there anything he is aware of?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

OIL AND GASOLINE PRICES

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Treasurer: In light of his announcement yesterday, his concern about inflation and his discussions in the past, especially about the increasing prices of energy and fuel oil and the discussions that are going to take place this week, why doesn't the minister take the approach of the Liberal administration in Nova Scotia and pass a law that would require oil companies to get approval from the government before increasing their prices? Apparently it has been very successful.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, gasoline and oil prices now are effectively controlled by the government of Canada, and I see no reason to duplicate that effort.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): The Treasurer is just copping out.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, if I might ask one supplementary, is there any truth to the rumour that the situation in Nova Scotia has been so successful that this province is looking at that approach vis-à-vis the increases in the price of oil?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay.

MOBILE DENTAL SERVICES

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health. Does the Minister of Health recall making a commitment that he would look into the dental needs of remote communities in northwestern Ontario? Does he recall specifically that I brought to his attention that the community of Upsala hadn't had the services of the railway dental car for five years? Is the minister aware that because of other priorities, such as \$400 million to the corporate sector, he doesn't have the money to provide dental services to this town of Upsala for at least another two years, which will mean seven years between visits?

Mr. Laughren: The same is true in many other communities.

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I certainly recall the first two parts of the member's question. I did review the matter, as the member knows, because he has correspondence from us. I still don't have as much money as I would like to have for all the programmes and it happens, as I have found

out, I haven't got enough money to expand that particular programme in spite of a budget that I assume is very close to \$3 billion.

Mr. Stokes: A supplementary: Does the minister think it is more important to reimburse the corporate sector to the extent of more than \$400 million than it is to provide something as basic and as essential as dental services to northwestern Ontario?

Mr. Lewis: That's the question. We've let \$108 million go down the drain but we can't have a dental plan.

Hon. Mr. Miller: The hon. member, I think, is confusing horses and cows in this issue.

Mr. Lewis: Not at all.

Hon. Mr. Miller: Completely.

Mr. Stokes: It is our money the minister is using too.

Mr. Lewis: The government is giving that money away—and it has already lost its corporate contributions.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Huron with his question.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Mr. J. Riddell (Huron): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of the Environment: In connection with the environmental impact legislation, can the minister tell us when the submissions to the green paper on environmental assessment were made public?

Hon. W. Newman (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I think I indicated in the House at the time that I would take that under consideration. We have reviewed it and it is public information; anyone can come and see it at any time. We have not reproduced all the submissions and reports because they are about 5 ft high. They are in our offices for review by anybody who would like to come and take a look at them.

Mr. Riddell: A supplementary: Can the minister say how many submissions suggested that it be made mandatory that notice of an undertaking be given to interested and affected individuals?

Hon. W. Newman: I can't tell the member exactly because there were about 170 submissions, and at one time in the House I did answer a question and gave the details of the various submissions of the green paper; but I

can't tell the member specifically how many there were.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: A final supplementary.

Mr. Good: Since this is the very basis of and an important factor in the environmental assessment legislation, would the minister say that half or three quarters of the submissions indicated that persons living in the areas or others should be involved in the hearings when an environmental assessment hearing is being held? How many suggested that?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, any environmental assessment hearing we hold will be open to the public; there will be necessity for a public hearing. The proper advertising will appear in the local news media, as we do now for environmental hearing boards, and people will have their chance to have their input.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

HOUSING PROBLEM SOLUTION

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Housing.

Now that we have seen his budgetary proposals for the nine-month period ending in December of this year, can the minister explain to the House how he proposes to protect tenants against rent increases that are unjustified, and how he proposes to make accommodation available to people earning less than \$10,000 a year within their capacity to pay?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, it would be great if the member for Wentworth would ask a question only once. This is about the 15th time he has asked the same question, and I am going to give him the same answer.

Mr. Deans: That's right, and I am asking it because the minister is doing absolutely nothing.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: We are going to provide housing for the people in Ontario—

Mr. Deans: Is that so?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Let the member get that through his thick head if he can.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is in trouble; he is in trouble.

Mr. Deans: Is it the opinion of the minister that all of the people of Ontario earn over \$10,000 a year? Is it the opinion of the minister that, within any of the housing programmes that he is offering, it is possible for a person working in Ontario, earning what is ostensibly the average wage in the Province of Ontario, to get into any single one of the programmes? And is there a programme anywhere, either in fact or in the planning stage, that will provide reasonable accommodation at a reasonable cost for people who earn reasonable wages?

Mr. Lewis: The answer is no, he doesn't have one.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Yes; the answer is yes.

Mr. Deans: Where?

Mr. Lewis: Name one.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Rainy River.

MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS

Mr. Reid: I have a question of the member for Hamilton West, who is in charge of manpower in the Province of Ontario. Can the minister indicate what he is doing? What is he doing, first of all? Can he indicate, for instance, that he has pinpointed the need for manpower in the various parts of the province? Where are those areas, where are we short, what skills are needed and what has been his input into the Dymond commission on apprenticeship?

Hon. J. McNie (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, there were a number of questions asked.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister can take them as notice.

Hon. Mr. McNie: Yes, I think the House will be interested to know that today the deputy ministers from the other provinces concerned with manpower are meeting in our city. It's a task force that is preparing for a meeting in Ottawa with the Minister of Immigration and Manpower, Mr. Andras.

One of the issues that they are addressing themselves to is how they can best collect and utilize the various resources that are available.

We're very well aware of the fact that across Canada today there is a growing unemployment problem. Together—and I say together—we're looking with the other provinces and the federal government to try to

find ways in which we can increase, among other things, the mobility of the work force, recognizing that in some areas there is a shortage of employment, and in other areas there is abundance of work.

In some areas, including the member's own riding, Mr. Speaker, the greatest problem is turnover. The turnover in some industries is as high as 100 per cent. As the member knows, we were there in January, along with the federal people, and discussed the question as to how we might improve the situation. We are doing the same thing in other parts of the province, again working with the Canada Manpower people.

It is a very complex problem and anyone who has been following the figures would know they have changed very drastically during the last two or three months. May I reassure the House that we are very close to this situation.

One of the things that we are doing—in answer to the first question asked by the member—is to try and co-ordinate the efforts of about nine ministries involved in one way or another in the development of our human resources, and to co-ordinate those with the other provinces and with the federal government. I think I may say it is being done with some success.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur.

OLD FORT WILLIAM

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Natural Resources, if I might. Can he tell me if there is any present-day military significance to Old Fort William?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: There's a firing squad there for the member for Port Arthur.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I didn't get the question. It sounded like a stupid one anyway.

Mr. Foulds: I am asking the minister, Mr. Speaker, if there is any present-day military significance to Old Fort William?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There might be, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Foulds: A supplementary: Can the minister then explain why a freelance photographer and writer was denied permission to take photographs of Old Fort William on March 19, 1975, and whether that was denied by the ministry or by the construction firm involved?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, I can't, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, could the minister get an answer for me?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No.

Mr. Deans: Why won't he?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Simcoe East.

Mr. Foulds: Why can't a citizen take photographs?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I can't hear the member for Simcoe East's question.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): A question of the provincial Treasurer—

Mr. Laughren: Some tourist attraction—they can't take pictures of it.

Mr. Speaker: I'm sorry, I still can't hear the hon. member.

Mr. Laughren: If the minister would answer his questions we wouldn't be interrupting.

Mr. Deans: He is not saying anything.

HOME BUYER GRANT

Mr. G. E. Smith: A question of the provincial Treasurer: Under the programme to stimulate home ownership, where he has announced a \$1,500 grant toward the assistance of the purchase of a first home, will this same grant apply to the initial purchase of a mobile home?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: It says so in the budget.

Mr. Ruston: Read the book.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes presented the annual report of the Ministry of Transportation and Communications for the year ended March 31, 1974, and the annual report of the Ontario Highway Transport Board for the year ended Dec. 31, 1974.

Hon. Mr. Snow presented the report of the Public Service Superannuation Board for the year ended March 31, 1974.

Mr. Morrow, from the standing procedural affairs committee, presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee has carefully examined the following applications for private Acts and finds the notices, as published in each case, sufficient:

Protestant Children's Village, Ottawa
City of Brantford (No. 1)
Borough of York
City of St. Catharines
City of Ottawa
Borough of North York
Peter Allan Gifford and others
St. Margaret's School, Elora
City of Brantford (No. 2)
Town of Cobourg
City of Toronto (No. 1)
Town of Kapuskasing
City of London
City of Toronto (No. 2)
City of Windsor
Hartford Limited
City of Toronto (No. 3)
City of Sarnia.

Your committee recommends the filing fee, plus penalties, if any, be remitted on the application of the Canadian Environmental Law Research Foundation, the application having been withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intitled: An Act to amend the Farm Products Marketing Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, this bill provides production controls for egg production in Ontario.

ST. MARGARET'S SCHOOL, ELORA, ACT

Mr. Worton moves first reading of bill intitled: An Act to incorporate St. Margaret's School, Elora.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MINISTRY OF CULTURE AND RECREATION AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Welch moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Ministry of Culture and Recreation Act, 1974.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Lewis: This is its abolition.

Mr. Stokes: Where are the regulations?

Hon. R. Welch (Minister of Culture and Recreation): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to effect the transfer of various programmes from the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs and the Ministry of Community and Social Services to the new Ministry of Culture and Recreation.

MINISTRY OF COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL SERVICES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Welch, on behalf of Hon. Mr. Brunelle, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Ministry of Community and Social Services Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

ONTARIO UNCONDITIONAL GRANTS ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the payment of Unconditional Grants.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, this bill consolidates into one Act the Municipal Unconditional Grants Act, 1974, the Regional Municipal Grants Act and the Property Tax Stabilization Act, 1973.

MUNICIPAL AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Municipal Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, these amendments to the Municipal Act provide for the following:

They delete the sections in the Act which outline the method of calculating the general purpose mill rates. The differential between

residential, farm and commercial mill rates will be standardized at 15 per cent across the province, and calculated in accordance with the Ontario Unconditional Grants Act, 1975.

Payments in lieu of taxation under section 304 will now be made in respect of certain previously exempt institutions, such as provincial educational institutions and agricultural research stations.

Payments for the educational institutions, such as the schools for the deaf and blind and agricultural colleges, such as the one in Ridgetown, will be calculated at \$50 per student place.

Payments for agricultural research stations will be calculated on an acreage basis, as is currently done for provincial parks. This formula provides \$5 per acre for the first 100 acres, \$2 per acre for the next 9,900 acres and 50 cents an acre on the acreage in excess of 10,000 acres.

In addition, at the urging of my friend, the member for Lanark (Mr. Wiseman), the amendments delete the limitation in the Act which restricted the payment under section 304 to no more than 25 per cent of the net municipal levy, which solves his problem with Montague township.

BOROUGH OF NORTH YORK ACT

Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Borough of North York.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF OTTAWA ACT

Mr. Morrow moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

PROTESTANT CHILDREN'S VILLAGE, OTTAWA ACT

Mr. Morrow moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Protestant Children's Village, Ottawa.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

BOROUGH OF YORK ACT

Mr. Leluk moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Borough of York.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF ST. CATHARINES ACT

Mr. Villeneuve, on behalf of Mr. Johnston, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF BRANTFORD ACT

Mr. Beckett moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Brantford.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF BRANTFORD ACT

Mr. Beckett moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Brantford.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MATRIMONIAL PROPERTY RIGHTS ACT

Mr. Bounsall moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish Matrimonial Property Rights.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, this bill recognizes that marriage is an equal partnership and, upon a divorce or annulment, the total value of the combined assets of the spouses acquired during marriage shall be divided equally between them. In addition, a husband or wife shall not dispose of the matrimonial home without the consent of the other spouse.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, before you call the orders of the day—unfortunately the gentleman has just left, but I wanted the record for this day to be correct—I want to draw to the attention of the House that the former member for Algoma-Manitoulin, well respected by all members, was sitting under the gallery today.

I wish to table the answers to questions 5, 6 and 10 on the order paper, Mr. Speaker. (See appendix page 678.)

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

ELECTION FINANCES REFORM ACT

Hon. Mr. White moves second reading of Bill 3, An Act to regulate Political Party Financing and Election Contributions and Expenses.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, we have come a long way since one day in this House a private member's bill was debated, I think at the instance of one of my colleagues; the hon. member for York West (Mr. MacBeth) had been scheduled to speak against it, but he was adaptable, because earlier that same day the Premier (Mr. Davis) had suddenly changed his mind in midstream.

One of the highlights of the goings-on in this House was the fact that the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Gilbertson) was unable to change his mind. He had a speech prepared to talk against an election expenses bill and he didn't really care very much whether the Premier was in favour of it or not; he went on and delivered his speech. I am sorry that he isn't here; we would like to hear from him as to how he now regards the bill and whether he believes what the Premier does or doesn't believe; it might be of some historical value to him.

Mr. Speaker, this bill naturally is going to be supported by my colleagues and myself because we believe this bill is a very important part of the electoral process in the Province of Ontario. We don't think that there is any point at the moment in giving a long history of why it is here; suffice for the day that it is here. As I say, in broad terms we are going to support it.

There are a number of problems that arise out of this bill that frankly make it a little hard to understand, and I would hope as this debate goes on here and in committee that there could be and should be some substantial revisions.

For instance—and I am just going to list about four or five of the problems that I see—there is the clause about the restriction of spending insofar as it relates to advertising. I believe that is section 38. The original report of the Committee on the Legislature advocated there be no such control. However, there was a dissent, given interestingly enough by the Liberal appointee, Mr. Farquhar Oliver, who was recommended by my leader to sit as a member of that commission. The recommendation of the commission was not accepted by the government, but on the other hand the dissent as expressed by Mr. Oliver was not accepted either.

It is strange to me why the government has now chosen to opt only for the control of advertising expenses and for limiting advertising to a 21-day period. Advertising expenses, certainly in the area of Metropolitan Toronto, are not particularly meaningful at all. I would very much doubt whether any candidate who runs in the Metropolitan Toronto area spends

any money at all on radio, on television or on advertising in the daily newspapers.

Over and beyond that, the kind of advertising that is looked at by the Act affects some members in some sections. Why, Mr. Speaker? In very of all the complicated machinery that is set up here—the audit accounts, the reports, the documents and so on—why is there not an overall control of the amount that can be spent? It makes no sense to me at all that there cannot be, that it is too difficult to administer, that there should not be.

Certainly one of the main purposes of this statute is to let the horses run equally from the gate to give them a fair chance, to more or less have an equality of electoral opportunity, electoral expenditure, full disclosure and that sort of thing. So why can there not be some sort of a limit on the expenditure? There is a limit suggested for these advertising expenses. It is not an unreasonable limit to attach to all expenses. Or, if the formula seems a little bit low, why not raise it a bit? Surely, Mr. Speaker, it makes good sense that there should be overall control of the amount that can be spent by any candidate or any party in an election campaign.

One of the anomalies that seems to emerge from this statute is the question of contribution by the candidate himself or herself. It would seem that a candidate can only contribute the sum of \$500 to his own campaign. It puzzles me as to who is going to pick up the deficit, if there is a deficit campaign. These things have been known to happen.

Somehow something goes wrong and the bills are more than the receipts. The people who have been good enough to extend credit, printers and poster painters and people who make pickets to put signs on and all that sort of thing, expect to be paid. If they can't be paid by the candidate, who is going to pay them? I think, as soon as this aspect becomes a little more known, candidates are going to find that it's perhaps just a bit difficult to get credit from the suppliers; because if the supplier is going to be put in the position that he can't legally be paid by the candidate and the candidate doesn't want to break the law and he has already put his \$500 into his own campaign, we have great trouble.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): I like it. Don't change it.

Mr. Singer: I would hope somebody would do something about that.

Then, Mr. Speaker, there is another unfair incident in this, and that relates to the definition of what is a candidate. A candidate, as defined in the Act, is a person who is duly nominated in accordance with the Election

Act—that means after the writ is issued—or is a person who is nominated by a constituency association, or a person who, on or after the date of the issue of the writ, declares himself to be an independent candidate. That's fine, I suppose, and it's simple and it's straightforward, except that it gives certain people a very substantial advantage.

It gives the members of the Legislature who are intending to run again a very substantial advantage because they can delay their nomination until after the issue of the writ, but they can be running very hard long before the issue of the writ. Their expenditures are not controlled until, in fact, the writ is issued, because until the writ is issued they are really not candidates. I don't think that this goes to the principle of equality that the bill seems to strive for.

In England, a person is a candidate as soon as he has given any indication that he might be a candidate, whether he is a member or whether he is not a member. If a political type goes to a meeting and indicates to that meeting he is interested in being a candidate in X constituency, as of that moment he is a candidate under their legislation and he is accountable from there on in for the money that is spent by him or on his behalf in advancing that kind of candidacy. I think here there is an undue and unfair advantage given to people who are not formally candidates as they come within the definition of this Act. I would hope that something can be done in relation to this.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am puzzled and I am unhappy, both as a lawyer and as a politician, about the meaning of section 1, subsection 4, which talks about trusts. I always understood that when a trust is established there has to be someone who establishes the trust and there has to be a beneficiary and there has to be a purpose for the trust. There are nice Latin phrases that we were taught in law school that apply to this. There's the person who puts up the money and there's the beneficiary of the trust. The statute does not define trust in any way, and I'm puzzled as to what the trust is that the statute talks about.

If the Progressive Conservative riding association of Durham has \$10,000 in its kitty, is that a trust? If so, it is a trust for whom? Who has the right, in law, to go to the court and say: "You must account to me for those moneys. You must tell me how it's going to be spent. I have a right, from time to time, to choose the people who are going to be in charge of it"? Or, if the money is taken for a purpose, that I, as a member of that association, don't think is proper, do I have:

any remedies? Can I pursue those remedies in court? Can I tell somebody how the trust should be administered, or can I go to court and enforce those rights?

None of those things are dealt with in this statute. And the word trust may have been very meaningful to the draftsman of the statute, but I think that we are just looking for great difficulty and trouble when we don't bother to define it here. Trust has to have a beneficiary. The Latin phrase is *cestui que trust*; the person for whose benefit the trust has been set up. And there falls from the setting up of the trust, in law, certain rights and remedies that can be enforced in the courts.

If what is meant in this section, and throughout the Act where trust is referred to, is that any funds in the hands of a riding association are held in trust, then the Act should specify for whom they are held in trust, and who has enforceable rights in regard to them.

Now, it has been suggested to me when I raised this question with some people I was talking to, that I was talking about a very technical legal matter. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it's much more than a technical legal matter, because in the absence of a definition and in the absence of a unit or an entity known in law as a trust, these words in the statute as they now appear are almost meaningless. And it's just more or less begging for trouble. When there are directions about funds held in trust, they have to be dealt with in a certain way.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I'm unhappy as well with either the grammar or the parsing or the setting up of that section 4. I presume it is meant to mean that if there are funds held in trust, that within 60 days of the coming into force of the Act, which is April 13—that's five days from now—a report has to be made to the commission of the total amount of the funds that are in.

And I presume as well—and I'm not at all sure of this—that this only applies to funds for a constituency association or the future candidacy of any person. If that's what it means, I think the section could be a little more clearly written. If that is in fact what it means, and this trust that we're talking about does not apply to party funds, are party funds in any way controlled at all? This gets to be a very, very difficult thing to contemplate, and actually the only reference that I could find was in section 39, where we talk about foundations.

If section 1, subsection 4, does not apply to party funds, then I guess we've got to go to section 39, where we talk about a

foundation. The setting up of a foundation is permissive—it's not mandatory. If a party has a large sum of money—which may or may not be a trust—and if the party, I suppose, comes to the conclusion that it isn't a trust, and that it doesn't want to set up a foundation, what in fact happens to that money? Is it accountable for in any way? Should it be accountable?

If we're going to have a starting position, would it not be reasonable, Mr. Speaker, to include the party funds under this trust concept that is purportedly being set up in the earlier section? Should there not be a mandatory setting up of an accountability of party funds? And should sub (c) of 4 not apply, and within 60 days after the day when that section comes into force, a party as well as a constituency "should report in writing to the commission the existence of such trust and the total amount of the funds therein"? That's what sub (c) says.

It would seem to me that if the section is going to be meaningful it should say something like that. Otherwise the gap is just so broad that the real purpose of the statute is probably going to be defeated. I have heard rumours that a party has presently in trust—is that the word?—has control of a large sum of money which it apparently is going to use for election purposes. Is that money going to be accounted for? How is it going to be accounted for? Is it a trust fund? Does the commission have to know about it? Do they have to set up a foundation and be governed by—obviously they don't have to set up a foundation; they can if they want. What happens to those moneys if somebody comes to the conclusion they are not in trust? Can they be spent in ways that don't bring the provisions and enforcement of the Act into play?

These are things that I think have to be worried about at some length if this statute is going to be meaningful. My colleagues and I believe that the statute in principle is a good one. We will support it and I would hope we will hear from the minister who introduced it, the member for London South (Mr. White), when he comes to reply as to how he proposes to deal with some of these apparent obvious difficulties. I am sure there are more.

We will be introducing some amendments, hopefully to try to take care of some of these things which we believe are deficiencies. We would hope the minister has already studied some of these problems and has some amendments ready himself.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, this legislation is based primarily on the Camp commission recommendations and it grows out of a growing public concern on two matters. First, the skyrocketing costs of elections these days and, secondly, the undue reliance of the Liberal and Conservative parties on corporate contributions and the NDP on trade union contributions.

The Camp commission assessed that reliance on the part of the old parties at 90 per cent on corporate contributions, and on the part of the NDP at 40 per cent on the trade union movement. I am not going to dispute those figures; I just cite them as an indication of the conclusion they came to, though I think they might be disputed to some degree.

Apart from the disclosure of the sources of contributions politically, the bill fixes limits on party revenues which can be received from any single source and it seeks to broaden the base of political contributions. In other words, to democratize the financing of political parties.

I would like to discuss each of these concerns in brief for a moment. The first concern is with regard to the skyrocketing of election costs.

I am not certain, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is going to achieve the objective which is set in this connection. The Camp commission fixed no limits on what might be spent in an election. The majority of the commission supported that proposition because they felt it was impossible to police it. Therefore they operated on what is otherwise a rather sound principle—that if one has a law that can't be enforced, or if one hasn't got a law that can be enforced, don't put the law on the books because it just brings it all into disrepute.

The minority view was that there could be a ceiling fixed. The bill sort of falls half-way in between. The government indulged, if the minister will forgive me for saying so, in a bit of political posturing by saying, "This is too important an area and we must move in and fix the limits on what is undoubtedly one of the major areas of escalating costs, namely, advertising." I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the limits which have been fixed merely legalize exorbitant levels of expenditure.

I won't take the time of the House at this point with the team effort that we're going to present in discussing this bill. I will leave that to some of my colleagues who are particularly interested in it.

If there is effective enforcement on the limits of giving from any single source, and if there is an adequate switch to public financing away from those traditional private sources, then future elections could be held at the level at which they now are. I seriously doubt whether you could reduce them, Mr. Speaker, but I repeat, I think you might be able to hold them at the level that they now are.

But if, Mr. Speaker, there is no effective enforcement, and instead of a switch of some of the expenditure to public money there is just simply a supplanting of the traditional private sources of money with the public sources of money, then I venture the prediction that we're going to be spending more on elections, not less. If that is the case, I would assume that would confirm my conclusion that this objective of the Act is a rather shaky one.

I move to a second concern; that of broadening the base of party financing. Some major steps have been taken and I would concede that they are real steps forward. For the most part they are paralleling what has already been done in the federal legislation, namely a rebate of personal and corporate income tax—the familiar figures now; 75 per cent on the first \$100 and so forth. However, the explanatory note in the bill, I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the minister, is not accurate, because the explanatory note in the bill states this legislation "implements the basic recommendations of the report"—that's the Camp commission report—"with the following major differences."

It lists differences, but it doesn't list the fact that nothing has been done, either in this bill or in the companion amendments to the personal income tax and to the corporations tax, to implement what is in my view that key recommendation of the Camp commission, namely that there should be in addition to rebates the \$2 checkoff for each person who files an income tax return. In other words, the person would have the right to designate the party of his choice—and I presume that it would be one party of his choice—and the \$2 would be sent on his behalf out of the public treasury.

The explanation that I have received privately in discussions with the minister and with others in the cabinet is that the reason why this is not either in this bill, or in the companion bills amending the Income Tax Act, is because the federal government objected to it. As I understand the federal government's position, it is ready to permit provinces to parallel anything that it has done in

relationship to tax collecting and exemptions and things of that nature, but not to go beyond it.

I just want to put on the record, Mr. Speaker, that if that is the position of the federal government I suggest it's irrelevant, because all this government wants to know presumably, in light of the recommendation of the Camp commission, is what people want to have done on their behalf. We now know that we have the so-called purple-coloured schedule on our income tax filings in which we deal with Ontario tax credits and things of that nature, and presumably there is a box—

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Not next year.

Mr. MacDonald: Not next year? Well, a comparable kind of schedule in which a person filing an income tax return could indicate what contribution would be made on his behalf. All the federal government would have to do is to indicate that X number of people wanted the contribution to be made to the Conservative Party, to the Liberal Party, or to the New Democratic Party. There would be no money out of their treasury. It would be reported back here to Queen's Park and Queen's Park makes the contribution.

So I can't see what substance there is in the objections that are being made by the federal government if this government is willing to proceed and implement all of the recommendations of the Camp commission.

I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is extremely important, because I concede that the rebate is going to result in much heavier personal contributions and there will be a compulsion on parties to seek to broaden the base because of the \$2,000 ceilings—\$4,000 including the contributions that can be made to local riding associations—and therefore they will be getting more money conceivably into the party by that broadening of the base.

But, particularly for the old parties—and I'd be the first to concede, in some instances for the New Democratic Party—where they get from certain trade unions a contribution of some thousands of dollars, that large contribution is now going to be out the window and it's going to take a lot of work to get the smaller contributions to make up for it.

My very serious concern is that in switching away from the traditional sources which had become so concentrated we make very certain we do get a real broadening of the base, and quite frankly this simple little proposition—which is a steal from the Ameri-

can scene that the Camp commission indulged in—of a checkoff of \$2 from the public treasury to the party of his choice, or party of her choice, is the real opportunity for broadening the base of political financing.

After all, I suppose 50 per cent as many people who file income taxes vote in this province, and therefore we get the opportunity for broadening the base for ongoing party purposes in the fashion that the Camp commission was quite eloquent in saying was necessary if we were going to escape some of the unfortunate features of party financing.

There is another point in this connection, Mr. Speaker, that I'd like to mention. The historical record in Canada in terms of enforcing legislation dealing with fund raising and election financing of any kind is really the sorriest record that one could conceive of. There has been no enforcement at all; no real effort at enforcement. As a matter of fact, the House may be interested in just a few, brief reminders to be found on pages 18 and 19 of the report of the committee on election expenses that was done at the federal level and dated 1966.

Back about 1906, 1907 and 1908 a fair amount of political flack developed because of charges of electoral and administrative corruption and patronage in the civil service and things of this nature. As a result of that the government moved at that time toward some electoral reform, including—believe it or not, Mr. Speaker, listen to this—including the prohibition on corporations from making any contributions to a candidate or a political party.

I suspect most people in Canada would hardly believe that that is the case. As a matter of fact I'm a little curious—and I suppose I should have checked and confirmed this—as to whether that really is still on the statute book, that no political contribution can be made by a corporation to a candidate or to a political party. We know, of course, that no attention was paid to it.

As was pointed out in the one speech in the House of Commons some years later, there was no lessening or slackening of corporate contributions, there were no prosecutions of those who made the contributions, there was no effort or no intent on the part of the government that passed the bill to enforce it and, indeed, there was no effort on the part of the opposition to seek to have enforcement of the legislation.

The point that K. Z. Paltiel, professor at Carleton University—who was the research director for the Barbeau commission and who has in subsequent years pursued his interest

in this whole phase of political science and writes periodic articles to bring the picture up to date—has made time and time again in his books—I suppose the most well known being “Political Party Financing in Canada” in the McGraw-Hill series—is the fact that the enforcement of election regulations and fund raising and efforts to root out corruption and things of that nature has been honoured in the breach consistently all down through our history.

My fear, Mr. Speaker, is this, that if we don't have real assurance of alternative sources for fund raising there is going to be a very strong compulsion once again on the part of the parties, on the part of those who have the responsibility—or rather the extreme difficulty of enforcing this legislation, to cut corners, to continue the old procedures which are trying to be rooted out here, or which at least are trying to be reduced in their impact by this broadening of the financial base.

I remember some years ago, just to deal finally with this point, an article that the late Blair Fraser wrote in Maclean's Magazine which was entitled, “Our illegal elections.” He pointed out that all of the elections, federal and provincial, were illegal because of the manner in which the funds were raised. He asserted—and nobody ever challenged him—that the heart and soul and spinal column of old-party funds at the provincial level come from those who have contracts to do work for the government.

It is precisely that kind of thing that it seems to me we want to get away from and that this bill seeks to get away from. It further seems to me we are going to be much more assured of the prospect of getting away from it if we have real alternative sources, a real genuine broadening of the base. The most effective way to get a real democratization of political financing, I suggest, is going to be by this purely voluntary proposition of being able to indicate that \$2, a rather small sum, will be sent from the public treasury on your behalf.

Perhaps there is another footnote I would like to make to this, Mr. Speaker, and that is that this kind of thing has been tried by parties and hasn't worked.

I can remember a few years ago—I won't name the spot—somebody within the framework of the New Democratic Party said, “You know, we've got thousands of people out there who vote for us. In a given riding we may get 10,000 votes. If we'd only get people to send in \$1, we would have \$10,000

and our problems would be greatly relieved, if not solved, in terms of financing the election.” As a result, they decided that they would experiment.

In this certain city they ran newspaper ads that cost approximately \$450 or \$500, inviting people to send in the money. Well, you know what happened, Mr. Speaker: They didn't get in enough money to cover the cost of the ads.

That isn't just true of the New Democratic Party. In some of the reading I've done this past year, I recall one instance in which the federal Conservative organizer, back in the early 1940s, attempted to have this kind of a campaign, appealing all across the country, to get money in by voluntary contributions of small amounts. It was a flop—it was an utter flop.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Action Canada.

Mr. MacDonald: We can't engage in compulsion, but at least in this instance we could have rather a simple voluntary procedure of ticking off a little square indicating the party that you want to make a contribution to and it would come out of the public treasury. It seems to me it would be the greatest single step towards achieving the broadening of the financial base and therefore the objectives of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a brief comment about what I think is the potentially great strength of this bill, and that is the so-called commission on election contributions and expenses. In contrast, while I acknowledge that the federal legislation is a real step forward, I think its great weakness, as Prof. Paltiel has underlined, is the fact that there is no machinery for effective enforcement. There is the chief electoral officer and his chief financial officer, and that man would need to be Solomon and an octopus with a thousand heads and arms and legs and everything to do the job. It simply is an impossible job.

But what we have done in the Province of Ontario, on the Camp commission's recommendation, is to establish a commission which is going to be made up of appointees, two appointees from each party, plus a full-time chairman and the chief electoral officer. The function of this commission will be to be both a watchdog and a counsellor to all those who are involved. They will have the powers of investigation. They will have the complete powers of a public inquiry, if necessary. There is, of course, all the auditing procedures.

Presumably they are going to have field people who will move into a constituency, when and if necessary, and sit down with local people to acquaint them with the procedures in the earlier stage, if it becomes necessary to do something other than just providing booklets and explanations. That I think is the assurance, the greatest possible assurance, that this bill is going to be more enforceable. Indeed I would hope it will be more enforced than all the other bills which have preceded it down through the years and which really were a travesty.

There are a number of areas which are grey areas. The member for Downsview has cited some of them. Some of them didn't seem as grey to me as they did to him; conversely some of the things which I think are grey, he may think are as clear as crystal.

Perhaps the first comment I want to make is that it is inevitable when one moves into this kind of field, with all of its complexities and with all its areas in which at some point there has to be adjudication as to what the rules are, what the guidelines are, we are going to have a continuing watching brief with somebody having the power to adjudicate and say, "This is the guideline; this is how we're going to operate."

Since that body, the commission, has representatives of all parties on it—it's an administrative detail, it's really non-partisan—it will likely be that it will be able to get cabinet agreement or a consensus, even though its members may vote and have some division of opinion along the way on occasion.

Let me cite two of these areas which bother me. The first one is in section 20. Section 20 states that a contributor is to contribute only the funds belonging to him. Let me create for members a little scenario.

A certain organization or a certain individual wants to make a sizable contribution to a political party or a sizable contribution to a certain candidate. He can't do it within the limitations which are imposed upon him so he goes to 20 different people and says, "Here is \$100" so that names wouldn't be revealed—or \$500 when names would be revealed—and says, "Put them in." Under the Act, the spirit of the Act is going to be violated because they can only contribute their own money.

I'm just a little uncertain as to how the government is going to come to grips with that and how it is going to avoid the violation of the Act.

I suppose it's just a case of being a watchdog and when the government finds instances in which it thinks it's being violated, it will

move in and, if it can get documentation of it, the penalties are imposed. We hope the lesson will be learned and it won't happen again; but it's an unfortunate grey area that may cause trouble.

Section 23 is another one. It says:

Where any corporate person, corporation or trade union with the knowledge and consent of a political party or a candidate promotes the political party or the election of the candidate or opposes any other registered party.

Then it goes on. How is the minister going to be able to say with certainty that such-and-such a person took action or such a corporation took action for or against a candidate or a party with their knowledge or consent? How is he going to be dead certain about that? Again, it's a grey area.

It may well be that one has to state these grey areas and work at it, knowing that the law will be violated, and then just play a double role as watchdog in that connection.

Perhaps it's like the Human Rights Commission which says people aren't going to discriminate on the basis of race, colour or creed but we know somebody is going to do it because he's always thought that way. We counsel him otherwise and if he can't see the error of his ways and the fact that he is violating the law, the next time he does it, he's charged. Maybe it's that kind of an approach. I don't know but it's a grey area that rather disturbs me.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): How about an anonymous donation?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, anonymous donations are another grey area. If one gets an anonymous donation, one is supposed to send it back if one knows the source; alternatively if one doesn't know the source, one sends it to the commission.

Mr. Singer: One can find it lying on the doorstep sometimes.

Mr. MacDonald: I will let the minister let his imagination go off in any one of six different directions as to how one can play games with that. How he is going to enforce it I'm not certain, but there it is.

There are other areas which I think are in the category that I referred to in reference to the comments of the member for Downsview. I think we are just going to have to count on experience being the guide. The commission then sets forth the guidelines, as they are entitled to do, under section 4, subsection (1)(j).

I know of one case the minister has given some thought to, and I know that my colleague from Thunder Bay is disturbed about it and I understand others are. That is the requirement that all the money must be kept in one bank account. Well, one bank account in Thunder Bay, if you just pause for a moment to consider the proportions of Thunder Bay, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): It is 110,000 square miles.

Mr. MacDonald: —it is an unnecessary kind of restriction and perhaps we should take a look at that kind of thing.

I want to deal for a bit in the final part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, on two sections that I am disturbed about, because I think they violate principles rather badly or they conjure up the prospect of administrative complexities and difficulties that are really mind-boggling. The first one that I want to refer to is section 30, in which it states that the first \$10 or any portion thereof that is a membership fee shall not be receipted and therefore, open to be able to get a rebate in filing on income tax.

I think to be very fair and frank on this, Mr. Speaker, the Camp commission may well have put this clause in here to meet the situation in the New Democratic Party. Our basic membership fee is now \$10. Without bothering the House at any great length, that fee is split, a portion of it going to the riding association, a portion of it going to the provincial party and a portion of it going to the federal party. We know elsewhere in the Act it says that one can't have money going from the federal to the provincial level and vice versa.

I think the Camp commission concluded that if they were just to exempt that fee, then they would get out of all of those complexities that existed within the framework of the administration in the New Democratic Party. What they didn't realize, however, is that they are not lessening the problem at all. If a person contributes a sustaining membership, which is a contribution beyond the basic membership, of any figure that he wants—maybe \$25, \$50 or \$100; it may be done on post-dated cheques over the period of the year and so on—there is also a division of that among all three levels of the party.

The net result is going to be that it doesn't really solve the problem. The net result of administration is going to be that if we leave that section in there the first \$10 can be receipted as a contribution to the federal party and, therefore, a receipt will be sent

out for the first \$10 on the federal legislation. Anything beyond that would have to be in the provincial legislation.

That is a piece of nonsense. Without taking too much time, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that all you have got to do is go back to the next convention and change the constitution as to what the level of the fee will be. It may be down to \$1 or \$2 rather than \$10. You can circumvent it. It is not necessary and it is just an undesirable proposition.

Members of the House may be interested to know that we have a bit of guidance from the federal experience already, even though they are less than a year old in trying to cope with these problems.

The federal legislation in the first instance was interpreted as saying that memberships would not be included as an item that could be receipted and, therefore, one could get his rebate on income tax. That was the first interpretation that was placed on it. In Ottawa, to a very great extent, interpretations on the Act are made by the federal revenue department because they handle the income tax, and one had better please those boys because if he doesn't, he will be running into trouble at a later date.

So all parties, as most people are likely aware, or spokesmen or representatives of all parties, met with the federal revenue department in countless meetings over a period of a number of months to iron it out. What I wanted to report to the House is that, after about two or three months of wrestling with this, all political parties agreed that it was administratively a nightmare and that the government should make the receipt eligible from the first dollar right through and forget the membership altogether. I suggest that is sound in principle, in the context of what the Camp commission is saying.

What the Camp commission is saying is that we are interested not only in the funding, the viable operation of a party at election time, but we are interested in the viable operation of a party between elections, and if the government's interest is there, and this whole bill is designed to meet that interest, what's the point of making the distinction between the money that went in as a membership, because it's always small, and money that went in as a contribution not described as membership. In short, we certainly will move an amendment and I hope that the case is such a reasonable one that the minister might be willing to move himself in eliminating that \$10 feature there.

Section 31 is an even more complicated one, and if the House will forgive me I am afraid I have got to give members a bit of an explanation as to the relationships between the New Democratic Party and the trade union movement with regard to affiliation fees. What this section says is that any affiliation fee that is paid by a local union to the New Democratic Party will be deemed to be a contribution from the union rather than from the individual members in the union.

In the first place, I just want to give members some indication as to why that is a violation that is just false. It's wrong in principle. It's an inaccurate reflection of what the situation is, because what happens is that when a union decides that it is going to affiliate to the New Democratic Party it does so by giving notice of it, it is considered at the next meeting, if the majority of people vote for it then the union is affiliated. Usually, to be very frank—I will let members in on a secret within these four walls—most unions will affiliate about 80 per cent of their members, partly because it's cheaper to do it that way and partly because they concede that there will be some people—

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Yes, but they have their price in obtaining a good spokesman too.

Mr. MacDonald: —who are opposed, who are supporters of other parties, and they are left out. They are sort of not included. However, the constitution of the New Democratic Party—not of the union, of the New Democratic Party—says that any individual member of a union which has collectively decided by a majority vote that it wants to affiliate to the New Democratic Party has the right to opt out and say: "No contribution shall be made on my behalf." The point I am making is that it's an individual decision. It's an individual contribution that is being made on his behalf, even though it may be sent in collectively from the union on behalf of the 50 or 100 or whatever members there happen to be.

There's a second feature that I wanted to draw to the members' attention and that is that in the constitution of the New Democratic Party it is stipulated that a trade unionist who has become an affiliate member of the party through his union can then pay, if he wants to become an individual member, not the basic \$10 but the basic \$10 minus \$1.20—the 10 cents a month that was sent in in his affiliation fee. In short, once again the affiliation fee is deemed to be an individual decision.

However, let me not try to make my case wholly on the basis of circumstances within the New Democratic Party and our constitution, that some members may view with a degree of scepticism. I know the hon. minister is never sceptical.

Mr. Stokes: I don't know why.

Mr. MacDonald: I don't know why, but let me go to Camp—

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): He is just a Cande of this world.

Mr. MacDonald: —to pages 34 and 35 of the Camp commission's recommendations. I want to read about three or four paragraphs here. It is talking about group contributions and then it says:

As an exception to the above, the commission recommends that employees, union members, or salaried members of any bona fide organization, be allowed to contribute to a political party through the "checkoff" procedure, without regard to and independent of any other political contributions by the participating individuals, provided that their contributions are voluntary, or are made according to the constitutional authority vested in the organization concerned, and that the amount of the check-off is not more than 10 cents per month for each contributor.

This practice is a familiar and well-established one, notably with trade unions, and since the individual amounts are nominal the commission would wish to encourage such a practice rather than inhibit it.

Would the minister note that? "The commission would wish to encourage such a practice rather than to inhibit it." Well, I suggest that section 31 is not only going to be an inhibition, but it's going to be a real compulsion, a real obstacle to affiliation.

Let me give the minister the really classic case to show the inequity of this section. Say there's a union that has 1,600 members in it, and it decides to affiliate: presumably they pay \$1.20 a year in this instance for all 1,600 of them, so they're going to contribute close to the \$2,000 in their affiliation fees. That means that they're denied any opportunity to make any contribution beyond that affiliation fee. I suggest to you, sir, that's unfair. Indeed, I want to suggest that it becomes ludicrous when we consider the example of the union of my friend from Hamilton, the big steel local at Stelco which has 10,000 members in it. Their affiliation fee is going to

be in excess of the \$2,000 that this bill has fixed as a limit. In other words, their affiliation fee is going to put them in contravention of the Act by paying the affiliation fee alone.

I let my case rest there and we can discuss it further if there is any aspect of it that is unclear. But it seems to me that the section is based on the misconception that that contribution is a group contribution, whereas it is not; it is an individual contribution, as indicated by two or three aspects of the constitution of the New Democratic Party. Secondly, it's the kind of thing that the Camp commission urged should be done, because it is a way of broadening the base of political parties and their membership, and the financing of them.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker. I understand that this bill, along with those portions of the companion bills that deal with the amendments to the income and corporation tax acts, is going to go to a standing committee and there will be opportunities for public representations to be made and, therefore, an opportunity to discuss this with some outside input.

I am very pleased that's going to happen, because I think we want to thrash through the detail of this now to make it as fair as possible, as clear as possible and as uncomplicated as possible. And in many of these sections there is not clarity or there are elements that I think are unfair, as in sections 30 and 31. Certainly it's unnecessarily complicated.

At that stage, like the Liberal Party, we will certainly be making some amendments. Perhaps the minister will anticipate some of them and be willing to introduce them himself at the committee stage. As for the bill itself on second reading, we will support it in the New Democratic Party. With all of the problems that it is going to create, it is a step forward and one that we welcome.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments to make on this bill. I believe that most of the comments have been covered by the hon. member for Downsview and the previous speaker, but the one point I would like to make is that obviously the introduction of this bill is a reaction of the government to the feeling among the people of this province that elections cost too much money and that political parties are spending too much money.

I am firmly of the opinion that rather than decreasing the costs of operating elections and equalizing the opportunities of all people to take part, this bill in effect will increase the total expenditures of political parties, particularly at the constituency level.

Consider, first of all, that the average constituency of perhaps 40,000 voters is going to have an input of approximately \$6,000 from the provincial coffers. Then there's going to be the ease of collection in many constituencies that hasn't existed before because of the tax writeoff that's going to be given, particularly the 75 per cent tax writeoff that's going to be given for contributions of \$100 or less. I know this may not be true in the larger more urban areas but certainly in the smaller municipalities of 50,000 or 75,000 and the rural constituencies this really does broaden the base from which collections can be made. I would suspect that much more money will be collected locally because there will be a lot of people who will be prepared to contribute \$100 knowing full well that 75 per cent of it actually is coming from the coffers of the provincial income tax.

In that way I believe there will be much more money available to candidates across the province without even considering the funds which may be provided to them through the foundations which might be established by those parties which now have large sums of money—or that party which may have a large sum of money to place into a foundation and distribute across this province to its constituencies before the oncoming election.

I think when we consider these matters in that light it becomes apparent that unless we have an overall restriction on the total expenditures a candidate or an association at the constituency level might make, what we are going to have is higher expenditures than we ever had before. The public, in the long run, is certainly going to be disillusioned by what otherwise could be good legislation.

I suggest to the minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, that in order for this piece of legislation to be acceptable, not only to us as members and to the political parties we all represent here but also to those people who really count, the general public, we must have overall control on the expenditures that can be made both at the provincial level and at the constituency level. I would suggest that a 50 cents per voter expenditure level should be set for each constituency in the province.

In other words, in the constituency I was discussing a few minutes ago, the total amount that could be spent to stay within

the terms of this Act would be \$20,000. In this Legislature we all realize that there are campaigns which have cost far in excess of that, both at the provincial and the federal level. These are the type of campaigns that really turn the public off and this is the reason for this type of legislation.

I would suggest to the minister that rather than have those sections of this Act which control the expenditures of advertising for 21 days prior to the election, he take the bull by the horns and include in the Act an amendment to provide total overall expenditure control. Certainly I would agree with those who say this will be very difficult to police and very difficult to control but obviously in any type of Act such as this it would be left to the commission naturally to make the final determination. I do believe also that in this type of legislation the policing of the Act falls not only on the commission and the chief electoral officer but also falls on the parties themselves. In other words, they are going to watch each other. This is what has happened in other jurisdictions and this is how they have made it work.

The English legislation to which my confrere from Downsview referred earlier builds into its Act the fact that each party carries on an almost ongoing auditing of the expenditures of the other parties. In that way they make the authorities aware of transgressions against the overall expenditures that are set. He has also mentioned the fact that once a person declares himself as a candidate, or declares himself as one who is interested in being a candidate, that any moneys or expenses from then on are charged against the total of expenditures to which he or the party which he represents in that riding is entitled to up to the time of the election date.

From the observations that were made by a number of us while in England, the legislation appears to be workable and to be enforceable. There have been a number of cases in England where candidates who have been successful have been unseated because of the enforcement of the Act based on information provided by the other parties. So policing becomes not only the responsibility of the commission established here, but also becomes that of the other parties concerned and, in fact, the general public.

So I would suggest that if we are going to have public financing, public assistance to candidates and to political parties, then we have to have a definitive line above which expenditures cannot go. I think limiting expenditures insofar as advertising is concerned will be as difficult to enforce as any other

type of expenditure limit. Although some other expenditures could be made under the table, or may be made some other way, I think you're going to have that type of expenditure whether you have this Act or not. Of course, those people who take part in that type of political games are covered under the Election Act, as well as being covered here.

There are also a couple of other points which I would like to make that rather baffle me. In section 37, subsection 3, the amount that a candidate or a constituency association can be charged by a publication for an advertisement has to be the same as what the publication charges other advertisers. For the life of me I cannot understand why that isn't extended to include the other media as well. We're all aware in this Legislature that there are many television and radio stations across this province that have two or three rates, and at election time they always seem to come up with a fourth rate that they apply for political advertisements. This rate is much higher than what they ordinarily charge to other advertisers.

So, if you're going to cover that contingency in regard to periodicals—and I presume periodicals in that section would also mean newspapers—then I cannot understand why the other media are not covered in the same way.

The other matter that I wanted to cover and bring up a bit more is the question of the overrun of expenditures—which the member for Downsview also mentioned—and the fact that candidates will not be responsible because they can only contribute \$500. Perhaps we'll all be walking around having to pay cash for any type of advertising or any type of a promotion which candidates of their constituency might want to do. Because, certainly as I read the Act, there is no responsibility left for payment of debts after an election if, in fact, there is an overrun of expenditures.

Along with that, I see that section 35 allows for the borrowing of money by a political party, constituency association or a candidate, but in section 36 it says that no persons, etc., can guarantee these loans. So when you put that together with the fact that the candidate himself cannot contribute more than \$500, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to understand what would happen if there were an overrun of expenditures in a campaign. Certainly the money can be borrowed, according to section 35. And, according to section 36, the candidate can co-sign or provide collateral responsibility for the repayment of the loan. But if the loan is, in

fact, in excess of \$500 he will be outside of the Act, because if he's called upon to repay that note he will be expending and contributing to his own political campaign in excess of what he's allowed under the Act. I, for one, would like to see that discussed more fully by the minister and explained as to what the intentions of the Act are.

These are the only points I believe that I wanted to bring up that have not already been covered as fully as I would wish. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I don't want to cover any ground that has been covered already. I welcome this bill as one of progress. I personally feel that it hasn't faced the issues quite clearly.

As I understand it, the purpose of the legislation is to free political parties and political candidates from undue influence from the various vested interests in our society. For example, to use a kind of a non-partisan provincial example, it could be that if the Bell Telephone Co. made a huge contribution to a federal political party which attained power, it might find it very easy to raise its rates at a later date. All members, I think, are aware of the possibilities that campaign funds have for working against the public interest. I don't think I need give any further examples. Perhaps that one example wasn't even needed.

I think the reform should have come in this manner. I believe that each candidate should have been allowed a certain sum—in my opinion, about 10 cents per voter—so that in a riding of 70,000 voters a sum of \$7,000 would have been allowed. The candidate would be allowed to spend up to this amount—borrow it from a bank, I would suggest—and then be reimbursed up to that amount after the election had been concluded. In my opinion, he should not be allowed to take any money from any other person, any other group or any other organization—from nobody. In that way he would be entirely free from any indebtedness to any person or any organization. I think this would turn out to be a much cheaper way in the long run for the taxpayers of this province.

We would then have elected members who were free from any obligation, and the political parties they belong to would be free from any financial political obligations.

Mr. Bullbrook: I agree with that. I agree totally with what the member is saying.

Mr. Burr: Thank you, Mr. Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, not quite Mr. Sarnia.

Mr. Burr: There would have to be some kind of very careful auditing—perhaps the auditing that is proposed now under the commission. I would suggest that there would be a penalty for overspending—perhaps the loss of the seat for the winner and perhaps a fine for the losers, if this overspending took place.

Some members might say that 10 cents per voter—that is, \$7,000 for a 70,000-member riding—would not be enough. I think it would be quite sufficient. It would be some indication of the candidate's ability to use money to organize his campaign and to spend the money wisely. If he chose to spend it on television, radio or newspaper advertising; if he preferred to put out leaflets; if he preferred to use lawn signs—this would be entirely up to him and he could spend the amount of money in any of the approved ways he wished—any way short of bribery.

I think also that each provincial party could be given a certain sum of money to spend as it saw fit—on TV, radio, newspapers, leaders' tours or any other specified ways.

However, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I think the bill is a step towards our goal, which in my opinion is freeing political parties and candidates from influence of the vested interests of the various kinds. I support the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to speak to this bill before the minister replies?

The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Could we alternate here?

Mr. Speaker: We could alternate, yes.

Mr. Foulds: Well, I would be glad to—

Mr. Speaker: No one rose until the member for Port Arthur rose.

The member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few brief remarks on the legislation itself. Some of the points that I will be referring to have been covered by my colleague from Downsview and possibly by my colleague from Nipissing, but I would like to make a few general comments on the bill.

My major concern about the legislation as it stands is that there are no provisions,

as far as I can see, to record the amount of moneys that will be going into this trust fund. That is, moneys collected prior to 3 p.m. on Feb. 13 of this year. Mr. Speaker, I feel that there should be provision for that. The purpose of the legislation, after all, is full disclosure of financing sources, expenditures and so on.

It seems to me that if we are going to enforce this through legislation for the next provincial election, and if we don't have that sort of provision, we are in some way avoiding the intent and purpose of this legislation by not having disclosure of amounts of money that are going in to this fund.

As I read the legislation, it may well be that a constituency association or a candidate will have to record moneys received from the party, and it's possible that some of those funds will come from a trust fund and moneys collected prior to Feb. 13, 1975, but the fact remains that that type of accounting of what was in that fund will not, in my opinion, be accurate. The moneys could be spent for advertising or a variety of other matters and could not be checked or accounted for reasonably.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to take this legislation seriously and if we are going to convince the public that we are going to level with them and make full disclosure of sources and expenditures, then we need this type of legislation. And I hope that this party, and the government, of course, will see fit to bring in amendments to the legislation—which will force all political parties to state the amounts of moneys collected prior to Feb. 13 and how much is going into this fund.

We've heard all sorts of allegations, and there have been a number of newspaper stories. For instance, Harold Greer, in his column in the *Ottawa Citizen*—I have a number of articles he has written. He has stated, and this has not been denied by anyone, that the legislation is, in his opinion, a \$4 million loophole. It may well be that is an exaggeration, that that amount of money has not been collected by the government party, the Conservatives in this province.

Mr. Good: It could be an underestimate, too.

Mr. Roy: I don't know. It could be that it's more than this amount but at no time have I heard any attempt to disclose the amounts of money which have been collected.

I think as long as people are making this type of allegation—and as long as we continue to perpetrate this type of secrecy in relation

to the moneys going into this particular fund, allegations will be made—the public itself will not be satisfied that all political parties in this province are prepared to live by their own legislation. That is, to disclose where the funds come from, what the amounts are and how they are spent.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the government would see fit to amend the legislation to compel all political parties in this province to state the amount of funds going into this trust fund; in other words, moneys collected prior to Feb. 13, 1975. I would think it would be to the advantage of the government because allegations have been made that the Conservative fund-raisers were extremely active some months or years prior to the enactment or the presentation of this legislation to the House. This would be a way for the government party and for all other parties here, to dispel this type of suspicion and to dispel any type of apprehension on the part of the public.

Mr. Speaker, one further matter I would like to comment upon on the legislation itself is that there should be limits on amounts of money spent in each constituency. I feel that if the federal legislation and other legislation which has been referred to—the English legislation—does have limits on this and that if we are, again, spreading the contribution of individuals—and this type of legislation as my colleague from Nipissing has said will do this—it will enable individuals from all walks of life to participate in the political process and I think that is healthy.

I was extremely pleased to see the minister has decided to take advantage of the tax legislation to allow deductions for contributors to political parties in this province. I think it would have been in some ways a very large deficiency in this bill if we had federal legislation which permitted tax deductions and provincial legislation which would not. I think that would have been extremely unfair to people who would have wanted to participate in the political process provincially. I think really that it was a wise move and we had no choice if we were serious about this type of legislation.

I do feel there should be limits on spending and I feel that the limits imposed by the legislation on spending for advertising are no limits at all. I think my colleagues have mentioned that they are not adequate. My colleague from Downsview has stated some of the deficiencies in the legislation—some technical problems with the legislation. I was pleased to see the minister's response that this bill will be going to standing committee be-

cause I think this is that type of legislation—especially when we consider the difficulty and the problems they had at the federal level with their legislation and the lengthy debates they had on it.

Mr. Speaker, these are basically my comments to this bill. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I welcome this bill and I am particularly pleased that the present minister is the one who is guiding it through. I hope it won't be his swan song in spite of his announced retirement because I've enjoyed the minister in the House. I think he is often aggressive, often pugnacious, but always stimulating.

Mr. Roy: The minister's performance yesterday left something to be desired.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Except his Throne Speech wind up. That wasn't very stimulating.

Mr. Roy: The minister was weak there.

Mr. Foulds: I was trying to be complimentary. I didn't know I was going to raise such a storm about being complimentary to this minister.

Hon. S. B. Handleman (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): It wasn't the hon. member. He is fine.

Mr. Foulds: I have often disagreed with this minister on principle in terms of his previous portfolios. That's why I am pleased to agree with the principle of this bill that he is guiding through the House.

We used to play a game when we were kids about one small step, one medium-size step and one giant step. I think this is a step somewhere between medium size and giant—

Mr. Laughren: It is called "May I."

Mr. Foulds: —in the right direction, in the game of "May I." I especially think of the way that this bill has broken ground in setting up a very clearly defined commission to administer the Act. That is something quite different, if I am correct, from any other legislation whatsoever. That is a genuine attempt, I think, on the part of the government to ensure tough enforcement of this bill. Frankly, I welcome tough enforcement of this bill. In fact, I would hope that some provisions under the bill would go further, because I think that there is an ennuï, an apathy that has taken hold of the public in

North America with regard to political parties and political activity. Anything that we can do in this northern half of North America to rehabilitate that attitude is welcome.

There are a number of limitations that the hon. member for York South touched on, a number of reservations that I have that he mentioned and which I endorse. I am disappointed that there are no overall limits on spending, either at the constituency level or on the provincial overall level—not just limits on advertising but overall spending limits. I wouldn't go quite as far as my colleague from Sandwich-Riverside in limiting every constituency—

Mr. Burr: Oh, come on!

Mr. Foulds: —to \$7,000 in expenditure. I think—and this is just a slight personal disagreement that we might have—that that would tend to favour the well known or established person, particularly in one-town constituencies like Sault Ste. Marie or something like that. Someone who had a business that for years had advertised publicly would have a name that would be better known than, say, a machinist out of a factory or a humble school teacher or someone like that.

Mr. Singer: Are there some of those around?

Mr. Foulds: There aren't very many humble school teachers any more, that I admit.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Foulds: There are a few of us who have been invalidated out of the profession, so to speak.

Mr. Bullbrook: The hon. member for Sudbury East is the only one I can think of.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Humble Elie.

Mr. Foulds: Yes, the hon. member for Sudbury East.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Members can tell my humility is always present.

An hon. member: We can always hear it.

Mr. Foulds: Anyway, I think the limit should be somewhat higher than that, but not substantially, certainly within the \$15,000 range at the constituency level.

Mr. Burr: I will go to 12 or 13 cents.

Mr. Foulds: Agreed, Mr. Speaker? We got that cleared up. But 12½ cents would

be more than enough for the average-sized constituency in Ontario, I would think.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Foulds: There are a couple of sections that I would like to mention on second reading to the minister so that we can discuss them more fully and he will have some idea of our thoughts when we get into committee. Perhaps he can explain either in committee or in his wind-up about some of the specific sections.

It occurred to me that in section 18 which was briefly touched upon—this is the section which covers anonymous donations—there is the possibility, in the style of Robert Redford and Paul Newman in "The Sting," one could be set up. Maybe this is not a bad thing, but it did occur to me that—

Mr. Laughren: Watch it, Jessiman.

Mr. Foulds: —if someone really wanted to do in a present hon. member, who shall remain anonymous, and sent him \$100 anonymously and he felt, "Well, I will just put it in at a social," and then the anonymous donor surfaced about a month after the election and said: "What happened to that \$100 that I sent?" and it hadn't been declared, what then? But I think the provisions of the bill are tough enough to prevent a fiddling there, if you like.

Mr. MacDonald: Of course the minister wouldn't have received it, would he?

An hon. member: No, certainly not.

Mr. Foulds: The only trouble is, the anonymous donor who wants to do a setup is going to have to register the anonymous contribution and I suppose that's one way it becomes non-anonymous. They can trace it back and find out who it was.

Hon. J. White (Minister without Portfolio): I should think it would be very easy to locate the anonymous donor. Simply by asking at any public meeting, "Who gave me this \$1,000 anonymously?" you would have at least one hand in the air.

Mr. Foulds: To claim the tax rebate. Hey, he does have this figured out.

Mr. Laughren: What a devious mind. That's why he was Treasurer.

Mr. Foulds: Another section that I want to mention that I find really quite fuzzy and I think we should examine fairly closely for clarification is section 23, sub-clause 1, where it says, "any person, corporation, or trade union with the knowl-

edge and consent of a political party"—and it goes on—puts in the advertisement. What I don't understand, and perhaps this can be clarified in the wording or the regulations that come out of the Act, with my full consent I know that the Liberals and the Conservatives are going to oppose me—I would hope that they would—but as I read the Act, if I know that they are going to oppose me—there's an "or" in there and it's a parallel structure—with an advertisement, then I am somehow liable to claim that. Maybe there's a wording problem there that I don't quite understand, but from a grammarian's point of view there's a parallel structure that means if you know that your opponent is going to oppose you, you can be in difficulty in terms of this Act. Perhaps one of the minister's officials can clarify that.

The other problem is one that I always face in my riding when the Communist Party doesn't run a candidate. They always take out a big ad, without notifying us, about three or four days before election day—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We pay for that.

Mr. Cassidy: They do as a matter of fact.

Mr. Foulds: —saying that "in the absence of a Communist Party candidate we support the NDP candidate" and that loses me at least 2,500 votes although it gets me 17 in my riding.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh, that is a great ad. The Communist Party has rights.

Mr. Foulds: They have rights, absolutely.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: In fact, the Communists are running ahead of the Tories up in Sudbury.

Mr. Foulds: Now, what happens, Mr. Speaker, through you to the minister, if someone in another party—say Social Credit, say Communist Party, say the anarchist party, say what have you—notifies somebody in my riding association, somebody who is just a canvasser in our terms, and does not notify the election committee or anybody in a responsible position and the canvasser doesn't pass on the word? Is that considered notifying the political party when they have notified a member of the political party who just may have a membership and not be very active? There is a clarification that I think we would like to see there. Maybe in terms of the regulations that could be defined as the consent of the candidate or any of the executive of his riding association or of the

campaign committee heads. But there is a problem there.

I suppose that section 27, the transfer from one riding association to another within the provincial party, is put in there primarily to aid all political parties when they are engaged in fighting a by-election. I would assume that that's the main reason for that section, and certainly would approve of it for that reason.

I would certainly like to endorse the comments of the hon. member for York South on section 30, and particularly on section 31, about the individual nature of the contribution by the trade union person whose local affiliates to my party.

What happens, in effect, is that the local, the trade union itself, is simply acting as an administrative agent, admittedly on behalf of my party, but also on behalf of its members, because the member can make a legitimate individual decision to opt out, and if he decides to take out a full membership in the party—as the hon. member for York South pointed out—he does not have to make up the full \$10 in our base membership. It works out to \$8.80.

I suggest to the minister, Mr. Speaker, that it is an individual membership and should not be considered as the contribution that the union as a body could make if it wished, either to my party or any other party, for that matter. There have been trade unions in my area that have contributed to other political parties, much to my embarrassment—but there it is.

Mr. Laughren: Is that right? That's incredible.

Mr. Martel: They haven't learned yet.

Mr. Foulds: That's changing; and it will change dramatically in 1975 and in 1976.

Mr. Laughren: Thanks to the representation of the hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: Right. Absolutely. Having heard that very nice thing from my friend, the hon. member for Nickel Belt, I want to say something on his behalf with regard to section 44.

Mr. Laughren: If he doesn't, I will withdraw the remark.

Mr. Foulds: There is a special condition that is included in the public funding of candidate expenses in section 44 for the electoral districts of Cochrane North, Rainy River and Thunder Bay. I would submit that the riding of Nickel Belt should be included

in that section. It is as large in physical size as the Rainy River riding, if not larger, and the transportation problems in it are just as great, if not greater, than the traffic and transportation and communication problems in Rainy River. I think that was simply an oversight on the part of the Camp commission when they made their recommendations. I would certainly ask the minister to look at that as a possible amendment.

I only have two more comments that I would like to make on the bill. One of them has to do with the tabulation of volunteer goods and services and the definition under that. I'll give you an example that we thrashed out in my riding association, Mr. Speaker, since we couldn't get a clear definition of it. Generally, we thought if a person volunteered his professional capability or professional service, then this would have to be accounted for.

In our election campaign we use signs a good deal. We have a corner grocer with a truck and we use his truck sometimes to go on the rounds to erect signs. The truck is part of his business. He's not in the trucking business, but it's part of his professional way of making a living. That was one thing that came to mind. Perhaps we need to define a little bit more clearly what are volunteer services that we need to keep an account of in terms of goods and services as political party contributions.

I certainly would endorse the comments of the hon. member for Nipissing on the point about the rates for media advertising other than periodicals. I don't know what other members experience in their areas—

Mr. Martel: Double rates.

Mr. Foulds:—but as soon as the election is called, the rates for newspaper, radio and television advertising—and in our riding we tend to use a good deal of that kind of advertising; it is in the nature of the riding both historically and in terms of communications—the rates go up quite dramatically. There is what one could call a special rip-off rate for political parties—and it affects all political parties—which is at least 1½ and sometimes double the highest prime rate for any other form of advertising. Therefore, I would think that the safeguards that are included in the bill with regard to periodicals certainly should be broadened to include the other media as well.

Those are my comments, Mr. Speaker. In principle I support the bill, and I am extremely glad that this particular minister is bringing it through the House and will be

guiding it through committee. We will be making specific points and amendments during the clause-by-clause debate, but in principle I support the bill. I am sure all members of the House, and particularly members of the public, welcome the general thrust of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly on the bill. We are supporting it in principle, and in general we think it is an excellent initiative indeed.

I remember very well when the Premier gave the additional terms of reference to the commission on the Legislature so that it would have the responsibility to advise us. At that time he said one thing not up for negotiation or even discussion is the fact that all sources of finance, beyond a very low limit, be revealed. This is one of the cornerstones in the improvement of the situation which this bill puts forward. The other one, in my view, must be an appropriate limit on expenditure, which has not been brought forward in this bill.

I really could never understand why Dalton Camp and Doug Fisher could not understand the basic strength and justice of a limit on individual and province-wide campaigns, both having participated in the political process themselves. Their argument that it was impossible to police it is one that cannot be accepted when we see that almost every jurisdiction that has moved in this sort of legislation has established a limit.

I would be the last to say that these limits have been effective. I have the impression, for example, in the Province of Quebec, that the limits are anything but effective. In the federal legislation they are established so high, certainly in the kinds of campaigns that are conducted in many areas of the province, that the limit has no effect at all. I don't know about London South or Kingston and the Islands, or some of the richer NDP campaigns in Sudbury—

Mr. Martel: They are filthy rich.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —where they get all the support from the insurance groups and so on. You never know how much they want to spend.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Is that why the member was elected?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But I will tell you, sir, that back in what I suppose is the politically naïve hinterland of Brant constituency you have got to work very hard to spend much more than about \$7,000 or \$8,000—although I think my Tory opponents normally spend more than that.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that it is regretful, as far as I am concerned, that the other keystone was not included in the report from the commission or in this legislation, and that is a meaningful limit on expenditure. I will tell you one thing: If we are prepared, as undoubtedly we are, to support a bill which is going to be a drain on the public treasury in support of bona fide candidates to the extent of maybe an average of \$6,000 per constituency, I really believe it is irresponsible not to have a top limit.

Failing that limit, even with the procedures and the requirements in this bill, in many respects this original payment from the public treasury—which admittedly comes after the election, after the candidate has garnered 15 per cent of the votes cast—this \$6,000 is just the ante that comes in from all three parties and upon which the expenditure can be built in a way which I think often subverts the political process.

It is interesting that the Minister without Portfolio is putting this legislation before the House. It is common knowledge that he is in fact conducting the campaign for the Conservatives. He doesn't like it when people say he's being paid \$7,500 of public money to be the campaign manager.

Mr. Bullbrook: He doesn't like it at all.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would think that if there were any loopholes in this particular legislation the place to look for them would be in the Byzantine recesses of the Minister without Portfolio's mind. If they can be found he will have found them and he will have seen that this bill has been put forward with that in mind. It was with great glee, suppressed glee on the part of the Premier but not so suppressed on the part of the Minister without Portfolio, that the operative date, now many weeks ago, Feb. 13, 1975, was imposed.

I suppose, and I might as well be frank, that we were pretty good at that stage. There were those people in the province who, for the first time in more than a quarter of a century, could see there was an alternative moving forward to unseat the Conservative Party which has been holding the reigns of power for so long.

I can't say that I have any regrets. This little bit of financial gerrymandering is something that actually we support because we do believe that the provisions of this bill will, in the long run, be very effective indeed. The fact that the Tories have got their \$5 billion salted down in kegs somewhere—maybe in Old Fort William, I don't know—ready to be doled out without attribution to its source is something we are prepared to overcome and surmount.

Mr. Martel: Joe Fabbro's got it hidden at Inco.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Joe Fabbro is working on that, is he? Fabbro used to run for Liberal nominations but evidently the Minister without Portfolio in charge of saving the unsavable has been working on Fabbro the way he was working on Benoit. I think he's got that great spokesman for the north, Leo Del Villano, on his short list.

Mr. Bullbrook: Are they getting Leo back again?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I think probably Leo is prepared to come down and address the gathering of the Tory hierarchy at the Albany Club. I think that probably they would learn a little bit from him but I don't know what the future holds. I doubt if there are going to be any more Tory members from the north. I think there are going to be fewer if anything. There are certainly going to be fewer from the London area and that goes without saying.

Mr. Bullbrook: Where will Merle be?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Merle? Is Merle back on the campaign trail again? They certainly go for those top-flight municipal leaders, don't they?

Mr. Bullbrook: Do they know Merle's address now?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We are, I suppose, prepared to say that this legislation, in its principle and its concept, is excellent. It will, in fact, have much more application in the election after this one when the Conservative Party is not going to have the ample resources—rumoured to be in excess of \$5 million—which they don't have to report and which they collected during their palmy days before their house of cards started to fall in. That was one political decision—that was before the Premier fired Mr. Shouldice I think, wasn't it, when they were still gathering those funds?

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I regret that there is a certain ingredient of hypocrisy in the approach to this legislation but its principle certainly is one which must be supported.

I wish the commission on the Legislature had been able to give a majority recommendation that there be a limit on expenditure.

It is incomprehensible to me that only Farquhar Oliver in his minority report put forward that strong recommendation. We in this party are prepared to put forward amendments which will call for a limit which we believe is enforceable, which would be carefully audited and policed by the commissioners which will be appointed to enforce the requirements of this bill.

Those people are going to have a great deal of responsibility. Presumably they will be paid for the responsibility and we are prepared to give them the complete independent authorization to impose such an upper ceiling and see that it is an enforceable and a workable one.

I personally am surprised that the Conservatives are prepared to dip into the public treasury for public support for candidates without going to the only control method which would make that system effectively operable and that is the establishment of a ceiling. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the members of the House can be persuaded, since this is legislation of value, to make it more valuable and put on a ceiling not only for province-wide campaigns but for individual campaigns in that regard.

I remember when the Premier got up in his place defending the \$50,000 contribution from Fidinam, of which we had prima facie evidence in the press. He said he would give his personal undertaking there had been nothing untoward, nor was there any association between that \$50,000 donation and the contract to build the Workmen's Compensation Board building. He was still in the first flush of his victory in 1971. So there didn't seem to be anything that could be done about it, other than to move on to other things eventually.

I personally believe that it was the embarrassment that the Premier must certainly have felt at the revelation of the facts associated with that case and others that have since been revealed that led him to give the additional term of reference to the commission. I'm glad that the commission report has resulted in legislation, even as effective as we have here.

I still say that the concept is incomplete. I hope by way of amendment we can im-

prove the legislation, but we intend to support it in principle.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. Laughren: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We are supporting this bill, of course, because we are quite enthusiastic about the whole principle of public financing of elections. I'm really disappointed, when we've gone as far as we have in terms of appointing the commission with all its powers of monitoring and enforcement, that we didn't go that next step, as the leader of the Liberal Party has suggested, and set ceilings. I've always felt that if the ongoing expenses of running political parties cannot be publicly financed, then certainly the election campaign should be, and I think that serves us all the best.

Quite frankly, it seems to me this government is not in a position that it should quibble over that. Given the last 3½ years, one would think they would be most eager to remove any of the kinds of suspicions that are there about party financing. I think it would have been politically astute for this government to have done that. There is no better way to do that than through what has been called the detached checkoff, whereby people can indicate they wish to have some tax dollars go for the support of the political party of their choice. In that way you have extremely broad financing of the whole political process, Mr. Speaker, that way it also helps finance parties between elections and allows them to conduct a campaign as well. I would see nothing wrong with that. It wouldn't be an undue burden on the public purse at all.

I'm confused by section 17 of the bill which talks about the first \$10 not being rebateable. I'm surprised at that. I would have thought that it would have simplified matters if the whole contribution could be rebateable. I think I know why that was put in. But I think that it probably isn't going to serve its purpose and that the whole thing should be rebateable.

Like my other colleagues, I'm naturally concerned about the whole question of the trade union checkoff. I don't think it makes sense to say that a union that's affiliated with a party can suddenly be told that it is performing an illegal act, when in effect what's really happening is that that local is acting on behalf of its membership to process the contribution of the membership to the political party of their choice. I don't think it's fair to consider that as a union

contribution, which when the large locals are involved would automatically contravene the Act because of the size of the contribution—and certainly Sudbury locals are a good example.

The other thing my colleague from Port Arthur spoke of on my behalf was the subsidy for certain of the ridings, namely Cochrane North, Rainy River, Kenora and Thunder Bay. If I might be so bold as to launch a plea on my own behalf, or at least on behalf of the riding of Nickel Belt, because it would effect not just me, of course, but the other candidates as well, Nickel Belt is a very large riding. They tell me it's 20,000 square miles and travel is a considerable burden during a campaign.

It is not just travel, though. It's the whole question of the distances. It means that if you want to communicate with your constituents 300 miles from one community, then you have to use different media. For example, advertising in the Sudbury Star—not that I would do much of that—or on the local radio or TV would not have any impact at all on the north part of the riding, because they just don't get the paper and they don't receive the electronic media either; so one has an expense that way.

There is the whole question of travel expenses, the food, lodging—and as a matter of fact I have often thought there should be an extra bonus for me in my travels in some of these small communities. It's very difficult to spend time down here during the week and then weekends 300 miles from one's home as well.

But that really isn't what I started to say. I started to say there should be some kind of reward or extra incentive to stay in some of the hotels that I have to stay in. There are hotels in that riding that I stay in that are very old, and I've stayed in hotels where even my feet hung over the end of the bed.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They could put the member up in the bureau drawer.

Mr. Laughren: The Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Grossman) and I could sleep end to end in most beds. But I think the riding of Nickel Belt should be added to those lists of ridings that receive subsidy—

Mr. Stokes: If members came into some of the hotels in my riding I could show them where the fire escape is a one-inch rope.

Mr. Martel: They could use it to hang a few cabinet ministers.

Mr. Laughren: —so that the riding of Nickel Belt for the benefit of all candidates who will aspire to public office, can receive the benefit of the increased subsidy. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Along with the other speakers I would like to endorse the bill as a whole, and just point out for the record that one of the interesting things about this debate has been the fact that the proposal to subsidize candidates to the tune of \$6,000 or \$7,000 during the course of an election has got such general support in the House that in fact it has not been commented upon at all.

I think that the concerns that I want to air, Mr. Speaker, are that some of the general purposes of the bill, in terms of democratizing the election process in this province and in terms of loosening or eliminating the grip that large corporations have had on the campaigns of the old parties, with the subsequent influence that might have had on government—and that is alleged to have taken place as well in the case of the links between the labour movement and the NDP—that not all of those purposes are fulfilled with this particular bill.

I would like to deal with three particular areas; and, with one or two side notes, the areas I want to talk about are the limits on contributions, the trade union check-off and the absurd level of spending limits that is provided for in the bill for expenditures on media—and that point in particular I have put some research into. I would like the minister to consider those points very carefully.

On the question of contribution limits first, I think the limits that are proposed in the bill are, frankly, far too high. As the minister knows, the Camp commission recommended that there be a limit of \$2,000 per annum for a contribution by an individual, a corporation or a trade union to any registered political party, plus a maximum of \$500 to a constituency association or to a combination of constituencies; and in an election year the Camp commission suggested that those figures could be doubled. The bill has gone beyond that, and it suggests that a maximum of \$4,000 may be given in an ordinary year and double—\$8,000—in an election year by any individual or corporation or trade union to any registered party.

The bill doesn't say it, but the reference in section 20 to giving money that isn't yours is sufficiently broad that, in fact, where a husband and wife, who are for all practical purposes one economic unit, wish to increase their contribution to a political party, then money can simply be handed along by the wife as well as by the husband. As a consequence, the practical limit in a non-election year for contributions by a married couple, by a man who wishes to use the support of his wife, is \$8,000; and in an election year it is double that again, or \$16,000.

Because of the way the system works, it appears clear that there is no restriction on earmarking of money which is given to a registered political party. It is therefore possible for the contributor to say he wants the money to go to this particular purpose or this particular riding. A man, therefore, who is still married and has his wife chipping in along on his behalf, can devote as much as \$10,000 in an election year to a particular constituency, along with another \$6,000 which can be put into other constituencies.

Well I just have to say, Mr. Speaker, that that figure, whether it's \$8,000 for a corporation or trade union, or in certain cases double that amount for an individual with his wife, is excessive. It bears no relationship to the kinds of incomes that people are enjoying in the province today, and certainly bears no relationship to the idea that people should be able to contribute and, in fact, encouraged to contribute to political parties on a relatively equal basis.

Now it was the purpose of the proposal to give tax credits to contributors to try and encourage widespread participation in the financing of political parties. That's why there are credits of up to \$500 available; and my people are encouraged to give up to \$1,000 or so.

But the sums that are involved here are quite out of sight, Mr. Speaker. The median family income in this province is about \$13,500. About 90 per cent of the family units in the province have got incomes that are below \$20,000 or \$21,000, and only a very small proportion have got incomes in the \$20,000 range and up.

Even if you're talking about a tithe of 10 per cent of taxable income or of post-tax income, Mr. Speaker, you're saying that the limits would only begin to bite for people earning upwards of \$100,000 a year. Now that, clearly, is inequitable.

It seems to me, and I think on behalf of my party as well, that much more reasonable limits could and should have been brought

in. If the limits were reasonable, then the artificial division which has been put in the bill between registered parties and the constituency associations would not be necessary.

Since it's easy to earmark money, it seems to me that it's a facade or a sham to say that money can be given to a party, but only so much to a particular constituency association. Provided the overall amount is not too great, the individual or corporation or trade union should have the option of where to put their money.

I would suggest that in the first place the contributions should be based on a family unit. In other words, where a husband and wife wish to contribute, or where a wife is being used as a channel to launder money that the husband couldn't give, that should be stopped by ensuring that a family unit would have the same overall limit on what it can contribute. The case where husband and wife are both working and earning an income could be accommodated, if the limits were not made too restrictive.

I've joked that we ought to make it maybe \$10 or \$20 per person, but obviously there's probably a climate out there that says that people are willing to accept something more than that. In fact, that was the finding of the survey that was carried out by the people who did research for the Camp committee. That survey suggested a figure of around \$1,000 per person would be a reasonable limit on contributions.

I would suggest that the limit might be a total of \$2,000 per annum, which could be given by an individual or an individual and his wife, or a corporation, or a trade union, to each registered party or to any of its constituency associations. And how they spend that \$2,000 is between the party and its riding associations and would be up to the contributor, presumably in consultation with the party.

Then I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that during the course of an election year that it is not the same people in fact who become the major contributors. It's fallacious to say that you're always going back to the same well and that therefore you have to double to triple the amounts that those people can be permitted to give.

In fact, as we all know, there are a certain group of regular contributors—presumably to all three parties—who see it as a public duty to give on a regular basis to sustain the ongoing activity of the party. At election time, a far broader group is drawn in and can be hit for money, can be asked for donations to support a candi-

date, a party or the workings of the political process.

As a consequence, I don't think it is necessary to double the limits on contributions during an election year. What I would suggest would be that in order to accommodate extra effort, by regular contributors, the limit for all purposes for the party during an election year possibly should be raised by \$1,000 to a maximum of \$3,000 per individual, per corporation or per trade union.

It seems to me that this is not going to be onerous on anybody in a modest, middle- or even an upper-income bracket. I would point out to the minister that the people in the survey conducted for the Camp committee who felt most strongly that there should be limits on expenditures, along with disclosure of names and amounts, were people who were already regular contributors to a particular political party. If that is the case, people who know and understand the system would welcome the reasonable kinds of limits that would define the extent to which they can be hit but would permit a broadening of that base of contributions to the party, and I think that that is something that this Legislature can take up.

I am aware, in suggesting limits of that nature, that it involves readjustments on the part of all three parties. It involves adjustments for the Conservative Party, where developers used to come in for breakfast with the Premier and wound up by giving \$20,000 cheques. I am sure it involves the same kind of adjustment, although the sums may be lesser, with the Liberal Party. And in our case there are certain trade unions that have a larger membership and have been accustomed to giving more than \$3,000 per annum to the NDP as their contribution to the political process and as their political activity. We are prepared to make that kind of adjustment, and I think that all parties should be prepared to try to make it.

I have a couple of other points related to contributions, Mr. Speaker, and obviously we will also be raising them during the course of the clause by clause study on this particular question.

The first is that it is an old tradition in our party, and possibly within at least the ladies' association of the Conservative association in my riding as well as, I am sure, in other political parties, that they take up a collection when they have a meeting. You pass the hat, the cup, the bowl or whatever it is you happen to have

in order to help to pay for the cost of the hall, to pay for the coffee, the tea or the sherry if drinks are provided and that kind of thing. It is a normal kind of thing; people like to do it.

The purpose of this legislation is not to stop parties from passing the bowl; it is to stop them from passing the bag. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that some kind of adjustment might be permitted in order to permit small collections of silver, up to a few dollars, during the course of election meetings.

Secondly, the provisions for permitting extra contributions during the course of an election campaign allow the creation of a financial campaign committee only at the time the writs are issued. That committee would not only last for 30 or 37 days, whatever is the length of the actual campaign, but it would continue to last for four months after the campaign was over.

If the period after the campaign is necessary in order to permit wrapping up, cleaning up and so on, I don't particularly dispute that. However, it is a fact of life that during an election campaign there are a great many duties to be done, and many parties, particularly when they have to look to a broader base of financial contributions, will want to get pledges or get money for an election campaign before the writs are actually issued. It is a bit awkward, it seems to me, that you have to go and accept a pledge and then cash in on the pledge as many as five or six months later.

I wonder whether those provisions about the date on which the money can be accepted for the campaign itself could not be broadened in order to permit the collection of actual money in the form of cheques and its deposit in a designated bank account prior to the writs actually being issued.

We all have a fairly good idea of when the writs are going to be issued; and, for that matter, the spending limits, if they were made more reasonable, would be sensible enough that if money happened to be given for an election and the election wasn't held that year, there would be no substantial abuse.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to lend my support to the comments made by other members of my party about the misapprehension of the minister and the people who drafted the bill about the nature of the money paid by trade union members under the checkoff. I can do so in a completely impartial kind of manner because to my knowledge I don't think there is a single

local chartered within my riding for which the checkoff applies.

The trade union checkoff however, Mr. Speaker, is a means for individuals to give money to a political party and the restrictions that are put on the agency through which that money is passed, that is the trade union, are wrong. No one is suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that if, for example, a corporation wishes to give money to its chief officers or its directors in the form of income for them to pass through to a political party and take advantage of the tax credits, that the corporation should thereby have a limit set on the amount it can contribute. It can give the money in the form of income.

Hon. Mr. White: It must be their own money.

Mr. Cassidy: It must be their own money but it can increase the income of those individuals and then, so long as they are not bound by contract to contribute to the party, they can decide they will give the money to the party even though, in fact, it is money which is coming out of corporate coffers. That could take place, for example, in the case of a closely-held family corporation.

Nobody is suggesting that the corporate limits be restricted because of money being passed through or because of the fact that the board of directors or the chief executive officer decided as a group that they will each chip in \$500 or \$1,000 towards the party of their choice. It seems particularly perverse to pick on moneys paid through the trade union checkoff when it was proposed in the original bill that contributions under the sum of \$10 to political parties should be exempt. The rule being applied in the bill is that all contributions under \$10 are exempt except for those amounting to around \$1.20 a year which are made through the form of the trade union checkoff.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there will be practical problems raised by this as well. The member for York South has pointed out that certain unions now affiliated provide more to the New Democratic Party through the checkoff—that is, their members provide more—than they would be permitted to provide under this bill. Therefore, they are breaking the law, effective at the time the bill was put in, I suppose. The minister has to come to some kind of an accommodation under that particular problem no matter what he does, because I think it would be absolutely unacceptable that he would force people to disaffiliate and interfere in the life of collective organizations in that way.

I would suggest as well, Mr. Speaker, if I can appeal to the Conservative sense of self-interest, that there is a halfway house right now by which many union members contribute to a political party through the checkoff but really don't do a heck of a lot more than that. If disaffiliation is compelled upon them, on their union, by this legislation it seems to me the union will disaffiliate; it will turn around and will continue to give the maximum it can give out of its own funds to the party of its choice.

It will then move heaven and earth within its own ranks to take those members who were affiliated at \$1.20 a year and turn them into active members of a political party at \$10 or \$20 or \$30 a year and at a much larger personal commitment than may exist right now. In applying this, the Conservative government may be cutting off its nose to spite its face given the political leanings of most active trade unionists.

The Camp commission wanted more mass participation in parties but this is a move which would discourage it. I hope the minister will accept very seriously the advice and comments that have been made from this side of the House. We believe that this is one of those areas which can be negotiated and can be settled and in which the government does not have to be totally rigid.

On the general question of an expenditure limit, I understand the government is going to be rigid. I have directed my comments on that understanding because I would like to suggest some reforms and some changes to be made in this particular bill which I think perhaps the minister can listen to and hopefully accept or accommodate. I support and endorse the view that there should be overall spending limits as has been said by members of my party and also of the opposition party. I don't really want to go into that any further, because it's clear, I think, now that the government on the matter of principle has decided not to have any limits at all. It is acting in that case on the advice of two of the three commissioners on the Camp commission.

However, Mr. Speaker, I think the government should bear in mind more than it has the relatively strong view of the public, as interviewed by the researchers of the Camp commission, that spending limits were desirable, that political parties are spending too much and that something should be done. I think we should also bear in mind that some of the controls that the Camp commission offered as alternatives to the fact that it was not recommending an overall spend-

ing limit have vanished in the process by which the report was translated into legislation.

For example, it does not appear to be possible now that the election campaign will be limited to 30 days from the present 35 or 37 days, because of practical problems with electoral lists and other things that the chief electoral officer has made representations about.

Secondly, the incentive plan, whereby candidates would be restrained from increasing their spending because every dollar in increased spending would lose them some money in public subsidy, has been taken out. The subsidy is now to be paid, regardless of whether a candidate spends \$10,000 or \$100,000 on his particular campaign.

Thirdly, the contribution limits proposed in Camp of a maximum of \$2,500 and \$5,000 have been increased to \$4,000 and \$8,000, or, as I suggest, to the maximum of \$16,000 in an election year on behalf of a husband and wife. So there's going to be more money running around than Camp had anticipated, a longer campaign and less incentive to each candidate to try to restrict spending.

We don't know for sure what the Conservatives spent last time, although \$5 million is the popular estimate. Two-thirds of the people who responded on the Camp commission said they thought that \$5 million was too much and they wanted to try to do something about it. They said that the amounts given should be reduced and they wanted to find some kind of limits on spending as well.

It's curious, Mr. Speaker, that the survey indicated that the public didn't really think it was that much influenced by radio or TV commercials. In fact, next to lawn signs, in which we are the specialists, they thought that radio and TV commercials were the least effective form of campaigning. Nevertheless, the Camp commission itself seems to believe that television, in particular, is a very important kind of influence. Moreover, there is no limit to be imposed on spending before the writ, and there are very high ceilings that have been imposed as far as the actual spending itself goes.

The Camp commission suggested that there were limits on TV spending which would protect candidates and that candidates themselves couldn't really spend that much on TV because of what they could afford. With the \$6,000 or so that each candidate will receive in public subsidy, he can afford, as I will suggest in a few minutes, a very substantial media campaign, quite apart from whatever resources were available before. All of us

know that there are going to be more funds available, because of the tax credits, than existed before.

I think it's true, Mr. Speaker, that we also feel—we certainly feel and maybe the government feels as well—we can cope with disparities in expenditure when it's on the ground and not in the media. If the Premier wants to have a fancy four-colour leaflet and we put out a pedestrian one-colour leaflet, that is, black on white, then it's the message that still counts. If the message isn't acceptable to the public, all amounts of four-colour printing are not going to help this government in its efforts to regain election.

When it comes to advertising in the media, however, Mr. Speaker, not only are the limits too large, but there is no control on the use of central party funds to work for or against a specific candidate. In other words, it isn't a matter of \$12,000 in local spending on the media according to the 25-cent rule, or \$25,000 if you say that the riding will get an equivalent from the party. It could be a case of \$50,000 being used by the NDP in order to defeat the Minister Without Portfolio's successor in London South.

It would be possible for our party, if we had the money, to concentrate our media spending on a particular government minister or member or candidate who we thought was particularly vulnerable. That certainly happened in the last campaign in the ridings of Oshawa and Peterborough. I particularly remember Peterborough—I see that the new member is here—where there was an absolute deluge of television advertising directed against the sitting member, Walter Pitman, one of the finest members in the House—

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): That is not true.

Mr. Cassidy: That is certainly true. Every bus station was devoted to the merits, such as they were, of the Conservative candidate.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Such as they are.

Mr. Cassidy: Such as they are; that's right.

Mr. Turner: That is not true. It's absolute nonsense.

Mr. Cassidy: Everything was used there in order to see to the election of the Conservative candidate, and Walter Pitman was defeated by a very marginal result.

Mr. Turner: That is absolute nonsense.

Mr. Cassidy: Well, I have noticed that the member has been trying to gerrymander his riding in order to get back in this time, but we can tell him that he won't be here next year.

Mr. Turner: Prove that.

Mr. Cassidy: Well, I can show you on the map, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Turner: Show me.

Hon. Mr. White: If he is not good enough for the NDP, he is not good enough for the people of Peterborough.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I say to the minister, I didn't really mean to get into this political kind of parrying—

Mr. Turner: Stick to the facts.

Mr. Cassidy: —with the hon. gentleman from Peterborough, because the point that I wanted to make is that—

Mr. Turner: Let's get back to the bill.

Mr. Cassidy: —even if saturation advertising was not used last time, it is clear that the only thing that can save the member for Peterborough would be saturation advertising this time on CHEX-TV, and that is possible under this particular bill because of the very loose kind of restrictions on the use of provincial party funds and the very large amounts that are available.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go into this question of what a party can spend. I also want to put some figures on the record, because I think they are important and I think they are disturbing in terms of what the government says it is trying to achieve and what it is actually trying to achieve. On the one hand, it says it is trying to limit the use of media as a means of buying elections; and on the other hand, it has not done so in the actual bill.

If I can summarize, Mr. Speaker, with about five million electors across the province, and 25 cents per elector to be spent by each party, each party will have the sum of approximately \$1.25 million to spend on paid media. Production costs are not included in that total. If you take all of the candidates of a party together, they will have another \$1.25 million to spend.

Mr. Speaker, to have a complete saturation campaign on TV and radio across the province, it would cost \$1.25 million for the 20 days during which media advertising will be permitted during the course of this campaign. In other words, that's where provincial funds

could go for a saturation campaign—and I will define that in a couple of minutes.

Then, for the candidates to have a saturation campaign that covered newspapers, billboards, community papers and bus and subway transit, would cost an additional sum of \$500,000. And within the limits that have been proposed here, there would still be \$750,000 in slush funds which could be used for God knows what purpose, but presumably to double or redouble the saturation campaigns that had already been bought.

By saturation, Mr. Speaker, I have in mind that every hour of every day, during all of the TV viewing hours between about 3:00 p.m. and 1:00 a.m., there would be a one-minute commercial for that party. Whether it would be prime time during "Gunsmoke" and "Hawaii Five-O," or during the lesser times, there would be 10 commercials a day on television; there would be about twenty-five 30-second spots on radio, or about three per hour in the better listening periods on every radio station in the province. There would be 500 radio spots and 200 TV commercials on every TV and radio station in the province that accepts advertising; that is, every one except for the CBC outlets, which don't take political ads.

Then there would be enough billboard advertising in order that there would be five million people see the political message every day—that's 100 per cent coverage, according to the way they measure these kinds of things.

There would be four advertisements for the Tory, Liberal or the New Democratic parties in every bus or subway car running in the province for the entire duration of the campaign, and there will be 20,000 agate lines of newspaper advertising in every newspaper in the province during the permissible time of advertising of the campaign. That equals a substantial ad in every paper, every day, for 20 days.

TV, Mr. Speaker, would cost about \$700,000. The saturation on TV ranges from about \$12,000 on the stations in Pembroke or in Sault Ste. Marie, to about \$132,000 on CFTO here in Toronto. That assumes, in fact, that the spending would be as heavy at the beginning of the three weeks as it would be at the end of the three weeks, whereas the minister probably knows from his gurus that one begins small and builds up. By the final week, one party spending this kind of budget could command half of the TV time that was available for advertising in the province. The three parties would simply dominate the media completely if it were possible to get that time; and the answer, of

course, is that it would not be possible to get that time.

If I can get down to more specifics again, I'm suggesting there would be about four ads in each of the double or triple A times and two ads apiece in the A, B and C time slots on every TV station in the province; and the same kind of spread on the radio stations. I have figures here, if anybody wishes to consult me, but for \$700,000 one can have absolute saturation in television and for \$580,000 absolute saturation in radio.

As far as billboards are concerned—I put this on the record if anybody is interested—\$85,000 gives one saturation coverage on billboards; transit, \$30,000 gives one saturation coverage; and newspapers \$350,000 gives one saturation coverage in all of the daily newspapers of the province. The community papers add another \$70,000 if one wanted to have a full-page ad in every community paper across the province for the three weeks in which media advertising is permitted. And, as I say, one then has enough money to go back and, on behalf of only one party, Mr. Speaker, spend the equivalent of another complete saturation campaign in TV or in some mixture of the various media that I have put down.

So what is the government proposing with these so-called limits on media spending? They're proposing page after page of political ads. They are proposing that every billboard in the province will be devoted to one or the other political party. They are proposing that transit is saturated, TV is saturated, radio is saturated; that, in short, the three parties among them will have the right to buy the advertising media of the province. All the government has done is to legitimize any conceivable level of spending.

Mr. Speaker, the minister can ask his people before we go into committee to look into those figures in detail. In fact, if I can get them typed up I will send them over to him in order that he can look at them. I'm trying to sort of get away from very political comment in my statements about the need for overall spending limits, but I think this is excessive.

I think it's quite legitimate that the parties should not have a direction as to where they spend their media dollars, as to whether they put them into newspaper ads, or community papers, or TV, or radio. I think that a reasonable access to media in order that the parties can put forward the messages that they want to put, rather than have interviewers interviewing candidates and that kind of thing, is also a reasonable part of our process as it has built up. However, it's become excessive

when we look at the fact that no conceivable amount of media spending during the 20 days which is permitted in an election campaign will be too much to be accommodated under the spending limits that are proposed by the minister. Therefore, I plead with the minister to look into this matter very closely and to consider that some more reasonable kinds of limits on the spending may be put forward.

I would point out to him, as far as the TV stations are concerned, that except in the depths of summer when they don't have many advertisers, the advertising which will undoubtedly flow to their doors is more of an embarrassment than anything else. For 20 days, the three parties are going to be clamouring for time and the TV stations know that the parties won't be there again for another one and one-half or two years—that is until we have the run-off election which I confidently predict after this one—or at any rate, in a normal kind of situation, not for four years.

They have to disrupt established advertising campaigns; they have to be nasty to their established advertisers. They face the problem of what to do if the Conservatives can put a downpayment on TV time now whereas the NDP gets its money about 30 days before the election and comes hustling in at the end and wants equal time and they are trying to assure some equity. I know they try but sometimes it's difficult and it won't always be fair.

They face real problems particularly on TV. The problems are less in radio and obviously don't exist in the same measure in the case of newspapers because they can simply expand the size of their newspapers if they get a large amount of political advertising.

It seems to me that the government should be sitting down with the parties. We should be sitting down in committee in order to talk about a collective approach to the electronic media of the province in order to find other means by which candidates, leaders, cabinet ministers and front-bench spokesmen can have an opportunity to have dialogue with people of the province through the intermediary of the airwaves. We should be doing that in conjunction with the CRTC which has the power to direct that a certain amount of media will be given over to political affairs during the course of an election campaign.

As the minister knows, the media already do a lot of that. Our media in Ottawa are quite responsible about that and I'm sure

that's the case in most parts of the province. They make an attempt to bring the candidates together in three or four candidate debates. They interview them individually and they look at their wives and their lifestyles and that sort of thing. They do a fairly good job. They do the same thing with the leaders as well.

Working in conjunction with the CRTC it seems to me it will be possible to give every candidate in every party reasonable access to the airways, at which time a much more limited ceiling on spending, whether via the airwaves or the press, would be in order. That's the kind of goal I believe we should be looking for.

I would urge, if the minister wanted me to be specific, that rather than the present limits of 25 cents and 25 cents we consider limits in the range of between a nickel and a dime per elector at the riding level and on the provincial level. If it were to be a dime and a dime for example—and that's more of a final point than a beginning point in my mind—with approximately five million electors that would mean each party could spend up to \$1 million on media advertising during the course of a campaign or \$50,000 a day.

If we want to go back to the campaigns I have talked about, in which saturation on television, for example, is available for \$700,000; saturation on the radio is available for about \$600,000; and saturation on newspapers for about \$350,000; it's clear that a party which chose and thought, for example, it had a photogenic leader and wanted to stress his leadership and his charisma and so on, could still have the option of putting a lot of its dollars into a province-wide TV campaign. Another party that wished to stress policy might decide to put a lot of its bucks into newspaper advertising because that's the way to carry across policy.

Those choices would still be there but we would not risk, as we risk now, that a party would cold-bloodedly decide that in order to save the seat of a Margaret Scrivener or a John Turner it would devote \$80,000 or \$100,000 to total saturation of the media in that particular campaign.

Mr. Turner: All this free advertising is terrific.

Mr. Cassidy: We would have a much more sensible kind of level of spending in the area which we all agree is the most easily controlled.

Yes, the member for St. David is in trouble. I don't think that the disparities in spending in other fields, such as whether we have glossy pamphlets or plain ones, are nearly of such impact as this question of media advertising. That is why I've tried to lay a case out before the minister. I hope he will consider it seriously and look carefully at the possibility of coming down to a much more reasonable figure such as a dime and a dime rather than the full amount.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to speak? The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: I want to speak for about 20 seconds. I am going to address myself specifically to section 44, since none of the other members has spoken yet from those ridings that were mentioned—that is Cochrane North, Rainy River, Kenora and Thunder Bay—where the government has seen fit to give the candidates in those four ridings the opportunity to get around in remote places that are accessible only by air by increasing the provisions of section 44 whereby public funding of candidates' expenses is increased to the amount of \$2,500. I want to thank the minister for including that in the bill. It will go a considerable distance in ameliorating the excessively high cost of air transport in the far north. On behalf of the four ridings mentioned in it, I want to say thank you to him for taking that into consideration.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about this bill myself. You may recall, sir, that about two years ago now I introduced a bill into the Legislature, a private member's bill, suggesting that there be spending limits on elections; and particularly that those people making donations of money, goods or services to election campaigns be identified if the donation was of a certain amount. I am glad to see that we are getting to that, because I think it's going to go a long way to restoring the voters' confidence in government so that they can be sure, especially after the scandals that this administration has gone through in regard to patronage and political donations, that perhaps the political system will be cleaned up and will be seen to be cleaned up.

In relation to my colleague from the north who just spoke about the extra added

—I won't say incentive, finances available to northern members—I think sometimes Mr. Speaker, we do much better when we don't show up in any of these places.

Mr. Stokes: Let the member speak for himself.

Mr. Reid: Well, I was thinking of what they told me about the member for Thunder Bay in Ignace last week.

Mr. Stokes: Ignace is in the member for Rainy River's riding.

Mr. Reid: I know, but some people from Savant Lake were there.

Mr. Stokes: People at Savant Lake support me quite readily.

Mr. Reid: Yes I know, I'm just kidding. But it does recall to mind, Mr. Speaker, particularly in the 1967 election, that because of a severe shortage of funds—

Mr. Stokes: In fact, I hope that—

Mr. Reid:—there were many places in my area I wasn't able to visit because I didn't have the money to do it, first of all. That led to a lack of aircraft being available to take me in to see my constituents in those places. For people in northern Ontario this is certainly a welcome addition.

I suppose most of the technical points have been covered by other speakers. I do want to reiterate this party's objection to the fact there aren't any top-spending limits on just what a candidate can spend.

In the northern ridings perhaps—again to be somewhat parochial—the amount of money that is spent compares in no way to the advertising campaigns that I suppose in some cases must be put on in the urban ridings where the competition for the press is keen and advertising rates so much higher. But I still think, Mr. Speaker, and I say this most strongly, that this bill is incomplete without the provision that there be spending limits on individual campaigns and also on the party campaign, because it still allows an election to be bought, so to speak, in one sense or another, if there aren't any limits on it.

Again, it puts those who are financially well off in a better position to have an undue and unequal influence, perhaps on the voters because of that financial position.

I would reiterate what my colleague from Downsview has said, and urge the minister to reconsider. I think it would be in the interests not only of the political parties

themselves but of the whole electorate, that there be some ceiling on individual riding expenditures as well as party expenditures.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, my comments will be very brief. In checking over that legislation, I have two suggestions to make as to items that should be included. The one I would like to bring to the attention of the minister is that one of the responsibilities of a returning officer—and possibly I would bring this under the public funding of candidate expenses—rather than the candidate being responsible, is that the returning officer should see that the voters' lists, after the enumeration, are sent to each individual voter or family on the list. In that way, if the individual does not get a copy of the voters' list, then he or she knows that they have not been included on the list. That might save the expense of the appointment of revising officers; or even though revising officers would be appointed, at least their work would be substantially reduced. In addition, the voters' lists would be much more accurate than they are today.

Another suggestion I would make is that it should be the responsibility of the same individual to distribute "you-vote-at . . ." cards through the mails. If each of the parties was sending out You-vote-at . . . cards, the expense involved by four parties could be substantially reduced if they were sent out at one time by the returning officer for each riding.

In addition, I would heartily endorse the recommendation of the limitation of election expenses. It's unfortunate that quite often there seems to be no bottom to the well when it comes to election expenditures. I think there should be a ceiling, and it should be a reasonable ceiling. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Any other hon. members want to speak to this? The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I think I'll just speak to 6:00 o'clock, dealing with several of the many points that have been raised and proceed with this in the standing committee on Thursday, I hope, where we can get into a dialogue with advisers and experts around us. The suggestion is that we take it into the standing committee on justice as soon as that committee can deal with it, which apparently cannot be on Wednesdays.

I want to express my appreciation of those who have contributed. I've got seven pages

of notes here, as a matter of fact, for my own consideration and that of the law officers.

There's been quite a lot of sound and fury from the Liberal benches about limits on advertising and overall limits on expenditures, notwithstanding the reasoned objections posed by two or three members of the royal commission. I've got some good news for the Liberals: they don't have to spend it. They don't have to spend any more than they want to. And certainly one would hope they don't go ahead and spend the \$5 million which their leader's chief adviser was promising to spend a few months ago. That was before he was fired—no, he quit, did he? Before he was fired or quit, whichever it may have been. But they don't have to spend that.

Along the same line, I must say to the member for Ottawa Centre, having proven that \$1.25 million buys saturation advertising in this province—and may I point out that advertising costs have gone up something like 40 per cent since October 1971—how in the world could the Conservative Party have ever spent \$5 million in this province? That's the most ridiculous estimation that's ever come our way. He's proven that it's absolutely arithmetically impossible for us to do so, has he not?

Mr. Cassidy: I hope the minister will answer my question; which is, why not reduce the limits now?

Mr. Foulds: We are used to the old shell game.

Hon. Mr. White: Those who are most anxious to limit expenditures are among those who are in the four ridings getting the bonus. I suppose there is no really serious incongruity, but when I hear some of the four members for some of those ridings saying, "Well, it's certainly nice to have extra dough" and "You'd better tighten up on the limits," it did seem to me that there might be just a tiny inconsistency involved there.

Mr. Reid: We don't come anywhere near spending that kind of money.

Hon. Mr. White: The member doesn't agree?

Mr. Reid: Don't be foolish.

Hon. Mr. White: Oh, I see.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I have the largest riding in the Province of Ontario, and that provision in total amounts to \$5,200.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have been impugned, too. I rise on a point of order because he is speaking about me also.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the highest expenditure in the Rainy River riding last election was \$12,000 spent by the Conservative candidate who managed to get a whopping 18 per cent of the vote.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is not a point of order. The time is very short, would the minister continue.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that two of the three royal commissioners said that controls were unworkable while the third royal commissioner urged that there be controls on expenditures overall.

We have no philosophical objection to it at all as I think we have proved, at least in part, by introducing limits on those portions of expenditures which can be qualified by the commission or by other parties involved in the election.

Mr. Reid: How much does the minister think it costs to run an election?

Hon. Mr. White: The royal commissioners concluded it was absolutely impossible when it came to certain other types of election expenditures. That's the reason purely and simply why we haven't included overall limits in this bill.

Mr. Reid: Why not have a dry run?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. White: The question was asked, and it is a very good one too, by the member for Downsview about the limit on candidates' contributions and the effect on credit when a candidate is not permitted to pay for a campaign deficit.

In point of fact, whilst it is generally held to be the responsibility of the candidate in the case of such a deficit, the legal advisers have informed me that there never has been a case in law to establish that. The members and I know the practical consequence is invariably that the candidate's friends gather around, he himself puts in something and the debt is paid.

Mr. Reid: It doesn't make any provision for anybody.

Hon. Mr. White: I think it is impossible to change this without destroying the entire principle of the bill. One can picture a very wealthy candidate expending tens of thousands of dollars and then, *post facto*, making an unlimited contribution to his own campaign as, indeed, Lord Thompson of Fleet

would have done when he ran unsuccessfully.

Mr. Reid: Stephen Roman even.

Hon. Mr. White: One can't remove that even though it may pose a little bit of awkwardness as parties clean up the deficits. I think we have to hang on to that.

Mr. Reid: But the minister doesn't make any provision for anybody.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Reid: Who does pay? Who pays?

Hon. Mr. White: Certainly the obligation can be paid off over time. The candidate himself can contribute \$500 per year and those of his supporters who wish to contribute in annual chunks until every nickel is paid off.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Can the minister imagine how long that would take?

Hon. Mr. White: Mention was made of the definition of candidate and I rather think that maybe this should be looked at. It was said that the definitions are advantageous to the incumbent. I am not so sure that that is true and I don't know how one can impose controls before there is some form of nomination.

Originally, the draft bill I saw had the form of nomination as the official nomination day. That wasn't satisfactory in our view and so we have added a couple of alternatives there in that definition. However, I am quite prepared to look at that when we get into the committee stage, if members so desire.

Trusts were not defined, deliberately, because there is a working definition of trusts. There is an appreciation of that function in the courts and it was thought to embark upon some definition outside of the well-established precedents might be more troublesome than accepting the—

Mr. Reid: There is more than one definition.

Hon. Mr. White: No, it was a complicated legal matter which I think the member and I will not discuss here now.

Mr. Reid: I know but I have looked into it. I don't think the minister has.

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, we have looked into it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There is very little time left. Out of courtesy, I think we should listen to the minister and not other people who have had their opportunity to speak

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): The hon. member doesn't know what courtesy means.

Hon. Mr. White: The member for York West has done a great deal of work on this and he has come in with several very good suggestions.

First of all, with respect to the \$10, I do believe that was exempted from the rebatable portion at the suggestion of the NDP. I think this is what the member for York West told me. Now that they see the disadvantages and the cumbersome nature of it, I feel perfectly sure that the bill can be amended in the committee stage. He and others are very keen on the idea of a \$2 checkoff.

We have general approval from Ottawa to permit tax credits, always provided our formulas are identical to theirs—and we understand the reason. If we didn't have tax credits, all of the money would be given to our federal counterparts and, of course, the federal government won't let us exceed those credits for fear that the same thing will happen in reverse no doubt. We have accepted that proposition and there will be a collateral bill coming in to put that into effect insofar as the personal income tax is concerned. We have complete control over our corporations tax and we are going to proceed along the lines indicated.

Insofar as the \$2 checkoff is concerned—and I will just end on this note I think, Mr. Speaker—we have now explicitly asked the federal government if they would permit us to use their form, whether it be on their part of their form or our part of their form, for such a checkoff. This was implicitly excluded in the general response we got from the Minister of National Revenue, when he said that it would have to follow their formulation exactly. Now our Minister of Revenue (Mr. Meen) has written him more explicitly asking if they would accommodate us insofar as the \$2 checkoff is concerned. He has followed that up in the last week. We have yet to receive a substantive answer to the question.

Now then, sir, we will be taking this into committee. In addition to those members who are interested. I do hope that the several parties will bring together their advisers, the tax lawyers, the accountants and others, who will have the responsibility in part of implementing this legislation. So everyone is welcome as we try to sort out a very good non-partisan bill.

Mr. Deans: Can we try to get advance notice?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: I understand it is to go to the appropriate standing committee on justice.

Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the House, I would like to outline the course of business for the next number of days. On Thursday I would ask the House, because the ministers are not available to meet today, to be prepared for the bills as a result of the budget, Nos. 8 through 16, for second reading. On Friday morning we will proceed to the estimates of the Ministry of Correctional Services. On Monday, as I understand by agreement, we will go back on to the budget—or start the budget debate formally. Beyond that, I will announce in due course.

Mr. Deans: May I ask a question? What has become of order No. 7? That was going to be the next order debated. The minister said No. 3 and No. 7 and that now seems to have been left off.

An hon. member: Eight through 16.

Mr. Deans: Are we not going to go ahead with the Representation Act?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, Mr. Speaker, we will not be going ahead this week with item No. 7.

Mr. Deans: Just for clarification, do I understand we will not sit evenings until the week of the 21st?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, well, that is correct, Mr. Speaker. I won't even make that date permanent; certainly not until then.

Mr. Deans: One further point if I may: Is it possible to get advance notice of the meetings of the committee of justice in order that we can comply with the request of the minister?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am very certain, Mr. Speaker, that the very generous, amiable, agreeable Minister without Portfolio will see that notice is given.

Mr. Deans: I am not so very certain.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:05 o'clock, p.m.

APPENDIX

(See page 648)

Answers to questions were tabled as follows:

5. *Mr. Roy*—Inquiry of the ministry:

Since Oct. 21, 1971 have any private members of the Progressive Conservative caucus been sent outside of Canada on behalf of any ministry or agency? If so, who are the members, what was the nature of their mission and what has been the total cost of these projects.

Answer by the Premier:

Ministry of Natural Resources:

Since Oct. 21, 1971, one private member was sent outside Canada on behalf of his agency: Aug. 2-4, 1972; Mr. James N. Allan, Chairman, Niagara Parks Commission to Longwood Gardens, Kennett Square, Pa., re horticultural garden inspection—\$57.92.

Replies from all other Ministries:

Nil.

6. *Mr. Reid*—Inquiry of the ministry:

Would the Minister of Government Services inform the House why the caterer for the members' dining room was reimbursed \$18,200, for pre-operational costs? Could the Minister give a detailed breakdown of the expenses incurred by the caterer for the \$18,200?

Answer by the Minister of Government Services:

The agreement dated March 2, 1974, between the Ministry of Government Services and J. and J. Dineley Ltd. contains a clause which provides that:

The ministry shall reimburse the caterer for all reasonable start-up and preliminary expenses incurred by the caterer for the performance of this agreement.

The original tender specifications included a requirement that the successful bidder assist the Ministry of Government Services in the design, planning and start-up of the new facilities. The tenderer expected to recoup the expenses associated with such services from the profits of the operation.

For reasons quoted on pp. 68 and 69 of the report of the Provincial Auditor dated Nov. 29, 1974, the contract arrangements were renegotiated during the developmental stages prior to opening and a management fee arrangement was adopted. A separate single payment for pre-operational costs was deemed preferable and more appropriate than a higher monthly management fee which might form the basis for future contract arrangements.

The amount of \$18,198.98 which was paid to J. and J. Dineley Ltd. in respect of pre-operational costs comprised:

(a) Reimbursement of salaries for staff necessarily recruited prior to opening date	\$10,168.98
(b) Reimbursement for sub-contracted consulting and professional work	1,100.00
(c) Consulting and professional services provided by J. and J. Dineley Ltd. (44 man days @ \$157.50)	6,930.00
	<hr/>
	\$18,198.98

10. *Mr. Foulds*—Inquiry of the ministry:

How many non-resident moose licences were issued in 1974? How many resident moose licences were issued in 1974? How many non-resident deer licences were issued in 1974? How many resident licences were issued in 1974?

Answer by the Minister of Natural Resources:

Number of 1974 non-resident moose licences reported issued as of Feb. 28, 1975—14,828.

Number of 1974 resident moose licences reported issued as of Feb. 28, 1975—81,214.

Number of 1974 non-resident deer licences reported issued as of Feb. 28, 1975—4,426.

Number of 1974 resident deer licences reported issued as of Feb. 28, 1975—78,443.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 8, 1975

Assistance to local government, statement by Mr. McKeough	631
Ottawa teachers' dispute, questions of Mrs. Birch and Mr. Auld: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Roy, Mr. P. Taylor, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Foulds, Mr. Cassidy	633
Ontario net cash requirements, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Reid	635
Home buyer grant, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Deans	638
Ontario Mortgage Corp., questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Lewis, Mr. R. F. Nixon	639
Fuel tax changes, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis	641
Ontario unemployment rate, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis	641
Sales tax exemptions, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis	641
Health survey of Elliot Lake miners, question of Mr. Miller: Mr. Lewis	642
Driver licences for hard of hearing, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. P. Taylor	642
Student purchases of homes, question of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Shulman	643
Oil and gasoline prices, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Roy	643
Mobile dental services, questions of Mr. Miller: Mr. Stokes	643
Environmental assessment, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Riddell, Mr. Good	644
Housing problem solution, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Deans	644
Manpower requirements, questions of Mr. McNie: Mr. Reid	645
Old Fort William, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Foulds	645
Home buyer grant, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. G. E. Smith	646
Reports, Ministry of Transportation and Communications and Highway Transport Board, Mr. Rhodes	646
Report, Pubic Superannuation Board, Mr. Snow	646
Report, standing procedural affairs committee, Mr. Morrow	646
Farm Products Marketing Amendment Act, Mr. Stewart, first reading	646
St. Margaret's School, Elora, Act, Mr. Worton, first reading	646
Ministry of Culture and Recreation Amendment Act, Mr. Welch, first reading	647

Ministry of Community and Social Services Amendment Act, Mr. Brunelle, first reading	647
Ontario Unconditional Grants Act, Mr. McKeough, first reading	647
Municipal Amendment Act, Mr. McKeough, first reading	647
Borough of North York Act, Mr. Bales, first reading	647
City of Ottawa Act, Mr. Morrow, first reading	647
Protestant Children's Village, Ottawa, Act, Mr. Morrow, first reading	647
Borough of York Act, Mr. Leluk, first reading	647
City of St. Catharines Act, Mr. Johnston, first reading	648
City of Brantford Act, 1, Mr. Beckett, first reading	648
City of Brantford Act, 2, Mr. Beckett, first reading	648
Matrimonial Property Rights Act, Mr. Bounsall, first reading	648
Tabling answers to questions 5, 6 and 10 on order paper, Mr. Winkler	648
Election Finances Reform Act, Mr. White, second reading	648
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	677
Appendix, answers to questions 5, 6 and 10 on order paper	678



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, April 10, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 1975

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Hon. S. B. Handleman (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman), who is in Ottawa attending the first ministers' conference, I would like to ask all members of the House to join me in welcoming, on his behalf, 50 members from the Adult Day School of Toronto, who are seated in the east gallery with their teacher, Sister Mary Alexander.

Hon. J. P. MacBeth (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in the west gallery we have some 92 students from Lambton-Kingsway Public School which is this year celebrating its 100th anniversary. I ask the House to welcome Mr. Cook, Mr. Robertson, a student-teacher by the name of Miss S. Bailey; and the students I've mentioned, sir.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the House to join with me in saying welcome to 40 grade 8 students from St. Eugene's Separate School in Hamilton East, accompanied by their teachers, led by Mr. Guy Macri.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

OTTAWA TEACHERS' DISPUTE

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, there were a number of questions in the House on Tuesday about the university admission situation as far as Ottawa students are concerned. In looking over the Hansard it became apparent the best thing to do would be to try and answer with a statement, because there was quite a variety of questions and comments.

On April 3, the Council of Ontario Universities issued a release on university applicants from areas where there has been a disruption of teacher services. A copy was delivered to the university affairs division of my ministry at approximately noon on Tuesday, April 8. The universities of Carleton and Ottawa released, on April 8, a subsequent

statement endorsing the Council of Ontario Universities' statement and detailing special considerations for the Ottawa students.

In areas of open enrolment there is no difficulty, with the exception that students may require special tutorial work by the school boards to avoid any disadvantage in starting university programmes. The final acceptance date is Aug. 15 for Carleton and July 1 for Ottawa. However, both institutions will be flexible in considering Ottawa student applications.

In those limited enrolment programmes, positions and scholarships have been reserved for students affected by the strike. Both institutions recognized the need for special tutorials to rectify possible deficiencies caused by the strike.

In connection with the statement of the hon. member for Ottawa East on Tuesday, representatives from Queen's University denied outright the existence of any memorandum to Ottawa school boards that stated Queen's University would not provide special consideration for the Ottawa students.

Indeed, the universities in question were responsible for issuing the statement to the Council of Ontario Universities on the need for special recognition of the situation in Ottawa. We are most appreciative of the action taken by the universities, which I believe demonstrates their willingness to provide the most equitable solution to a difficult situation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this clarifies the situation for the hon. members and corrects any misconceptions certain members may have had regarding the universities in Ontario.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, if I might rise on a point of privilege. In relation to statements made by myself on last Tuesday involving the university situation—and which were reported in the press—about the fact that I had had information, or there was a statement made, that Queen's University would not give special consideration to the Ottawa students, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have spoken with Queen's University in Kingston, to Mr. Harry Stern, who is in charge of admissions. He has reported to me that the information I

had received and the statement that I had made was, in fact, erroneous; and that he and Queen's University have a list of the Ottawa students who are interested and that they will be given every consideration.

So I would like to correct any statement that was made on Tuesday.

Hon. J. R. Rhodes (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Still batting a thousand.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition?

KRAUSS-MAFFEI SYSTEM

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Perhaps the Minister of Transportation and Communications could tell us about his report on Krauss-Maffei? Is the minister going to table that report in the House, further to his answer to my question a week ago in which he said the government was going to make a statement as to continuing involvement in the Krauss-Maffei concept?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that statement will be made next Monday here in the House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's better than a thousand.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: My average is very good compared to many in this House that I know.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Will the minister tell us how much it cost?

OTTAWA TEACHERS' DISPUTE

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask the Provincial Secretary for Social Development if she can give her daily report on the status of the negotiations between the school board in Ottawa and the teachers in the absence of the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells)?

Hon. M. Birch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge the talks are underway at the present moment with the Minister of Education and those involved in Ottawa.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: I wonder if the minister could give any assurance to the members in this House, or the parents in the Ottawa area, that there is any progress being made?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: This morning the deputy minister told the social policy field that the situation was hopeful and that progress was being made.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? The member for Ottawa East?

Mr. Roy: Yes, has the minister fixed any deadline on how long he is going to talk with them? And has the government fixed a time when, in fact, it will have to accept its responsibility as a government in this matter?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, in view of the sensitivity of the negotiations at the moment, I think it would be unwise for me to comment.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. P. Taylor (Carleton East): Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. In order to rotate back and forth, I will allow a supplementary from the member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Is the minister aware that the member for Ottawa East, on behalf of the Liberal Party, now believes there should be legislation to send the Ottawa teachers back to work—and said so publicly last night?

Mr. Speaker: It sounds like a hypothetical question. The member for Carleton East?

Mr. P. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, that was an excellent observation.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please, the member for Carleton East.

Mr. P. Taylor: Would the minister—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. P. Taylor: Just relax; relax.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please, order. The member for Carleton East.

Mr. P. Taylor: Would the Provincial Secretary for Social Development advise the House whether or not the Premier (Mr. Davis) has anything specific to say to the parents of Ottawa when he meets with them this afternoon at 4 o'clock.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to know what the Premier is going

to say to anyone he is going to be talking with this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, I have. I didn't hear what the minister said. I presume she said there was nothing specific to be said?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I said that I am not aware of what the Premier will be saying to anyone he happens to meet with this afternoon.

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Is he going to recommend to his colleagues in the situation that all of us are experiencing—and reading the reports of the energy conference in Ottawa—that legislation be prepared to give the Ontario Energy Board the power to control the costs of petroleum products within the borders of this province, similar to the initiative that was taken a year ago by Nova Scotia?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of the fact that it is my responsibility to discuss that with my colleagues. The Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell), who reports for the Energy Board would, undoubtedly answer the question of the member on the policy of the Energy Board. I have discussed with the Minister of Energy the possibility of some kind of joint funding for those who wish to appear before the Energy Board on behalf of the consumers of Ontario. I am certainly prepared to pursue that with my colleague.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Has the minister any opinion as to whether or not the Energy Board ought to have this increase in its powers in view of the concern expressed by everyone, including the Premier, over the costs of energy as they were established a year ago now and in conjunction with the negotiations that are presently going on in Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with the proposed increase in powers. I'm prepared to study it and report back to the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations: If the government believes, as has been suggested, that the existing price provides the companies with enough revenue for exploration purposes, wouldn't it be a function of such an exercise of power here to squeeze out any excess profits for the benefit of the consumers?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, the member keeps flogging that horse; I'm not too sure whether it's dead or not. We have not suggested there are excess profits. We have suggested there may be sufficient to do what is needed.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

CARLETON BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask the same minister about another matter which doesn't fall directly within his purview but into which I understand he has inserted himself. Can he explain why the township of Nepean did not receive additional assistance for education costs on the same grant basis as additional moneys were made available to Gloucester and, I believe, March township by the Carleton Board of Education?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I think the member should acquaint himself with things before he accuses me of inserting myself into a situation.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister announced the grant, did he not for the Minister of Education?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Yes. As the member for Carleton, certainly I announced the grant which applied to one township in my constituency and one township—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask if it is an accepted rule in this House—

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The minister still has the floor.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —that the member for the area is—

Mr. Speaker: Order please. It is not a point of order.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How the devil do you know it is not?

Mr. Speaker: The minister has not yielded the floor yet.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please, order. The minister had not yielded the floor. Has he completed his answer? Has the minister completed his answer?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Will the member for Brant (Mr. R. F. Nixon) take it easy?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: If the member is familiar with the situation, it goes back about four years. There was an appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board concerning the allocation levies of the Carleton Board of Education. The decision of the Ontario Municipal Board resulted in two municipalities, one March township and the other Gloucester township, being assessed, retroactively, large sums of money. The Minister of Education, who can undoubtedly answer for this, under the powers vested in him through the Education Act was enabled to make grants to the Carleton Board of Education, not to the municipalities, to prevent undue burden on the ratepayers of those two municipalities; and that's exactly what was done.

The township of Nepean, which I have the honour to represent in this Legislature, was not in any way prejudiced by that decision nor was it asked to pay additional levies to the Carleton Board of Education, as were the other two townships.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary. Wouldn't it be true to say—and surely the member for the area would know this—that the ratepayers in Nepean township had been paying additional amounts for education by virtue of the inadequacies of the distribution of the costs previously? Wouldn't the minister then agree that while the payments to Gloucester were fully justified there should be a similar prorated payment to Nepean?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Of course Mr. Speaker that's exactly what was happening. That's the reason that money has been paid.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Nepean did not get a special payment.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Neither did March nor Cloucester, Mr. Speaker. The Carleton Board of Education received funds to credit to those two townships. They were ordered by the OMB to credit Nepean. In fact, that's exactly what they have done. Now the Reeve of Nepean would like to take that money to use to lower the municipal rate. What will happen is that the credit will be allowed to the ratepayers of Nepean to reduce the educational rate, which is exactly what the OMB intended.

PRESENTATION OF GRANT CHEQUES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I have a question of the Chairman of Management Board. Can he make it clear to the members of the House if it is government policy to always make announcements of grants across the province through the elected member in that area, as was indicated by the minister, or just if he is a Tory member?

Mr. MacDonald: Just if he is a Tory.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): How about the member's federal counterparts?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): I don't think that that's so. The implications of the question aren't so. However, as far as the Chairman of Management Board is concerned, it is left to the discretion of the operating minister.

Mr. Roy: Supplementary to that question, Mr. Speaker: How then does the minister justify it that when grants and cheques are handed out in my riding they are given to the member for Ottawa South, the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett)? How does he justify that?

An hon. member: He is a bona fide member.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They can't say they are cheap politicians, that's for sure.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member would repeat his question?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia, a supplementary.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): May I ask, by way of supplementary, is it indicative of

the importance of members of this Legislature when my colleague, the member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson) gives the mayor of Samia a cheque for \$2 million and I get notice today of a grant of \$216.84?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: All those are relative.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

HOUSING STARTS

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Housing. Can the Minister of Housing give some statistics to bear out the claim by the government of 90,000 projected housing starts in the Province of Ontario in the year of 1975; given that in the first quarter of this year, January starts were 63,950, February starts 57,531—that's the annual rate of start—and March 45,802; and that the likely number on that projection would be about 57,000 housing starts in the province, given that we already know what kind of programmes he has in mind?

Hon. D. R. Irvine (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, I'm very well aware of the figures the member has quoted. I think all the members of this House follow the figures for housing starts not only in Ontario but all of Canada. There is nothing to say that January, February and March figures will apply the same throughout the rest of the year. It is our indication from the private sector that there will be many more housing starts in the second, third and fourth quarter than we had originally expected. Therefore, the federal anticipation of 85,000 housing starts in Ontario may be exceeded somewhat; we don't know at this time.

Mr. Deans: Given that after three months of 1974, the projection was for 123,200 housing starts and the actual figure was 85,000, and given that the minister pumped all of his efforts last year into trying to get more housing starts and failed by 40,000 to reach his target, how then can he claim that after three months of 1975 he is going to be able to reach a target higher than his actual in 1974, when he is down by approximately 60,000 in the projections at this point?

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): How indeed?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, the member for Wentworth's arithmetic isn't too good.

Our figure was 100,000 for the year 1974-1975, and the actual figure was 85,000. So that's 15,000, if I can add, and I think I can, of a shortage, not 40,000 as the member was saying. We had a real booming industry in the year 1973-1974 and that is why we had some 120,000 starts.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: The very poor fiscal policies the federal government had for the last year and the year before finally caught up with the housing industry and caught up with a lot of other industries.

Mr. Cassidy: Don't forget to blame the municipalities as well.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: We have a problem now whereby we will all have to work together to make sure we get 85,000 or 90,000 starts.

Mr. Deans: Why didn't this government spend the money it had from the federal government?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I think the federal government has realized this. Mr. Turner is coming in with a mini-budget in May and it will be helpful to the Province of Ontario, I hope, in regard to this.

Mr. Deans: Supplementary: Is it possible for the minister to explain how, if the federal government is responsible for the mess, this government didn't spend all of the money, to the tune of \$103 million that it had available to spend in the Province of Ontario, and that it fell short? What I'm saying is that the government fell short by 40,000 houses in the actual number of housing starts in the Province of Ontario for the whole year over what the projected number would have been had the rate during the three-month period in the early part of 1974 been carried through the year.

Why didn't the government spend the money it had?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, let me ask the member for Wentworth if he would repeat what he said our shortage was, because I didn't hear? Did he say \$102 million?

Mr. Deans: What I said to the minister was this: That based on the three-month projections in 1974, the government should have had 123,000 housing starts. It had, actually, only 85,000 housing starts. I don't care what the minister projected. I'm telling him what his figures said. In the first three months of 1975, the minister has a projection of 45,802

housing starts. That's down some 80,000 from what was projected in 1974; the minister is not likely to hit 60,000 in total in 1975, even based on his most optimistic projections.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a question in connection with this?

Mr. Deans: That's what I'm telling him. Where is the housing programme?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Deans: Where is the housing programme?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, there is neither a question nor is there any truth in what the members says.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Deans: On a point of privilege, the minister has said that I am lying. He said there is no truth in what I said.

An hon. member: He didn't say that.

Mr. Deans: He said there is no truth in what I said.

An hon. member: There probably isn't.

Mr. Speaker: My interpretation is not that the member deliberately misled the House or lied or anything like that. Did the hon. Leader of the Opposition have a supplementary?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I have a supplementary, yes; thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) in his budget on Monday said that he expects 90,000 new units will be started in Ontario this year, can the minister square that with his more optimistic statement that was made just about six weeks before? Is it that the programmes that were enunciated in the budget are going to fall short of what the minister was going to accomplish, even without the new initiatives that evidently were a part of the budget?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, as the member for Wentworth has tried to say to the House and the Leader of the Opposition is saying now, the figures all depend upon the actual output by the private sector. The private sector has indicated just recently that it is prepared to start building housing.

Mr. MacDonald: They've let the government down before and they'll let it down again.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: They didn't build many houses in the last part of the calendar year of 1974 but they are going to be building housing, in Ontario at least, in the second and third quarters of 1975.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Why doesn't the government start treating housing as a social necessity?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: What we are saying is that we had originally anticipated 85,000 starts for this year because of the very poor economic climate that we have in Ontario and throughout Canada. But we think maybe now it could be 90,000. The member for Wentworth is saying it could be 45,000. I say there is absolutely no way that he can say there are only going to be 45,000 starts in Ontario for this year. This is what I meant when I said there is no truth in the statement that we think there will be 45,000 starts.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister said 100,000 starts in January. What has happened since then?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: It wasn't that the member was misleading the House. I just said that there is no truth that there are only going to be 45,000 starts.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: I have just a final question of the minister, Mr. Speaker. In view of the kinds of figures and variations that the minister is talking about, isn't it time we treated housing as a public utility, as a public service, and ensured a planned level of starts year after year, rather than leaving people's housing needs to the whims of the private market?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Does the hon. member for Grey-Bruce have a supplementary question?

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Supplementary: If the key to housing starts is the cost of mortgage money, does the government have any plans to give us six per cent money in the housing field?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. That is not really supplementary to the original question.

Mr. Sargent: I'd like to know—it's very important, it's the key to it.

Mr. Speaker: The member may ask it in his turn. The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Sargent: Does the minister have an answer?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Yes, I do.

Mr. Speaker: This will be a new question then.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to answer the member if I could—

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): He doesn't very often have an answer.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —if it's in order.

Mr. Speaker: We'll wait until his turn comes.

The member for Wentworth.

HOUSING PROGRAMMES

Mr. Deans: I have another question for the Minister of Housing. Given that he claims the private sector is going to engage in the house-building field this year to an extent far exceeding last year's involvement, how then does he propose to provide housing when their own records show that they are unable to provide housing for people who earn under \$12,000 per year? How does the minister propose to provide housing for people who earn the average wage in the Province of Ontario, which is \$9,400 per year?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, both the federal government and ourselves have rental accommodation available for those making less than \$8,000. I don't believe, as I have said before in the House, that it's possible for a family with a total income of \$8,000 or less to have its own home; I think it must have rental accommodation.

As far as the provincial government is concerned, we have accepted tender proposals in the amount of \$42 million in Metropolitan Toronto, Oshawa, Hamilton and Thunder Bay. We are also quite confident we'll be able to call for more proposals in the very near future for limited dividend projects which will have rent stabilization and, in my opinion, will provide the rental accommodation that is necessary in those areas where there is a very low vacancy rate.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary: Given that 60 per cent of the population earn less than \$10,000, could the minister explain to me how many homes we're going to build to meet the needs of that 60 per cent of the

population? How many would we have to build in any given year in order to meet their needs?

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): Doesn't the member know the answer to that question?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, the 60 per cent are not without homes right now. The people of Ontario are the best housed people in all of Canada. Let's start with that as a fact which we all know and recognize.

Mr. Foulds: How about the universe?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: What we're going to do is try to provide additional accommodation to the best of our ability, and I'm sure that the programmes we now have in the Ministry of Housing, along with the co-operation we expect to get from the federal government, will provide rental accommodation and new housing for those people who want to have their own home—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The federal government has given \$480 million to Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —and I'm very confident the private sector will build theirs.

Mr. Cassidy: The government is wrong, and the electors will tell it so.

Mr. Singer: Get the member for St. David (Mrs. Scrivener) to make another speech.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Sudbury wants to ask a supplementary question.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Is it the position of the Minister of Housing that 60 per cent of the people in Ontario will have to resign themselves to the fact they will never own a house?

Some hon. members: No, no.

Mr. Deans: That's what the minister is saying.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: More than that own houses now, my friend.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, that is a typical confused NDP statement.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. Foulds: It was a question. Why didn't the minister answer it?

Mr. Deans: I have a further question—

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for St. George with a supplementary.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Do I understand that the new housing the government is proposing in the Metropolitan Toronto area will be exclusively limited-dividend housing, with the fiscal policies of that programme at this time?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: No, Mr. Speaker. I was addressing myself to the part of the question by the member for Wentworth dealing with rental accommodation. I expect we will have senior citizen accommodation in Metropolitan Toronto in the coming fiscal year, as well as some HOME developments and other developments besides rental accommodation, but I was merely addressing myself to the part about rental accommodation.

Mrs. Campbell: Could I ask a supplementary on that question? What I'm asking is whether the rental accommodation for families in the Metro area is to be exclusively by way of limited dividend in this programme. Are we going to be building family accommodation for rental on a rent-geared-to-income basis?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, we would be delighted to build as many units as possible of the type the member has described if we get municipal and community acceptance of the family rental units—

An hon. member: Blame somebody else!

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is evading the question again.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: The problem last year was that we weren't able to fulfil the number of housing units we wanted for family accommodation because of a lack of acceptance by municipalities.

Mr. Germa: Why doesn't the minister resign now?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Does the member for Wentworth have a new question?

VALPORT HOMES

Mr. Deans: I have a further question of the Minister of Housing. Can the Minister of Housing indicate what action he plans to take against Valport Homes, which are developing both of the Hamilton home ownership programmes, since upon a recent inspection of one of the homes just completed it was found that there were 60 defects, many of them of a structural nature including the foundation and the main beams. What does the minister plan to do with a builder like

this? When is the minister going to bring in a warranty which will protect those people in spite of the Ottawa people's inability to come to grips with the problem? When are we going to get a warranty in Ontario which will protect home buyers against this kind of shoddy workmanship?

An hon. member: It's long overdue.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the particular project the member is referring to. If there are actually 60 defects in the particular housing unit he is referring to—and I am sure we have already had it checked by our inspectors as to whether or not there is that number—we will make sure the defects are corrected.

As to when we will have a warranty policy, that will depend upon my colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

Mr. Deans: Does the minister agree with me that it is not nearly good enough to have found the defects because the man who happened to move into the house knew something about building? Those defects could have gone on for 20 years and not have been noticed until the house might have collapsed.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. What is the question?

OBLIGATIONS OF HOME PURCHASERS

Mr. Deans: I have a further question.

Can the minister explain to me the rationale used by Ontario Housing Corp. in determining that Mr. Kalyani had the right to sell to Mr. Malhatra the properties in Bramalea, which I raised with the minister some time ago; and the right to evict the Nancekivells who had been renting the property from Malhatra and Kalyani respectively during the period when neither one of them, in fact, should have owned the house in the first place?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, we went through this particular case in some detail last year; I think it was in December.

We have determined since then through Ontario Housing Corp. and the Ontario Mortgage Corp. that we do not have any legal rights to retain or retrieve the home from the present owner. We have had discussions—and many of them—with the tenants of that particular home and the Nancekivells have been told many times they should look for other accommodation. They have not chosen to do so. They have an order now to

be out of the house by the end of April, as I understand it, and I would have thought if they wanted to protect themselves they would have at least tried to get into another of our HOME lotteries; we have had two of them in the area. They didn't try to. It seems to me that we have bent over backwards for these particular people and they have not tried to get accommodation for themselves.

Mr. Speaker: Further questions?

The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: One supplementary question. Can the minister explain how he could possibly have come to the realization that he doesn't have any legal right to repossess a house for which the owner or the purchaser signed a contract which said they must live in it and not rent the house, and who subsequently sold it without permission? Surely right within the contracts, which I have copies of, it says very clearly one can't sell it without permission and one must live in it. OHC did have the right to repossess it and didn't exercise the right.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

This question is getting too extended; it's becoming a debate. Are there any new questions? The hon. member for Wentworth?

The hon. member for Elgin has a question.

Mr. Foulds: Stand up.

FARM STABILIZATION PROGRAMME

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Is the minister able to report on the meeting held yesterday with the federal Minister of Agriculture regarding the farm stabilization plan? Will the federal department be working with the provincial ministry on Ontario's proposal—

An hon. member: If he presents it.

Mr. McNeil: —to guarantee costs of production?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, we had a meeting yesterday—all the Ministers of Agriculture—with the federal minister on the stabilization programme proposed by the government of Canada.

Mr. Sargent: I am glad the member asked that question.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: May I just take a moment to go back to September, 1973, when the ministers were asked to go to Ottawa to discuss how greater food production could be accomplished in Canada. All of us were unanimous that there had to be changes made in the Agricultural Products Stabilization Act which would reduce the 10-year averaging period and increase the 80 per cent which had been paid out before.

This was presented in the form of a resolution to the federal government a few months after—in December, 1973, I believe—the federal government brought forward an Act which is now in the committee stage of the House of Commons. This provides 90 per cent of the previous five-year average for certain commodities named under the Agricultural Products Stabilization Act, and they also add in a cost increase factor which takes care, or supposedly will take care, of the inflationary factor from year to year.

We are concerned, because of the escalation of inflation particularly in the last couple of years, that the cost factor they have proposed to add in is high enough. Our discussions were based on that concern. The suggestion we made was that there be 90 per cent over a five-year average supported by the government of Canada, and that we might consider participation of the producers, the province and the federal government in the add-on cost factors, on the basis of one-third being paid by each, of whatever that amount might be.

That was the proposal we made yesterday. The federal government suggested they would give it consideration. I am not very hopeful they will implement it, but I think it's worthy of consideration because to me it goes further than what their legislation now provides.

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: We will allow a supplementary. The member for Prince Edward-Lennox.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Supplementary, of the Minister of Agriculture and Food: The budget proposes the expenditure of some \$20 million to assist in connection with the stabilization plan. Could the minister indicate to the House the manner in which the \$20 million will be used to augment the federal plan?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: By direct cheque delivered Monday before the election.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well that's a good idea, and my friend would know when the election was due.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is the way they did it last time; that's the way they did it last time.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Excellent suggestion.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We have always been anxious to have suggestions from the opposition, and that's the only good one they have made for years, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We know how they do business. They buy votes with public money.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: To answer my friend from Prince Edward-Lennox, the budget statement said the \$20 million would be earmarked for that programme if necessary. We do not know what the federal programme really means. Yesterday when we were there we could not get any specific illustrations, for instance, on commodities such as hogs, corn, soya beans and white beans—crops unique to the Province of Ontario.

We don't know what that add-on factor is. One can easily determine the five-year average and 90 per cent of that; we know what that would be. But to add on, with great respect, the farmers of Ontario are entitled to know that when they plant a crop they are going to get back the returns of their cost inputs into that crop, and that's what we are proposing to do.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): He's quoting the Minister of Agriculture for Canada now.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We do not believe the legislation at Ottawa goes as far as that. That's why the money referred to by the member for Prince Edward-Lennox is so earmarked. However, we don't want—and I want to stress this, Mr. Speaker, because my friend has raised an interesting question on the \$20 million—we don't want add-on programmes that will in effect be built on top of the federal programme which would put the provinces in competition with each other as to which one is going to bid the most to the add-on programme. The federal minister, I think, in his wisdom—and I support that, and as a matter of fact stressed by letter to him—

Mr. Roy: Sit down.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, those fellows over there are not interested in anything for the farmers. All they want to talk is something about politics. It is the only thing they have a clue about. The only thing they are interested in is politics.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If the minister sold his farm, there wouldn't be a farmer over there, and there isn't one here in the NDP either.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I want to say to our friends in the Liberal Party who are saying to me, "Sit down; we don't want to hear what you are doing for the farmers of Ontario"; we are interested in farmers and I will stand here as long as necessary to say so.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What a silly thing to say. The minister can't wait to get his hooks into this extra assistance.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They haven't got a working farmer over there; not one, not even one.

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): The Leader of the Opposition is the only one, eh?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The industrial milk programme—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Will the hon. Leader of the Opposition take his seat?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. We are wasting valuable time.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Indeed we are, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: The Leader of the Opposition will be a working farmer soon.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I think it has been amply demonstrated by the industrial milk programme which placed a standard subsidy right across Canada, and we think that is the kind of a pattern we should follow. That's what we were trying to debate yesterday, and discuss; and I think we reached agreement.

Mr. Sargent: The minister was through half an hour ago. Why didn't he sit down?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Huron.

NAPPAN ISLAND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. J. Riddell (Huron): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Minister of Housing; and this is in connection with Nappan Island. And I beg your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, to let me complete my question

so that we might get a decisive answer from the minister today.

Mr. Sargent: I wouldn't bet on it.

Mr. Riddell: In light of the fact that a resolution signed by the united townships of Seymour, Percy, Rodden, Alnwick, the town of Campbellford, 30 council members, and the lower Trent Conservation Authority, has been sent to the minister stating that—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: The Minister of Agriculture and Food shouldn't say a word.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Riddell:—any development on Nappan Island on the Trent River is not compatible with the interests of conservation or land management, and that no development on this island take place.

Mr. G. Nixon: What is the question?

Mr. Riddell: And since the federal and provincial governments have signed an agreement this past February under CORTS to co-operate in the development of a recreational corridor along the river systems—

Mr. G. Nixon: Give us the question; come on. He is all mixed up.

Mr. Riddell: And since their study identifies the Nappan Island area as one that should be held in its present state with no future development, can the minister—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Riddell: Does the Minister of Agriculture and Food like those jottings? I'll bet he reads them every week.

Mr. Speaker: Will the member place the question please?

Mr. Riddell: Can the minister now tell us that no final approval will be granted for this development?

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): And if he can't he better resign.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I've been urged by some of my colleagues to ask the member to repeat the question, but I wouldn't like to. I'd like to assure the hon. member that I'm aware of the area he's talking about.

Mr. Singer: It's in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I'm also aware that there will not be any development occur, nor has

there been any development up to this date to my knowledge, without proper circulation and without proper hearings by those parties affected. Also, the fact is that my ministry will give very careful consideration as to whether or not any development should be allowed there. We have the matter very closely under control, and we feel that there will not be a development, as the member has said.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is the minister aware that his predecessor gave partial approval to a programme on Nappan Island, where there was no service at all, and that the waste material had to be picked up by truck and carried off the island and dumped somewhere else? His predecessor, sitting beside him, approved that.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows full well it's only a draft approval. There are conditions to be fulfilled.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A draft approval for moving that waste material that way?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

DORE WRECKING CO.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): A question of the Minister of Government Services, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the dialogue he had with the Leader of the Opposition on March 17 in relation to the wrecking of the Hamilton Psychiatric Hospital by the Dore Wrecking Co. It's in two parts.

Part one: Is the minister aware that yesterday the Metropolitan Toronto House Wreckers Association went to the scene of the Hamilton Psychiatric Hospital wrecking and reported that it was being done in a very unsafe way: "By taking a steel beam attached to a bulldozer, and charging the building like a knight on a horse with a lance."

Part two: Is the minister aware that the Dore Wrecking Co., as of today, still has not paid four-fifths of their assessment for last year's compensation, despite the statements made by the minister? And that they underestimated their payroll to the Workmen's Compensation Board last year by 80 per cent?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any of those items.

Mr. MacDonald: Resign; resign then.

Mr. Shulman: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

An hon. member: That's irresponsibility.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. MacDonald: On a point of order. He reported it.

Mr. Speaker: I will allow one supplementary. The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Did the minister on March 17 not say to the Leader of the Opposition that he investigated this and everything was in order? How does he explain this situation?

Mr. MacDonald: That's right; resign.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He is supposed to know about it.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I did everything I told the Leader of the Opposition that I said we had carried out. We had checked with the Workmen's Compensation Board and found they were in order.

Mr. Shulman: What does the minister mean "in order"?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I assured the hon. Leader of the Opposition we had a certified cheque deposited for \$150,000—

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): That's in the Premier's box with the aircraft cheque.

Hon. Mr. Snow: —as certification of the security for this company and that deposit would certainly not be released until we have a certificate from the Workmen's Compensation Board that they have been paid in full.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

DOW CHEMICAL ACTION

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General. Since the Attorney General's answers to my questions the other day about Interprovincial Co-operative Ltd. and Manitoba against Her Majesty the Queen, indicated the minister had absolutely no knowledge of the case at all, has the minister bothered to inquire from his own official, Mr. T. B. Smith, QC, who attended at the court hearings on behalf of the Attorney General of Ontario, as to what the effect of the decision was on Ontario's pending lawsuit against Dow Chemical?

Hon. J. T. Clement (Attorney General): No, Mr. Speaker, I didn't inquire of Mr. T. B. Smith, QC, I inquired of Mr. F. W. Callaghan, QC—

Mr. Singer: Yes. The minister has the decision?

Hon. Mr. Clement: —who said that the case in the Supreme Court of Canada dealt with the vires of provincial legislation, an Act by Manitoba, and in essence it was held that Manitoba could not legislate for torts committed originating outside of its borders, and therefore the case did not have any applicability as far as the Dow case is concerned.

Mr. Singer: Would the Attorney General, by way of supplementary, explain to us why he is not aware, when he has representatives of his department at important cases like this, and why he has to resort to flippant and irrelevant remarks in answering legitimate inquiries addressed to him in the House?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to apologize to the member for Downsview who is certainly more sensitive than I thought he was insofar as a flippant remark is concerned.

I am not being flippant. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that we have requisitioned from the Supreme Court of Canada a copy of the judgement. We did not have it as of the day after the member asked the question; it has not come into our possession. There was no point, insofar as I am concerned, in asking the law officer who attended that hearing to report to me. I want to see the report. We have requested it; as soon as we have it I will read it. Perhaps we could read it together.

Mr. Singer: Perhaps the minister would like to borrow the one that is here, that was tabled by the court on March 26 last?

Hon. Mr. Clement: I would be very appreciative; we don't have the resources in our ministry to get them like that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): When did this subscription run out?

Mr. Roy: He probably won't understand it anyway.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Stormont.

PLANT CLOSINGS

Mr. G. Samis (Stormont): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism: Could the minister tell the House what his department has done and is planning to do to assist the workers of the Sylvania plant in Cornwall which, as he knows, is scheduled to close this summer?

Hon. C. Bennett (Minister of Industry and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, in regard to plant closures, the ministry sends its field representatives in to deal with management and to review the problems with them.

Mr. Cassidy: With the management.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: With the management, that is correct, and if the member for Ottawa Centre would sit and listen for a moment he might want to hear the rest of the answer.

Mr. Foulds: Just trying to give the minister some time to think about it.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): He is all mouth and no ears.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: When we meet with the management usually at that time the employees' representative group is there also, so we may learn from them exactly how many people will be looking for employment if the plant closes and what are their qualifications and competence in other jobs.

Sir, we have not got the ability—and I admit this openly—to find employment for all of the people that happen to be laid off in a particular industry. But let me assure this House that the ministry and its staff will go out into the field, both in that community and in adjacent communities, to try and find employment for those people. If not, then we will try to encourage other industries to come in and take up the slack by purchasing the assets of the company that could very well be closing.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of the Environment has the answer to a question asked previously.

Mr. Samis: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Well, if it is a short supplementary. The time is fast running out and many people wish to ask new questions.

Mr. Samis: These are people who are losing jobs, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Will you proceed please?

Mr. Samis: Can I ask the minister if his department has discussed with GTE Automatic Electric in Brockville any form of job assurance should they move to Cornwall? Has the minister had any discussions with Automatic Electric?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: If the member had liked to write me on that question I could have had the answer for him, but I will have to take the question under advisement and check with my ministry as to exactly what has transpired in the discussions with our field people and that particular operation.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of the Environment?

BURLINGTON SKYWAY SEWAGE TREATMENT FACILITY

Hon. W. Newman (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, in answer to a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition on March 25, I wish to report to the House on the sewage treatment capacity of the Burlington Skyway treatment plant.

Mr. Speaker, if it is all right with you, I will just send the answer over to the hon. member in the absence of time. Would that be all right?

Mr. Speaker: I think that would be acceptable to the House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: On how many days did they have to dump raw sewage because of inadequate capacity at that plant?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the supplementary question, I did point out that there were two modifications made last year. The plant itself was built for over-capacity; it is just the pumping capacity into the plant. The effluent going out of the plant at the present time meets our standards. If the member will read the answer over he will see that all in there.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce.

HOUSING PROGRAMMES

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Housing.

In view of the fact that in the United States there is talk of three per cent money available for a crash programme on housing, and in view of the fact that a crash programme in housing in Ontario would cure

our unemployment situation, and in view of the fact that the government has given \$100 million to Syncrude, what is more important than having the minister tell the House what steps he has taken to give us even six per cent money for mortgage money in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member discussed this matter with me some while ago and I said I would be the most delighted person in Ontario if we could have six per cent money, but I don't believe it's possible at this particular time. I think the federal government has indicated that it is possible in some cases to supplement the interest rate down to maybe eight per cent, but I think now, when the going rate is 10½ per cent and will be 10½ and possibly 10¾ per cent—

Mr. Ruston: Six per cent for the Wallaceburg hotel.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —it is not realistic to think that we can get six per cent money.

Mr. Ruston: The government gave it to Holiday Inn at Wallaceburg.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Maybe Mr. Turner will be coming forth with some proposal, as the member has suggested. I don't feel that we have the funds available.

Mr. Sargent: A supplementary: In view of the fact that the government makes the rules here and has made the rule regarding \$1.6 billion to win the election, why can't it make a rule to give us—

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Sargent: Just a minute. Why can't they make a rule that they can spend \$100 million on housing?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I think the minister has answered that.

Mr. Sargent: Why the hell can't he answer it? It is an important question.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Hamilton East.

REDEVELOPMENT OF QEW

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Would the minister explain why his 1974-1975 report says not one word about what I consider, and he himself must consider, the major issue on the design boards for the past two years; that is the redevelopment

of the Queen Elizabeth Way from the Guelph Line to the Stoney Creek traffic circle, including the twinning of the Burlington Skyway Bridge, or tunnelling? Why is it not mentioned in his report?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I think I shall be tabling very shortly the programme that is coming up for this next fiscal year which will have all of the details of the work that will be done in that particular job. It's really just getting under way now. I will table the report in the next couple of days, sir.

Mr. Gisborn: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. We will just have time for about one new question. The member for Carleton East.

OTTAWA TEACHERS' DISPUTE

Mr. P. Taylor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister of Education give us a first-hand report on the progress of negotiations involving the OSSTF and the Ottawa Board of Education?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, the talks are still continuing in Toronto and the mediator is still present.

Mr. Roy: Is there any progress?

Mr. Speaker: One final, final question from the member for Thunder Bay.

POLLUTION OF GREAT LAKES

Mr. Stokes: I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. In view of the ruling handed down by the Supreme Court of the United States to allow Reserve Mining Co. to continue to drop 67,000 tons of taconite tailings daily into Lake Superior, and in view of the concern expressed by the city of Duluth just recently about the impairment of the quality of water as a result of this activity, what initiatives does the ministry intend to take with the IJC to see that no further impairment of this great water resource continues?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I only heard part of the member's question with all the talking that is going on, but I can assure him that we were involved originally on this matter and did express our concerns to Ottawa, to the federal Ministry of the Environment, and they in turn passed the con-

cerns on to the Environment Protection Agency. Certainly we're concerned when any international waters are involved and we will be getting involved, but I didn't know the results of the Supreme Court were down. We did express our concern earlier; we are concerned about any effluent that is going into the Great Lakes.

Mr. Foulds: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The time expired some moments ago. The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. Ewen from the standing private bills committee presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:—

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:—

Bill Pr2, An Act respecting the Town of Seaforth.

Bill Pr7, An Act respecting Quinn Lumber and Builders' Supply Co. Ltd.

Bill Pr9, An Act respecting the Borough of Etobicoke.

Bill Pr22, An Act respecting the Borough of Scarborough.

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill Pr18, An Act respecting the City of Kingston.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. There is too much conversation going on in the chamber. It is very difficult to follow the proceedings. Are there any further reports?

Hon. Mrs. Birch tabled the first report of the Ontario Advisory Council on Multiculturalism.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce three members of that council who are sitting in the Speaker's gallery: Mary Louise Clements, the vice chairman of the council; Bromley Armstrong, a council member; and Elizabeth Szalowski executive officer of the council.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that tomorrow this House resolve itself into the committee of supply.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the standing administration of justice committee be author-

ized to sit concurrently with the House for its consideration of Bill 3, An Act to regulate Political Party Financing and Election Contributions and Expenses.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

HARFORD LTD. ACT

Mr. Apps moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Harford Ltd.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF HAMILTON ACT

Mr. J. R. Smith moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF HAMILTON ACT

Mr. J. R. Smith moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF HAMILTON ACT

Mr. J. R. Smith moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF TORONTO ACT

Mr. Wardle moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

SHERIDAN PLACE ACT

Mr. Beckett moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Sheridan Place.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

RETAIL SALES TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Meen moves second reading of Bill 30, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, the various amendments which are being made in this Act may indeed well be dealt with when we go into committee. I don't think there is any particular principle as such that we have to discuss here, other than the most important one concerning the changes which are going to exempt production machinery and equipment and construction machinery and equipment from certain provisions of the sales tax.

This matter had been discussed fully in 1970 when the government attempted the same approach that it is taking now and we were concerned then as to the number of jobs which might be created by this particular kind of change in the government's taxing policy. It has certainly been well discussed over the intervening years and, as a result of this budget, the matter has come up again.

We are prepared to support the government with respect to the passage of this bill in the belief that there may be some general addition to constructive capacity which will result from decisions made by manufacturers and those who will be using new equipment to purchase items in order to obtain the benefit of this particular governmental decision.

Certainly the question has been made, and logically so, as to whether, in fact, we would be receiving any particular taxable benefit in the sense that new jobs might be created or items might be purchased within Ontario or within Canada that might benefit the overall economy. The government has come to the conclusion that a general benefit will occur, and it is very difficult at this point to quarrel with the expressed hope at least that this will result. Accordingly, we are prepared to support this particular point and look forward to having at least some report received from the minister from time to time as to any monitoring which he is able to do that will show that this kind of tax change is going to benefit the Province of Ontario.

The other point that I would like to refer to briefly is solely the one dealing with compensation for retail sales tax. As the minister will recall, he and I served some years ago, in 1968, on the select committee on taxation. At that time, the explanations received and the comments made, certainly by the staff which we had on that committee, were to the effect that the collection procedures for these kinds of taxes, as well as for other kinds of documentation required by provincial or federal government authorities, were simply a matter of doing business. Accordingly, the businessman had to accept this as his responsibility or

her responsibility when carrying on a business in this jurisdiction.

I think a case has certainly been substantially made by the vendors, particularly now that costs have risen to this point and that the time being spent is such, that some balancing factor is reasonable. I am prepared to accept their view at this time, especially as the forms and documents that are completed are becoming more and more in number and as the cost of having someone complete this information in the form that is required becomes greater and greater.

Accordingly, we are prepared to accept this situation of compensation, which may indeed not be a total equivalence of the funds spent but is a contribution and an acknowledgement that the imposition of certain informational requirements by the government should at least be compensated somewhat by a reduction from the funds which otherwise would be sent in to the province.

With those particular comments, Mr. Speaker, I think I will end my remarks on the second reading. As I say, I presume the bill will go to committee and there may be particular comments on various definition items that can be more easily dealt with at that time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, my sage prediction is that the Liberal Party throughout the series of tax measures that is forthcoming, beginning with this one, will support the government under every head. We do not intend to. We do not intend to support this particular piece of legislation.

How can they inveigh against a piece of legislation or the package as a whole, raise proper Cain, raise their voices and give a little hell and, at the same time, accept everything holus-bolus and across the board. It seems to me a fundamental dereliction of the role of an opposition. It is an opposition that ceases to oppose. It is a position which rules them out as holding any opportunity or any competence to take over the affairs of this province, which they presume to be able to do. If they can't make more scathing criticisms and assessments of legislation than that, then they should retire even from the opposition, God help us.

The Retail Sales Tax Act is predicated upon two fallacies. The whole budget rests on two fallacies. One of them is that the government anticipates, like Minerva spinning a web, that somehow or other this econ-

omy is going into an upswing. There is no indication of that. On the contrary. While we deplore it and while we think the government makes its own contribution to downturns, the continental system and even the world economy are in such a state, it seems to me, particularly in the United States of America upon which we're terribly dependent, that that is kind of Pandora's box or fancy thinking on which to predicate a course. But that's not the reason at all. The reason is the election, and we'll come to that in a moment. That's why we're taking umbrage and offence and have reservations about this legislation.

The second thing is the oil thing. One dollar on the oil will send up the budgetary deficit by millions of dollars and take out in excess of \$200 million from this province ultimately. It will send the government into a tailspin. At the moment I'm standing here talking, the Premier of this province (Mr. Davis) is in Ottawa anticipating, absorbing and making up his mind as to his modes of acceptance of that particular thing. It's on its way, and it's going to happen. It's going to be \$2 or \$3. There's little question about it. He may come back here rampaging and even go to the people over the issue. But the fact of the matter is that predicating a budget upon such a tenuous thread seems to me a kind of basic irresponsibility in matters of setting a budget. Then in the throes of making his budget, he says he very well might have to come back very shortly with reformed budget. I dare say he will.

We do not oppose—and I want this to be made abundantly clear—the reduction from seven per cent to five per cent in the sales tax. We do not oppose that. As members of this House, the NDP opposed the increase when it went from five to seven. We felt that this is a regressive tax in its nature and that it ought not to be imposed to the degree that this tax is being relied upon by this government at this time in history. We've fought it all along the line and it's in the record and it's well known. Therefore, we don't think we need to make any apology.

What happens in legislation, nevertheless—and it's true about the Succession Duty Act which will be coming up next, I anticipate—is that legislation is, as this kind of legislation is, a bundle. There are various statutes or sectors or fragments of it which, for one reason or another, people like myself in this opposition do not think hang together. There are things that are acceptable and things that are unacceptable. In that way, the central core of the thing is so basically flawed as

to oblige us, while we accept one portion of the legislation, to take issue with and to raise our voices in protest against two or three others.

The first one is to do with the termination day. We want the thing extended indefinitely. We want the tax reduced and left reduced. Go out and get the money from the corporations. Don't insist upon taking it from the lowest wage-earners in the province as the government does with the retail sales tax legislation.

The minister is only posturing with this for a partial period—up to Christmas and a little after—and then reimposing the whole burden again on some pretext of an upswing so that as we all know, he can go to the people between now and then on the basis of his beneficence, as a Santa Claus with a false beard.

The word "cynical" has been used too often; this is a piece of blatant hypocrisy. We find, as the budget indicates throughout, that it seeks to pick up every element in the population that has any clout at all and confer some kind of benefit upon them here and there; but in the areas where the government finds it unpalatable, it has fore-shortened it by setting up a time limitation. We object to that time limitation and think it is a sufficient principle alone upon which to take umbrage and to vote against the legislation.

The second thing—and we have expressed ourselves ad nauseam in this House about this—concerns the production machinery benefits. The Minister of Revenue and I sat on the Smith committee, and he will remember well the numerous briefs—and I brought them here today—with respect to production machinery benefits.

Hon. A. K. Meen (Minister of Revenue). Indeed I do remember.

Mr. Lawlor: It was in 1968, I believe, that the federal government introduced measures to alleviate the corporate sector of the tax burden on production machinery with the sole motivation of stimulating employment. Did it stimulate employment then? We have had many years of practice, many years of testing; the experiment has been tested and it hasn't proved out. The money is pocketed. It goes into profits. It's not passed on.

There is a second factor to consider. Even if some small portion of it does start some kind of stirrings in the economy, very often it goes into automated equipment in any event, which loses jobs instead of stimulating them. Therefore, the production machinery

concept is not a very operative one. If this is a special way of the government giving a handout or largesse to its friends—we think it is, and we take exception to it—we say the minister is giving away \$200 million of the taxpayers' money in the province with regard to this particular area of the economy and fetching nothing.

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): What about the lack of employment too?

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): What about the workers?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: He doesn't care about them.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister is not doing anything for the workers of this province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: All the minister is doing is increasing corporate profits. It's just nonsense. The minister hasn't got a tittle of evidence to prove that this particular tax measure over the years, or now, will have one iota of significance with respect to this concept. There are a hundred ways in which the minister could do it with far more common sense than this. This is the handout factor written into this particular legislation. We find it unpalatable and we say he should withdraw it.

An hon. member: Power to the people.

Mr. G. Nixon: The people don't hate us.

Mr. Lawlor: If the minister would extend the time or make it indefinite regarding the five per cent, and pull out the production equipment sections of the Act, we would vote in favour of the legislation.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The member has already stated he is against the legislation, regardless of its merits.

Mr. Lawlor: On the contrary, we have no particular compunction about giving compensation to the small businessman. We don't see why it should extend to the T. Eaton Co., who would be the chief beneficiary of this particular legislation. Again, the minister is not sufficiently subtle with his legislation. He covers the whole waterfront. Those who don't need it get it as well as those who do. I think sensible legislation should segregate that out a bit and give it to the small businessman who does have to hire auditors and so on, over and against the giant corporations and retail outlets of this country and this province who really don't need that at

all; they have adequate office staff and adequate accountants and auditors working on their books.

I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that our committee some years ago recommended unanimously that that particular offering to the public and to small businessmen had used up its usefulness. However, because of the inflationary aspects of the thing and the increased costs of doing business, it very well may be brought in at this time with a view to alleviating conditions in the small business sector of the economy.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Does the member support that part of the bill?

Mr. Lawlor: Those are the basic propositions we want to put forward.

I am just a little bemused—I say that before I sit down—as to how the present Treasurer's (Mr. McKeough), budgets are well afoot to dismantling everything that his predecessor sought to do. In 1972, the former Treasurer (Mr. White), brought in numerous measures which are directly contrary to these particular ones. My feeling was at that time, since the present Treasurer was a bit out of office and out of favour, and out of flavour, and various other outs of, that he wasn't particularly happy then. He reasserted himself. And while giving little accolades left and right to his predecessor in office, he has nevertheless gone about it to tear down that house of cards.

Well, in this particular instance I hope it goes to committee. If we do, there are many sections in here of a technical and nice nature. For instance, I would like to know why he includes natural gas and manufactured gas in the tax and what brought him now to stick fixtures within the taxable items, with the infinite, very considerable difficulty it creates. Does he intend to delineate what he means by fixtures? He knows the difficulties in law trying to define what a fixture is or is not. Is a television aerial a fixture, for instance? It is a very moot and tricky question and I would suspect that he will have to spell that out a bit.

If he is going to give this largesse to the big manufacturers of the province, who are all multinational corporations and couldn't care about his wretched money anyhow, except just to add to corporate dividends and to send it out to people living somewhere else, in some other parts of the world, then at least he might have confined it to the type of manufacturing in this country and kept it—tried to stimulate the economy within the

perimeters of our own geographical areas. But he hasn't seen fit to do that.

The one other thing I wanted to mention to you, Mr. Speaker, is that it seems to me that somewhere in his budget papers he mentioned telephone rates or a number of things having to do with telephone service that were caught in the legislation—I just haven't detected it—and I would be pleased to learn what his position was on that.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kit-chener-Waterloo.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): North.

Mr. Speaker: Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: I am compelled to say a few words, Mr. Speaker, and I suppose one could take this opportunity to make almost a budget speech with this tax. But the remarks of the member for Lakeshore surely indicate that the NDP have no place to stand, other than to oppose just for the sake of opposing.

Mr. G. Nixon: Right on, right on.

Mr. Good: Any party that opposes a bill that reduces the most regressive form of tax we have had, from seven to five per cent, surely is left with no place to stand whatsoever—just opposing for the sake of opposing.

Mr. Lawlor: He will do anything for a buck or a vote.

Mr. Good: Now, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken in this chamber on several occasions in the last several years completely condemning the fact that the largest single source of revenue in this province has been the retail sales tax.

As far as I am concerned, it is absolutely unacceptable that this government should have raised more money by sales tax in the last two years than by any other source. And this is shown very clearly in the budget papers. Last year, 19.3 per cent of the budget was raised by retail sales tax. The year before that it was 19.2, and personal income tax raised only 18.3 and 18.1 per cent, respectively. So, certainly this move had to come.

Any government which will continue to use a regressive tax when there are more progressive taxes open to a government, such as the income and corporation taxes has certainly got its priorities mixed when it comes to methods to raise money.

I am glad to see this reduction from seven to five per cent but there is no way this can

be interpreted as a genuine method of re-vamping the government's currency programmes and its methods of raising money when one sees that it is proposing to do this only until the end of this year. This, Mr. Speaker, is an entirely unacceptable situation but the way this matter has to be attacked is to approve the principle of the reduction, which is right, but amend the bill to such an extent that this will not be constricted to a definite termination in time.

There is nothing available at the present time from economists, nothing generally considered in the whole economic outlook to show that this so-called upturn the Treasurer spoke of is going to come in the fall. He knows as well as I know, as well as everybody here knows, that our economy does have a lag reaction to that of the USA. While we are slower going into the recession we will be slower in pulling out. The indications across the line are that this so-called recession is going to continue past this fall. There should be no inclination by the government to restrict the reduction of sales tax to the short period from now until the end of the year.

The reduction time limit has been a complete giveaway on their part. It has given away the fact that they are openly and blatantly being political with the provincial budget and with the money of the people of Ontario. It is absolutely nothing more than bold, bald politics that they would introduce this measure and limit the time period from now until the end of the year. It's almost disgusting and the people of Ontario are going to realize that this is what is happening.

Mr. Lawlor: We thought it was so disgusting we will vote against it.

An hon. member: Crepe hanger.

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, the minister has indicated on previous occasions that the sales tax isn't that regressive, because we have the great sales tax reduction refund which we get on our income tax. As far as I am concerned that is pure misnomer as well because the refund given there has no bearing on either the amount of sales tax paid by the individual or in his ability to pay but it is tied to his or her personal exemptions which have no relationship to the sales tax whatsoever. Mr. Speaker, this government just can't continue to fool the people indefinitely, and the time has come this year, in 1975—

Mr. G. Nixon: The member is double-talking.

Mr. Good: —when the people are finally waking up to what it is doing. It brings in a measure and we know why the Tories are doing it. The measure is good but there's no way they're going to get away with this, terminate it at the end of the year and expect to be re-elected.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I could respond briefly to the previous speaker, I assure him we are not opposing this bill for the purpose of finding something to oppose.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That's not what the member for Lakeshore said.

Mr. Laughren: When one is debating in this chamber against this government there is no shortage of reasons to oppose its legislation. It's beyond me how the Liberal Party—

Mr. Speaker: It is not customary that you respond to the speaker. You talk to the principle of Bill 30.

Mr. Laughren: If I could talk to you for a moment, Mr. Speaker, I say when we oppose this bill and other elements of the budget, which we intend to do, it will not be because we are looking for room to stand on or that we are looking for a difference between us and the Conservative Party in Ontario. It's because we have never seen before a budget which was so saturated with political, social and economic hypocrisy.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: He is a cynic, a political cynic.

Mr. Laughren: To support a clause in a bill because it lowers the sales tax from seven per cent to five per cent for about nine months is surely not a principle position which we could possibly live with. Mr. Speaker, if this bill lowered the sales tax to zero we would support it; if it lowered the sales tax to five per cent indefinitely we would support it; but we refuse to be part of game-playing with the Ontario economy that reduces the sales tax for a nine-month period.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): It is the people's money.

Mr. Laughren: And I don't know, Mr. Speaker, how the Minister of Revenue is going to justify to the Ontario people that there is going to be an upturn in the economy this fall particularly, as my colleague from Lakeshore pointed out, when they knew

full well before going to Ottawa that there was going to be an increase in the price of oil. We know that. We knew that beforehand, the Treasurer knew it beforehand, and he still goes through this charade of drawing up a budget on the premise that it is not going to happen. Nothing could be more ridiculous.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Why should they have a conference in Ottawa?

An hon. member: The member knows why.

Mr. G. Nixon: Why waste their time going there, if they've got all the answers?

Mr. T. A. Wardle (Beaches-Woodbine): To hold down the price of oil and gas.

Mr. Laughren: Well, he went down there to get his orders, that's what he went down there for.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Why are all the Premiers down there?

Mr. Laughren: He went down there to see if they could get a consensus but he knew when he went he wasn't going to get it. The member knows and I know that that price was going to be increased.

An hon. member: He went to find an election issue; that's all he wanted.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, if the government was really interested in stimulating the economy it would not be using this kind of short-sighted methods. If they would listen to the Economic Council of Canada, if they would listen to the Science Council of Canada, they would tell this government—they have been trying to tell governments in Canada—that there is a way in which the economy of this province and this country can be stimulated in the long run, but it is not through short-term fiscal policies such as this.

Mr. Lawlor: Listen to the electrical workers.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: We need jobs now.

An hon. member: What is the government going to do in January?

Mr. Laughren: I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, where these jobs are coming from in this budget.

An hon. member: They have all the experts.

Mr. Laughren: Is the government suggesting that reducing the sales tax from seven to five per cent might work creating jobs?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It might help.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, we wish to make it perfectly clear that we are in favour of a reduction in the provincial sales tax. We are not in favour, however, of reducing the provincial sales tax for nine months only and using a short-term reduction for—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: He would rather have no reduction. He would rather have no reduction at all.

Mr. Laughren: —for a short-term political gain.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, another aspect of this bill which turns our minds to glue—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That's easy for those fellows. They are a tacky bunch.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, surely that's a remark that should be withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: I didn't hear what the remark was. What was it?

Mr. Laughren: I would rather not repeat it.

Mr. Speaker, the part of the bill which allows an exemption from provincial tax for production machinery and equipment was trumpeted by the Treasurer as an aspect of the budget that would aid northern Ontario, that would be an asset to the people in northern Ontario and would stimulate jobs and investment in the north. I sure wish that he would give us some historical evidence that this is the case. To date he has none, and he continues to bring forth these kinds of policies.

I would also like to know whether or not it is a fact—perhaps the Minister of Revenue could indicate in his response whether or not it is a fact—that the investment intentions of the private sector on which the estimate of how much this would cost the province were based on already stated intentions of investment by the private sector to Statistics Canada? If not, where did he get that figure of the investment intentions of the private sector? We don't know how he came up with this figure, because we suspect that those intentions are already in effect and that that investment is going to occur,

whether or not there is an exemption. Surely that is clear. All he is really doing is saying, "Well, you are going to spend that money anyway, but here we will give you a little bit of a perk to help you along this year."

As far as stimulation of jobs in the north is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I would hazard a guess that what has occurred in recent years in northern Ontario will continue to occur and that's a reduction in employment—unless you are looking at an expansion of a particular facility, such as Texasgulf at Timmins. If you look at the employment in the mining industry or in the lumbering industry over the last 10 years you will find an absolute reduction in the number of people employed.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They can't get workers.

Mr. Laughren: They can't get workers?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They have been looking for workers in the mining industry from other provinces.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, I accept your admonishment not to respond to interjections and so forth. But I really must say to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is a high rate of unemployment in northern Ontario and you need only check with the local unemployment insurance and Manpower offices in the north to know that there are lots of people unemployed. It's not a case of not being able to get people for jobs.

If I could just point out to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that when I was in Timmins about a month ago I was in a cab from the airport and heard a newscast that said Texasgulf couldn't find workers for the smelter in Timmins. I asked the cab driver, "What is this, not being able to get workers in Timmins? Is there really nobody unemployed in Timmins?" He replied, "I want to tell you something. I've had my name in at Texasgulf for six months and they haven't even bothered to call me."

So the mining industry has a vested interest in spreading this myth across Canada, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Does the member get all his information from cab drivers?

Mr. G. Samis (Stormont): A good source.

Mr. Laughren: Before we reply to the budget, I hope that the member for Prince Edward-Lennox will be here, because I intend to deal with that issue in more detail.

I would like to know as well, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Revenue has any assurances

from the private sector that this exemption on machinery or production equipment will not cause a further capitalization in the industry. We know that in the mining industry, as an example, that the tons of ore produced each year goes up very dramatically and the value of the ore goes up even more dramatically. At the same time, the number of people employed in the industry either remains stable or goes down. So we're really seeing capitalization of the industry and this kind of exemption encourages that, not the increase in jobs in the industry. So, Mr. Speaker, you can see why we're very concerned about this bill.

When we get to the part of the bill about compensation of retailers, we support that and we think that's fine. I don't feel very strongly either way on that. All businesses have certain costs of carrying out that business. If the Treasurer sees that as necessary to retain the support of small business in election year 1975, then I suppose we won't quarrel with him too much on that.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say to you that we have never before seen the kind of desperation budget like the one that the Treasurer brought in the other night and for that reason we shall oppose this bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for—

Mr. J. Duksza (Parkdale): I was first.

Mr. Wardle: Beaches-Woodbine.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Parkdale will have to alternate between different parties.

Mr. Wardle: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a word or two on a particular aspect of the budget, and that is the reduction of the sales tax from seven per cent to five per cent.

An hon. member: A nice round figure.

Mr. Wardle: I know, Mr. Speaker, that the small businessmen will appreciate very much the opportunity to now recover at least some of their costs in collecting this tax. I think the \$500, as far as a large corporation is concerned, will only go a very small way in their remuneration. But as far as the corner store is concerned, and the small businessman, I know that he spends several hours each month, or each quarter, preparing his tax return.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Why don't they take it away from him, then?

Mr. Wardle: This is often done in the evening, or odd hours, or over the weekend when his store is closed. I think it was in the last budget address that I mentioned the fact that we did have many presentations from small businessmen and organizations asking that they at least receive some remuneration for the time spent on this effort. So, Mr. Speaker, I do welcome this particular aspect of this bill.

Secondly, I think it's a forward step and a stimulus to the economy that all the provincial sales tax will be removed on production machinery and equipment.

I know that many businessmen who are considering expanding and replacing old equipment have hesitated until this date, mainly because of the economic climate now prevailing not only in Ontario but throughout this country and indeed throughout the world. But I do hope and expect that this gesture of removing the tax will be the stimulus that will encourage people in the manufacturing business to go out now and buy the equipment, which will of course provide necessary jobs.

Third, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the reduction from seven to five per cent, albeit it is presently planned until the end of this year, will be a stimulus to the purchasing power in the province. While it is only two per cent, often on large purchases such as a motor car and household equipment I think this could make a difference. I know the people in my particular riding welcome the fact that production equipment purchases will help the economy and either provide more jobs or at least hold the jobs we have, which is very important.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): That's nonsense.

Mr. Lawlor: He hasn't a simulacrum of evidence for that.

Mr. Stokes: It didn't do it the last time.

Mr. Wardle: The small merchants in my area welcome the fact that they will have at least some small remuneration for the collection of the tax.

Fourth, I know the people in my riding and throughout this province welcome the fact that the tax has been reduced from seven to five per cent. This is a forward step, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that all members of this House will support this bill.

Mr. Lawlor: It's a kind of a stumble.

Mr. Wardle: I don't know how the members of the official opposition and the NDP could ever put themselves in a position of opposing a bill that would help the people of this province.

An hon. member: They want a full reduction.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale.

Mr. Duksza: Mr. Speaker, the member for Waterloo North has done a superb job of apologizing for the government and for the capitalist system. The Liberals should actually recognize that ideologically they are in the same camp as the Tories and they should always vote together and, in fact, join together, since they only differ in detail.

We are opposing this bill and I'm personally joining in opposing this bill for three reasons: 1. That the whole sales tax is extremely regressive. It hits only the poor; 2. There should be no sales tax. Most of the revenue should be raised from a graduated income tax. I despise the way this sales tax has been reduced, giving a few shoddy goodies for nine months for purposes of the election; 3. It also fails lamentably in dealing at all with unemployment and with the oncoming recession. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I intend to make a few comments on this bill. The previous speakers made mention that we in the official opposition are supporting the principle of the bill. That's true. We are supporting the principle of the reduction of the tax from seven to five per cent. Anyone who would refuse to support that type of a principle certainly must have his priorities mixed up.

We would have preferred to have seen the sales tax completely eliminated, but that isn't the bill before us. The bill before us is to reduce it from seven to five per cent and that's what we are going to support; the reduction from seven to five. Personally I would prefer not to have a sales tax, because I think, just as the member who spoke before me, that sales tax is the most regressive type of taxation.

Mr. Lawlor: Condemn it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. B. Newman: I would prefer to see taxes always pegged according to ability to pay, but that isn't what the bill says.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. B. Newman: The bill is designed to reduce taxes, so we are going to have to vote on what the bill says and not on what it doesn't say.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that does disturb me is the minister having this bill effective only for a nine-month period. That tells the average individual something. It tells the average individual that this is strictly a political manoeuvre and nothing else. If the minister were sincere concerning the reduction of the sales tax, he should have simply eliminated any date on that and removed the sales tax completely or reduced it from seven to five. The nine months' period is completely unacceptable.

Mr. Deans: Vote against it.

Mr. B. Newman: One of the areas in which I am pleased to see the elimination of the tax is in relation to production machinery.

Mr. Samis: Here we go.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): The Federation of Labour wanted that.

Mr. B. Newman: Back on Nov. 4, 1969, when the government imposed the five per cent sales tax on production machinery I very strongly objected to it. I presented my objections in the House by letters from all types of industry, both large and small, in my community. They were not necessarily multinational corporations but small two-man machine shops in the tool and die and jig and fixture business in the community.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): They want it off all the time. They want it off for ever.

Mr. B. Newman: At that time, Mr. Speaker, the minister of the day (Mr. White) pointed out emphatically that the imposition of a sales tax on production machinery has no effect at all. It doesn't increase costs. It doesn't have any detrimental effect in the manufacturing process. All of a sudden, from Nov. 4, 1969, to April 10, 1975, this government has flip-flopped.

It has seen the opposite now. It realizes the mistake it made at that time and now it is withdrawing the tax on production machinery. I am pleased to see that, because when I look in my own community and see

the Chrysler Co. putting up a new truck plant, which will probably provide another 1,000 jobs, and seeing so many unemployed as a result of the downturn of the economy, I hope that will enable them at least to provide extra jobs in the community.

Mr. Laughren: I'll believe that when I see it.

Mr. B. Newman: That's all right for some of those fellows who wouldn't believe anything.

Mr. Laughren: This will be good for GM—is that what the member is saying?

Mr. B. Newman: In this past year the Chrysler Co., from what I understand, and Ford, especially on the US level, have had extremely unsatisfactory profit pictures. The only one of the big three, I understand, that did show any margin of profit was GM. Surely if they are not going to thrive in the community, there won't be 16,000 unemployed in the city of Windsor—

Mr. Laughren: What's good for GM is good for Canada.

Mr. B. Newman: —there might be 30,000 unemployed. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the left certainly wouldn't want to see that in any community in the province.

If by the elimination of the sales tax on production machinery, we can provide additional jobs in the manufacturing industry throughout the province, speaking from a very parochial point of view, for the city of Windsor, I welcome it. I wonder why it took this government so long to realize the mistake it made when it first imposed the sales tax. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Prince Edward-Lennox.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. It certainly is a reasonable response to a current economic situation. There's no question about that.

Mr. Laughren: Sure.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It's all right for the NDP party—

Mr. Deans: NDP—not NDP party.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: NDP, right. I understand that much of what they are; there is no question in my mind. No matter how they posture and how they parade, I understand their party and their philosophy.

Mr. Deans: Good. Does the member understand what he is?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: And after hearing their speeches today, it's even that much more clear, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —what the New Democratic Party stands for.

Mr. Deans: The people of Ontario.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: We've listened to the double-talk of the New Democrats.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): No double-talk.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They come here and they oppose a sales tax—

Mr. Samis: We want a permanent reduction.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —on the premise that it is regressive taxation. At the same time they oppose a bill which proposes to reduce that very sales tax. I don't care how they try to rationalize that. What they are saying, in effect, is that they want to keep the sales tax at seven per cent.

Mr. Lawlor: We are saying to cut it out.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: If they think the people of this province—

Mr. Lawlor: Pure Phariseism. The modern Pharisees; not even up-to-date.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —will go along with anything like that and will interpret the party's stance in any other way, they are sadly mistaken.

Mr. Lawlor: We object to being hoodwinked.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lawlor: We are going to tear the veils from your temple of Mammon.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member has the floor. Can we return to the principle of the bill?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Insofar as the Liberal Party is concerned, they again accuse this as being a regressive form of taxation. However, it seems all right for them at the federal level to impose a 12 per cent sales tax, as long as it is masqueraded as an indirect tax so that the people don't realize what going on. Let's make it clear. The fact remains—

Mr. Breithaupt: Would his people have taken it off?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —remains that through this legislation the tax is being reduced as a response to the current economic condition. I believe, and this party believes, that the present economic condition is of a temporary nature.

Mr. Lawlor: Oh, he doesn't believe it at all; he doesn't believe it at all.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The reduction will be of a temporary nature. The pessimists in opposition preach doom and gloom.

Mr. Lawlor: The government is a pollyanna.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: No doubt the opposition expects the economy to go into a tailspin and remain in a tailspin.

Mr. Lawlor: They are the guys who put the economy in the spot it is in.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: We don't believe that.

Mr. Lawlor: Everything is going to get better. It's always tomorrow that it gets better.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: We're talking in terms of an upturn toward the end of this year, and that's the reason for the temporary reduction of these taxes.

Mr. Lawlor: Give us nine months and we'll—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Furthermore, the NDP is opposed to the little man.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): They don't care about unemployment over there.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox has the floor.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They don't care about the small businessman and they have no use for the farmers. It's obvious. Many of us on this side of the House have advocated that the small businessman be reimbursed for the collection and remission of sales tax.

An hon. member: It was a progressive step.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: All right—a progressive step. It is implicit in this legislation that the little businessman be reimbursed. It's provided for here. And who is opposing that? It's the NDP. And they can fight it anyway they like but that's what they are doing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They are opposed to it. They know and I know that there's a limitation put on of \$500, so that the big department stores and the large retailers will not benefit unduly from that payment for collection and remission. Nevertheless, the NDP still opposes—

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): Sure they do.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —the payment to the little businessman for the collection of that tax.

Insofar as the elimination of the sales tax from production machinery is concerned, there is no question in my mind—

Mr. Laughren: He is misleading the House.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —that it is a very forward step in light of today's economic conditions. You know and I know, Mr. Speaker, that inventories are probably at an all-time low. The manufacturers are putting off the decisions as to whether or not they should expand or whether or not they should produce more, because of the uncertain economic climate. If this will stimulate industry to take steps now to purchase additional machinery, which in turn generates jobs—

Mr. Laughren: It doesn't matter what they do, this government is done.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: If it will further promote and prompt them to manufacture more, to build up inventories, then that's all good for the economy.

Mr. Germa: And the Tories.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: This is a stimulus to them which manifests not only our optimism as to the upturn toward the end of the year, but also an incentive to them to start now and to get some activity going to generate jobs and a stronger economy.

Mr. Lawlor: Will-o'-the wisps.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It is hoped that it will create that remedy; that it will stimulate the economy.

Mr. Deans: He doesn't believe this, does he?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: We don't know everything and we don't profess to know everything. The socialists, with their blueprint for government, with their total plan of destiny, think they are going to rationalize the whole economy and direct it for everyone. Well, they can't play God in this province or in

any other economy in the world, because they don't know.

Mr. Lawlor: The government has been trying too hard.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: We are convinced that with this type of stimulation that we will get this economy going and it's necessary now, Mr. Speaker. It's necessary now to take these measures which have been announced in the budget and which are proposed in this legislation to assist in the stimulation of this economy. I'm all for that and let the record show the socialists here who are opposed to a strong provincial economy.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): The trained seal strikes again.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Speaker, a few words on Bill 30, the Retail Sales Tax Act amendment. This bill is an emanation of the budget, which was delivered the other day with so much bombast by our hon. provincial Treasurer. He reminded me of a movie I saw where the Titanic was going down and the captain was on the bridge screaming and yelling. Our provincial Treasurer reminded me of that person.

The whole Conservative Party is on the Titanic. They are going down and they are reacting in a very desperate and reckless fashion with the budget which they have presented. It was a last-ditch attempt to recoup the losses that they have suffered because of the mismanagement of the economy of this province over the past three years. There is no doubt in my mind that the economy is in trouble—

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): That is what the hon. member said before the last election.

Mr. G. Nixon: But he knows that isn't right.

Mr. Germa: —and that the Conservative Party of Ontario has to take the blame for this.

Mr. Speaker: I am wondering if the hon. member would return to the principle of the bill.

Mr. Germa: There is no principle in the bill, Mr. Speaker. There is no principle whatsoever attached to this bill.

Mr. G. Nixon: What is the hon. member talking about?

Mr. Germa: It is a piece of crass political cynicism and hypocrisy—

Mr. Lawlor: It is an unprincipled piece of chicanery, that's what it is.

Mr. Germa: —trying to use and trying to dupe the people of Ontario—

Mr. Gilbertson: Same old jargon.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The member is trying to hoodwink the public.

Mr. Germa: —into believing that they are going to be their salvation. We are going to go out and we are going to tell the people of Ontario that the gestation period is nine months—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Why doesn't the member be honest and support the bill?

Mr. Germa: —and that at the end of nine months the event will happen. They will go back to where they were.

What we are going to try to do, and what I think we can do, is abort this bill at an early stage before it runs its full lifetime, because it is rife political opportunism.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The hon. member wants to abort it.

Mr. Gilbertson: He said he was supporting it.

Mr. Germa: There is no doubt in my mind that they have sucked in the Liberals. The member for Waterloo North was sucking and whistling at the same time—and that is a very difficult task—and this is precisely where they have got them. They don't know where to jump because they are in bed with the Conservatives and they certainly have duped them.

We in the New Democratic Party do welcome a reduction in the retail sales tax.

Mr. Breithaupt: But they are going to vote against it.

Mr. Germa: We believe it is a regressive tax, it should be abolished at the earliest possible moment and this tax should not be used as a gimmick to manipulate people in the Province of Ontario. That is precisely what this government is doing. It is rank political gimmickry of the rankest order.

Mr. G. Nixon: How can the hon. member say that?

Mr. Laughren: The Gallup poll.

Mr. G. Nixon: But we don't believe that.

Mr. Germa: Another objectionable feature of the bill, Mr. Speaker, is the tax reduction on production machinery. It is supported by the premise that this is in some way going to create employment.

Coming from northern Ontario, where industry is highly capitalized, we know that every time we spend \$50,000 we put another man out of work through mechanization, and all this will do, rather than reduce the six per cent unemployment rate we are presently suffering, is increase the unemployment rate.

An hon. member: No, it's not.

Mr. Germa: What we have to do is put money in the hands of people so that they can purchase goods on a permanent long-term basis, and by terminating this Act Dec. 31, 1975, what we are doing is going to have an economy that no one can plan for.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, that's right.

Mr. Germa: Who can adjust themselves to such severe adjustments in the fiscal policy of the government? The government has to have, eventually, some principle to guide itself. It cannot continue forever to manipulate and dupe the people of Ontario.

An hon. member: We are the thinkers.

Mr. Germa: I am glad that the Gallup poll shows that they have finally caught the Conservatives by the tail and they are going to turf them out. And the sooner the better.

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): Watch his riding.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): The hon. member is the only fellow who has to worry about that.

An hon. member: Even the Communists are ahead of the Tories up there.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member for Sudbury has the floor.

Mr. Germa: I also don't see any reason for paying the retailer three per cent of the tax collected in order for him to collect the tax. This is a cost of doing business. There are certain costs of doing business in the province—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Come on, grow up.

Mr. Germa: —and this should be just accepted as one of the costs. Eaton's and Simpsons don't need any of our money. They don't need any of the taxpayers' money, and yet here we are going back to where we were a few years ago. This government just doesn't have any policy. It was only about a year ago—

An hon. member: The hon. member was against it.

Mr. Germa: —that they hoisted the sales tax from five per cent to seven per cent. Maybe someone will explain to me what was the motivation then, when they hoisted it to seven per cent?

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): It wasn't an election year.

Mr. Germa: We know, it wasn't an election year—but get them to admit it? No. Sheer hypocrisy, that's exactly what this whole budget is, and this is the centrepiece of their hypocritical Act. I am proud to stand here and tell the public of Ontario that I intend to expose the government as the bunch of hypocrites they are.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland South.

Mr. Haggerty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to add a few comments on Bill 30 and to support the principle of the bill to reduce the sales tax from seven per cent to five per cent.

I suppose when one looks at the budget one could say it's a cosmetic budget. I recall back before the election of 1971, this same government went to the people, saying there would be no increases in taxes in the election year. Lo and behold, just after the election, the government increased taxes throughout the Province of Ontario and increased the sales tax by some two per cent.

Members on this side and particularly in this party said that before the next provincial election is called the government will remove that sales tax, and it has removed the sales tax. Perhaps it should be reduced lower than that. I quite agree with other members that have spoken that it is a regressive tax and that there are other measures to obtain money through other tax sources in the Province of Ontario.

To say the tax is going to be removed for a nine-month period makes me wonder, talking about a nine-month period, if that budget isn't going to be aborted some time here in the next couple of months and an election

called. We will then see what the government has to offer the people this time.

I think you can fool the people some of the time but not all the time. The public is well aware of the gimmicks that the government is trying to pull off for this next election. I am sure they have seen through the government and that there will be a change in the government and we will have back a responsible government leading the Province of Ontario once again after some 32 or 35 years of Conservative governments.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Is the member going to vote against the bill?

Mr. Haggerty: I am lost as to why my colleagues to the left will not support the bill in principle. Perhaps if they don't support it—

Mr. Cassidy: We almost had a responsible government.

Mr. Haggerty: —they are looking for the seven per cent to remain. I wish to bring to the attention of the minister that I am concerned about the matter of the taxes that will be removed from production machinery. Perhaps some of my colleagues may not agree with me or some other members of the Legislature will not, but I am concerned about where machinery can be produced. If in Canada or in Ontario, then I say the tax should be removed, but if the government is going to allow machinery to be imported, then I suggest to the minister that the tax should still remain.

Mr. B. Newman: Only if that machinery cannot be made in Canada.

Mr. Haggerty: Only if it cannot be manufactured here in Canada and Ontario. For example, if one takes the automobile industry, I think the government should learn a lesson. We have seen them pull out machinery from plants in Ontario and remove it back to the United States, which in a sense creates employment over there. If the machinery is produced here in Canada and in Ontario, we are going to increase employment.

I am aware that there is some machinery that cannot be produced here in Ontario or in Canada, and I could name you a great number of items, Mr. Speaker, but I think we must encourage Canadian manufacturing. That's the important thing. We are looking for job employment. In the last budget the Treasurer brought in with respect to the tax on production machinery in Ontario, the government said at that time it was going to create some jobs in Ontario and that never

came about. Now is it going to create employment today or is it going to reduce it?

When I think particularly of the metric system that is going to be in force here at some time in Canada and Ontario, there are many jobs that can be applied and obtained through production in the metric system here in Ontario. Particularly one can take weigh scales and other measuring machinery to weigh different goods. I think we should encourage the government to induce Canadian manufacturers into production of equipment to capitalize on the metric change here in Ontario.

Sometimes I wonder if we are moving in the right direction on the metric system, when we find our American colleagues to the south are not ready to move in this direction. I think as long as the States are going to remain undecided under the present circumstances, then I think Ontario and Canada should move more cautiously too. When it comes to the metric system, matters of exchange and quantity of goods can be done by calculation. I am thinking particularly of exporting wheat and grain which can be done on the tonnage basis and then changed into metric tons afterwards. I believe these are some of these things we should be looking at.

I'm delighted to see that the minister has taken suggestions by the opposition here to reimburse the small businessmen for the collection of provincial taxes. I think this is a change in the right direction. I think some of these men with small businesses who are out on the street grabbing taxes for the provincial government and receiving no remuneration whatsoever will be pleased.

On those bases, Mr. Speaker, I support the principle of the reduction of the sales tax to five per cent. Like all other members I would like to see it totally removed, but I guess when it comes to a money bill the members of the opposition have very little say. We can't move an amendment, we can't do this. So, it's up to the government at their wish and whim to decide what is best in their interests.

But it will be interesting to see when we go to the people this fall or in this late spring to see just how much the government has fooled the voters of the Province of Ontario. I don't think they have. As I said before, it's a cosmetic budget; it's just nothing but a front.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Stornont.

Mr. Samis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to participate in this

debate. Coming from a riding where incomes are not exactly the highest in the province, we welcome any reduction in the sales tax. Like my colleagues in the NDP, and apparently my colleagues in the Liberal Party, I too regard the sales tax as a highly regressive, unfair form of taxation. And what bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is the tremendous reliance government seems to be placing on the sales tax as a prime source of revenue.

I just look at the budgetary figures in the previous years. I notice in 1972-1973 that we got \$1.205 billion from personal income tax versus \$895 million from retail sales tax. In 1973-1974, Mr. Speaker, personal income tax stays practically the same, whereas our revenue from sales tax increases to \$1.315 billion.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Inflation.

Mr. Samis: In 1974-1975, Mr. Speaker, we go up to \$1.442 billion from personal income tax, but the sales tax again exceeds the personal income tax at \$1.57 billion.

So I think our tax policies need changing, and we need to lower the sales tax—not just lower it on a nine-month interim basis, Mr. Speaker; I would favour abolition of the sales tax, or a serious attempt towards that. One of the reasons I ran for the New Democratic Party is that we've been consistently opposed to the retail sales tax when it was suggested, and when it was increased. We don't want any temporary measures; we want a permanent reduction if not abolition of the sales tax.

That's one of the reasons I intend to vote against this bill, Mr. Speaker, because it's a cheap political gimmick designed to win votes, and on Jan. 1, 1976, we're increasing taxes; again, that's going to have its effect on the economy. I'm pleased that the NDP in 1971, 1973 and 1975, in their provincial programme, were against the retail sales tax and for a reduction to four per cent as a first step towards eventual abolition.

I welcome the three per cent rebate to small businessmen, since Cornwall has an abundance of small businessmen.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: He's voting against that, too.

Mr. Samis: I again wonder why it takes an election or a couple of bad Gallup polls for the government to bring in this measure. It's amazing what a Gallup poll can do, it seems, in an election year. I only wish, whichever party wins, that we make some permanent changes regardless of elections, and that we make these tax changes on an equitable and just basis—not geared to an

election, whether it's in June or the fall, on a permanent basis, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It's not the election, it's the economy.

An hon. member: The economy!

Mr. Samis: Are they worried about the economy or the Gallup poll?

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: They don't seem to be worrying about unemployment.

Mr. Samis: Of course they don't.

Mr. Lawlor: The government members don't seem to be worrying about an election. The Treasurer of the province did. It's the only thing he did worry about.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In adding my words of comment to this bill, it's a "yes, but" position. We have to support it for many reasons.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The member for Grey-Bruce will like that conversion.

Mr. Sargent: Today marks the first anniversary of the famous land speculation tax.

An hon. member: Is that right?

Mr. Sargent: A year ago today it was passed into effect, and we know what a mess this has been and what a dismal failure. The Minister of Revenue's projections were completely, 1,000 per cent wrong—almost. We are now in an area where we have an informed public in this province, who know exactly what was going on in this performance last budget night.

The history of this man who would save the Conservative Party is one we should look at. When he was last the Treasurer of this province, the auditor brought out a book, 157 pages in length, with hundreds of millions of dollars misappropriated, poorly spent and God knows what else. It was the worst document of any parliament in the history of Canada.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That's not right.

Mr. Sargent: This Treasurer—this is a fact and we can prove it. I will give the member the book and check it off with him.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair fails to see what the comments have to do with the principle of the bill.

Mr. Sargent: Sir, I know you would, but we are talking about this sales tax. He is the man who perpetrated this ridiculous situation.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Remember the energy tax?

Mr. Sargent: This man who is the Treasurer of Ontario—I wish he were here today; I don't mind saying what I think to his face, but these are the facts. Everything he has touched he has ruined.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Shame on the member. He is in Ottawa fighting for him now.

Mr. Sargent: He has given us regional government in this Province of Ontario. He was the father of this and we have here today this man—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That has nothing to do with this bill.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member will please return to the principle of the bill.

Mr. Sargent: I am right on target because he is the perpetrator of this bill. The regional government he gave us has cost us a fortune. There is a man named Jack Rettie, the chief administrator in Newmarket. He is making \$48,000 a year as the regional government administrator in Newmarket. Here we have Bob Hodgson, the son of the member for York North (Mr. W. Hodgson), making more than his father. He is making \$36,000 to \$40,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the member return to the principle of the bill, the sales tax?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I stand here as a representative of my people to know what is going on in this House. This government is corrupting this province. I will not sit down if I cannot speak my piece. I am a busy man and I don't come here to waste words with government members.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: All right, I will talk about the bill. I would have greater respect for the government if it would tell us the truth.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: He should have a great deal of respect for it; that is all it does.

Mr. Sargent: As I said before, everyone in this House knows exactly what is going on; everyone in this province knows exactly what is going on, what the government is doing.

Mr. Lawlor: The member for Prince Edward-Lennox doesn't.

Mr. Sargent: The galling fact is, Mr. Speaker, here is a government rife with corruption, which has squandered us into debt. We have gone \$4 billion into debt in the last two years; we are now about \$10 billion in debt.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It was a \$10 billion budget.

Mr. Sargent: I say to you, sir, no other province of our 10 provinces and no state in the 50 states to the south of us is in such a serious financial position.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Oh come on.

Mr. Sargent: I was in the States yesterday and the legislature down there is planning to budget for a surplus.

Mr. Eaton: Don't forget that triple-A rating there.

Mr. Reid: The Tories won't have it after this budget.

Mr. Lawlor: They lost it yesterday.

Mr. Sargent: I will tell the member what it is going to do.

Mr. Haggerty: They will need more than a triple-A rating to get the money to bail them out.

Mr. Sargent: Every man, woman and child in this province as of now will have a millstone around his neck of \$575 from here on. The undermining thing, Mr. Speaker, is that the Treasurer says is they may have to institute new budgetary measures if the oil thing isn't favourable. God knows what next is coming.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The member's friends in Ottawa can fix that.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That is what Ottawa is for.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, and they say, "Elect us. Here are all the goodies but after the election we are going to take them back."

Hon. Mr. Meen: No. We are just being responsible.

Mr. Sargent: I want to tell members that we have this situation, where we have about 125,000 or 200,000 people in this province who are out of work today. We can cure that but not by taking two per cent off the sales tax. The government should take the

seven per cent off all building materials, but it's taking only two per cent off that.

Hon. Mr. Meen: What does the member think would happen to the provincial debt if we did that?

Mr. Sargent: I want to tell the minister something. He hasn't proved himself a very good administrator in his job so he shouldn't talk too much. If I had him working for me I would fire him. I tell him that.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The feeling is mutual.

Mr. Sargent: You bet your boots. The sales tax we are talking about hurts the people who can least afford to pay for it.

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): Like the tourist. He wants them to ride free.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Except the member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: The fact is that we have here in this province the richest province in Canada in assets and in natural resources, yet Alberta and British Columbia are debt-free and budget for surplus. Yet the Treasurer of Ontario has the audacity to say to people, "We want to increase the debt to \$1.6 billion this year." Plainly this is deficit financing, although it's against the law for any municipality to budget for a surplus. The municipalities are told they cannot have any capital spending programmes, yet we say we're going to spend \$1.6 billion to retain the right to control the money flow in Ontario for the establishment.

I said today to the Minister of Housing (Mr. Irvine) that the \$100 million we gave to Syncrude and the multinational oil corporations, who need this money like a hole in the head, would finance a crash programme in housing.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It is an investment. The member knows that.

Mr. Sargent: It's an equity investment, yes; but why can't we have an investment in people? A few weeks ago, Mr. Meany of the AFL-CIO was talking about the need for a crash programme in housing. He said: "What we need in this country is three per cent mortgage money to put the housing business into operation, because when housing is healthy everything is going great."

Afterwards, reporters said to him: "Mr. Meany, you must be off your rocker to suggest three per cent money." His reply to them was: "I don't know. We're giving billions of dollars to the Russians under the

Marshall Plan. Why in hell can't we give three per cent money to the Americans to put our economy back on track?"

I say to the minister, or whoever is in charge, why can't we put the economy of Ontario back on track by giving us three per cent or six per cent money? God knows, we've got the money. The government is throwing it around like a drunken sailor.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: If we do that, we'll have a bigger deficit.

Mr. Sargent: I'm not talking about bigger debt—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: We would have to run up a bigger deficit.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member for Grey-Bruce has the floor.

Mr. Sargent: I'm not doing a very good job.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: At least he is honest.

Mr. Sargent: I want to say that we will support this, but—and in the eyes of the people of Ontario it is a big "but"—honest to God, as I listened to the Treasurer the other night, I thought I could book him for two weeks in my night club. He's the greatest comedian I have ever seen. He must be a comedian if he thinks the people of Ontario will buy his song and dance about going to the bank to borrow \$1.6 billion to buy the election from them. It's like going to a finance company to borrow money to shoot craps with. That's what it amounts to. And the minister has the audacity to ask us to believe that this government are good legislators.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The best.

Mr. Sargent: I think it verges on corruption, and they should be damned well ashamed of themselves. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Bounsall: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, This Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act, as far as I can see, only involves three main principles. One is the temporary reduction of the retail sales tax from seven to five per cent for this very short nine-month period only. We support a permanent reduction of that sales tax to five per cent as the first step to eliminating that sales tax completely. It's a very regressive tax.

An hon. member: We'll take five per cent as a start.

Mr. Bounsall: We support the permanent reduction of that sales tax and in principle we cannot tolerate a change which is not a permanent one. We are against this part of the bill because it is not a permanent change—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Everything must be inscribed in stone?

Mr. Bounsall: —because it is not a permanent reduction, and because it is not larger. We support a reduction, but we cannot tolerate or stomach a reduction that is not permanent.

If you want to take a look at the effects of this, I suspect that in the case of large purchases like a car, it might make a difference. When you're talking about a saving of \$80 to \$100 as a result of this reduction, it may cause someone to buy a car when otherwise they wouldn't buy a car. But it's not sufficient in the case of appliances, for example, to really cause anyone else to go out and borrow money in order to make those purchases in this particular year.

Unless you're dealing with very large purchases this interim purchase really does not have that much effect. But for those families who think it's going to have an effect and go out and borrow money at 12 per cent in order to save two per cent on the purchase price—that's going to occur, say, perhaps this fall as the termination date looms. Anything that's going to be bought next winter is going to be bought in the fall. What is going to happen to the economy of Ontario in the months of January, February and March next year when nothing is purchased except the bare necessities?

Look ahead to the economic situation for the early months of the next calendar year and one can predict disaster and widespread layoffs as no one purchases appliances, furniture or anything else except the bare necessities of life on which to survive. That's what this sort of temporary reduction brings about, a tremendous valley in terms of purchasing and a tremendous valley in employment in this province. We support a permanent reduction and we cannot tolerate anything less.

The second principle involved, Mr. Speaker, as I see it, is the elimination of the sales tax on production material. If the sales tax was eliminated right across the board with this budget, then we would support that. We wouldn't say that it should be retained on production material and

equipment and production machinery. But looking at this as being the one exception, the one set of items that has been taken out and reduced completely, this is a disaster as far as I can see it.

I looked in vain in this budget for anything which would encourage employment in this province. This is a measure that works against employment. When this tax did not pertain, the government could not produce one single shred of evidence that a job was created because of this tax not being imposed before. This was the argument it always made at that time about the encouragement of employment by it.

Various ministers got up and made a big hullabaloo about this being a measure to encourage employment. Not one job could be pointed to or produced as a result of this tax having been off production machinery. In fact, it works in reverse.

If even this budget had contained the statement that in this area the government would take the tax off production machinery manufactured in Ontario or Canada, we might have felt differently on it. Eighty per cent of the production machinery that's covered under this Act and that completely has the sales tax reduced on it is imported into this country and is not produced here. So this is, in fact, a measure which encourages —importation into Ontario, mainly from other countries—not other provinces. We are the leading production province in Canada by a long way. It means it's encouraging the importation into Canada of production machinery. Insofar as there is an employment incentive here, it's to companies outside Ontario, not to ones in Ontario, to produce production machinery. It does not encourage a company to expand to produce production machinery. If it was for production machinery produced in Ontario, we might look at this differently.

An hon. member: A lot of it is.

Mr. Bounsall: Only 20 per cent of the production machinery used in Ontario is produced in Ontario, and it's no encouragement to any company in Ontario to get into the production of machinery.

Thirdly, it works against the encouragement of employment. Where we do have an employer who is encouraged by the fact of no sales tax on production machinery perhaps to buy production machinery and expand it, it tends to be in machinery that is in the way of increasing automation within the plant. Where this does act as a slight incentive—and I don't think that it

really acts as very much of an incentive to any company—it's going to encourage them to automate and create more unemployment, not less. In that sense, it acts against the employment situation of our work force in the Province of Ontario.

The last point that I'd like to make on this sales tax reduction on production machinery is that in point of fact it really isn't enough to encourage companies to buy new machinery. All that happens is that this shows up in an increased and enhanced profit picture for the company.

By this measure what in essence the government has done is it has not encouraged employment. Where it has anything to do with employment it has created more unemployment. What it has done with funds is to add it to the profit side of the balance sheets of the companies in the Province of Ontario. It is another corporate handout—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Nonsense!

Mr. Bounsall: —with a negative effect on employment. There is no way, Mr. Speaker, that we can support this particular bill that contains that type of provision in it.

The third area of principle in the bill is the one—and it's a very small area—of allowing sales tax collectors to retain three per cent of that amount which they collect up to a maximum of \$500. If this was all the bill was about, we could support this bill.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The member is equivocating.

Mr. Bounsall: As far as I can calculate it very quickly here, this really means about \$17,000 worth of tax, roughly corresponding to \$340,000 worth of sales. From the way I can determine this, we are talking about the person who just sort of reaches that in sales. Across the province, this would be a small two- to four-person operation. We would support their being able to recover their costs by that maximum of \$500.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: He won't though. He won't support it.

Mr. Bounsall: In a big corporation like Eaton's, I suppose this corresponds only to two or three weeks of sales in the course of the year. I'm not sure. And we certainly don't want to make that handout to Eaton's.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: How many opinions do they have in that party?

Mr. Bounsall: If that was a separate section of the bill, we could support that.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Political posturing:

Mr. Bounsall: But the government puts that measure against the temporary reduction of sales tax only. It is a blatantly, cynical, hypocritical measure brought in simply because it's an election year—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That's the member's party's position he is talking about.

Mr. Bounsall: —hoping that the people of Ontario won't really think ahead to Dec. 31 and know it's coming off. We'll make sure that they do. This is very cynical—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Oh, yes, and we'll make sure they know the member voted against it too.

Mr. Bounsall: —short-term reduction. The member for Prince Edward-Lennox might at the same time, if he is being honest, make it very clear why we are voting against it, which is because it is not a permanent reduction.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That is a lot of double-talk, that is.

Mr. Bounsall: We are against a short-term reduction.

An hon. member: It is straight talk.

Mr. Bounsall: To repeat again for his edification, our party programme states and calls for at the moment an immediate reduction to four per cent as the first step in completely eliminating sales tax.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They don't believe in a compromise.

Mr. Bounsall: That is party policy. There can be no compromise in this because of the effects it's going to have on employment and sales in the first few months of the year 1976. What concerns me is when unemployment rises and sales plummet.

Lastly, putting this small measure we could support of rebates to the collectors of the sales tax against the unemployment-producing measure of the sales tax on production machinery, there is no way we can vote in total for the bill. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that it is a great shame the government couldn't have simply reduced the sales tax from seven to five and make it permanent, so that we could vote for this bill, and left production machinery untouched as a separate item. The two measures it has taken, the temporary nature of the sales tax reduction and the separating out of the production machinery; in our view creates unemployment and leaves

us no alternative but to oppose this bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: If the member doesn't believe in the sales tax, why does he not support its reduction?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-view.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, in looking at this budget and this bill, I can only think of that old game that used to be played and still is in our fairs and exhibitions—the shell game.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: We have heard this speech before.

Mr. Young: Now you see it and now you don't. The government stands around that table with the little shells on the table and asks the people to look at this reduction from seven to five per cent. They hope that they will rivet their eyes on that reduction. They say to them, "Now keep looking boys, and while you are looking, get a Tory vote into the ballot box." As soon as the Tory vote is in the ballot box, something happens.

Mr. Gilbertson: Does the member think the people of Ontario are so stupid as to buy something like that? They are smarter than that.

Mr. Young: While they saw it before, the thing is pulled away; now you see it and now you don't.

Mr. Deans: It isn't what we think they are; it's what the government thinks they are.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Young: What they're trying to do is to get public attention focused on the two per cent reduction hoping that they're going to vote for the Tories and then suddenly they're going to yank it away after the vote is in the ballot box.

Mr. Gilbertson: He is trying to make out that the people in Ontario are stupid; they are not.

Hon. Mr. Meen: It is honest.

Mr. Young: That's what they're doing. It's just as cynical as that.

There is another cynical thing about this. There is no question that the government had to face up to an election and had to face up to campaign funds and support from the business world, and even though had they refused to give this reduction in production machinery tax before this time, now they

make up their minds they're going to give it. It will mean a lot in the business world and so, all right, they decide they're going to give it, and they quite realize that we in the NDP will be against that kind of a philosophy. I can see the wise men in the situation saying, "Now if we just combine the reduction of the sales tax"—a temporary reduction—"with this, then it will give a chance for the member for Prince Edward-Lennox to scream, 'You're voting against the sales tax.'" That's what happened. He's done it. And I can see the speech writers and I can see the writers of the ads on television and newspapers screaming, "The New Democrats voted against the sales tax reduction." Sure, because this government sees fit to combine a handout to the business world with a tiny temporary handout to the people of Ontario, and if you can get more cynical than that, let me know about it.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Don't believe that.

Mr. Young: It's not been very many months ago that I asked the Premier and the Treasurer how soon they were going to lower the sales tax from seven to five per cent. The Premier said, "Well, we'll make an announcement, if we're going to, in good time," or words to that effect. In other words, he refused at that time to commit himself.

I also asked, on a couple of occasions, whether this government would consider raising the minimum upon which the tax is paid from 20 cents to something near 40 cents, because I think we all recognize this fact, that many things which were free and exempt from the sales tax when the sales tax was first put into effect, or even two or three years ago, are now coming under the tax. Simple things like chocolate bars, like pop and all kinds of little things that children and others were buying and which were not subject to the tax a few years ago, are now under that level. So my argument with the Premier and the Treasurer was that we should be thinking in terms of raising that 20 cents to something like 40 cents; it would have to be worked out in terms of how best it could be administered. But that is not in the bill as it should be, because—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The member wouldn't vote for it anyway.

Mr. Young: Let me say this, Mr. Speaker, when I hear this kind of—well, I won't say it—this kind of interruption in parliament—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The member for Lakeshore said the NDP were going to oppose it and that's what they are doing.

Mr. Young: When it comes to the voting, clause by clause, this party will agree to the things upon which we agree in this bill—

Mr. Cassidy: That's right.

Mr. Young: —and we will disagree with those things with which we do not agree. But we're not going to be caught in the trap, which has been laid for us by the minister, of incorporating contradictory things in this bill and making a fundamental thing of giving away to the business world largesse from the Treasury of Ontario and something far less for the people of Ontario on a temporary basis.

Mr. Laughren: Shoddy politics.

Mr. Young: We are just not going to be caught in that trap, Mr. Speaker. I can see in the future more of the kinds of interjections we heard from the member for Prince Edward-Lennox, about us voting against the sales tax. That kind of thing is not only dishonest, he knows it isn't true.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The member stood up and said he was going to vote against it.

Mr. Laughren: He is deliberately misleading the House.

Mr. Young: So, Mr. Speaker, we cannot support this omnibus bill in its present form. Pull that bill apart and give us these particular items that we have talked about; the small businessman, the payment for his business, too.

Mr. Cassidy: Let them try it and see what we do.

Mr. Young: Lowering the sales tax on a permanent basis—

Interjection by hon. member.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It is temporary, too.

Mr. Young: —or even on a temporary basis if necessary if they are going to put it in a separate bill. We are not going to be hoodwinked into voting for the pouring out of the largesse from the public treasury to the business world with the hope they are going to buy production machinery, which, it has already been pointed out, will be bought in large measure outside this country and provide employment for making it there. Then, when it comes into Canada, it will be automation which means simply less work for the people of this Province of Ontario.

We are not going to be caught in this kind of a trap and so we are going to vote against this omnibus bill here today.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, like the last couple of speakers, I will keep my remarks very brief.

I, too, am concerned with some of the provisions of the bill. Having taken into account last year's budget and this year's budget sometimes I wonder, having been trained or taken some courses in economics, whether the government really understands what it is doing when it is playing around with the sales tax.

For instance, I recall when it raised the tax from five per cent to seven per cent it seemed to come as quite a shock to the member for London South (Mr. White), —who, I believe, brought the increase in—that tax was inflationary and that it was adding to the inflation we had in the province. That is a simple tenet that anyone who has had any study in basic economics would understand. It makes one wonder if the government really knows what it is doing and what impact its taxes are actually having on the Province of Ontario.

The sales tax, I believe, brings in the second or third largest amount of money to the government coffers and it was obviously imposed for those reasons.

Mr. Stokes: The largest by far.

Mr. Reid: The largest? I am sorry, it's \$1.4 billion, is it?

Mr. Stokes: It's \$300 million for each percentage point.

Mr. Reid: Right, so it probably has more impact on the economy than any other tax we have.

Now we have the government lowering it. We are certainly not objecting to that. We only question, sir, the motives and the reasons for doing so.

The last part of the last speaker's address was in regard to production machinery. We haven't all the details of that programme yet, I understand, on who is going to be eligible and under what guidelines.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, I am sure we've been over this before, that the government promised us some years ago—three years ago, I believe, when it brought in its budget—that its generosity to the corporate sector was going to bring to Ontario some 300,000 jobs or more. The government never was able to substantiate that. I would like

to know if the Minister of Revenue has any figures he can show us today which will substantiate that a tax cut of this kind to industry will bring the kind of benefits by way of employment that the Treasurer has suggested.

The questions obviously are: Would those plans have gone forward in any case? Do companies and industries plan ahead on a five-year or 10-year term? Is the government doing anything other than putting more corporate profits in their pockets?

In other words, can the minister prove to the Legislature and the people of Ontario that what some would call this largesse to the companies has a direct cost-benefit relationship—a cost to the province in lost taxation and revenue and a benefit to the people of the province in that employment actually will go up and jobs will be created, and that they can be attributed directly to the removal of the tax on production machinery?

The points have already been made. Will it be a direct benefit in that this machinery will be produced directly in Canada and therefore create jobs, primarily in Ontario where the largest manufacturing goals are established? Will it in fact bring benefits that the government suggests wouldn't otherwise be there if this tax was not removed? I believe it is going to cost us \$190 million in the first year of the removal of the tax, but it seems strange that we might not project the tax a year ahead, because those who will put in machinery this year obviously have made those decisions already and must have placed the orders for the machinery last year; therefore they are going to be the recipients of the benefit based on decisions they have already made.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate the bill hasn't been broken into three separate bills. Perhaps for neatness or to save the taxpayers' money, which the government doesn't always seem to be concerned about, we do find these three principles enshrined in the one bill.

I would be particularly interested if the minister would indicate if the government can prove that the removal of the seven per cent sales tax will lead directly to increased investment in production machinery and therefore to the creation of jobs in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: I want to make a couple of comments about this bill, Mr. Speaker. I join with my colleagues in questioning the

kind of cynicism that led the government to believe that the electors of the Province of Ontario would be duped into believing that a nine-month reduction of sales tax represents any real benefit or will have any real long-term impact on the economy of this province.

It is no coincidence that the tax will go back up to the unreasonable level of seven per cent only months after the anticipated date of the provincial election, which I suppose is probably going to come in the fall.

It seems to us, in addition, that this kind of cheap trick that is being used with the sales tax is all of a piece with the kind of reversals the government has put forward again and again. They backtracked on Krauss-Maffei. They backtracked and finally yielded the point on election expenses. They backtracked on the Hydro inquiry. They backtracked on Bill 274. They backtracked on the energy tax, which was included when the seven per cent sales tax was to be introduced.

It may even be, given the kind of fortunes that the Conservatives are having this year, that some time later in the year they will admit the point we are making and have been making all along, which is that it is wrong to have a sales tax at the level of seven per cent; it is wrong to have such a regressive tax imposed on the people of the Province of Ontario; and it is wrong, when it goes down to five per cent, that that tax will go back up to the seven per cent level at the end of the year.

This is not a measure designed to help people with their budgets. This is not even a measure that will have much impact on consumer spending. What this measure is designed to do is to try to restore the electoral fortunes of the Conservative Party, of the government of Ontario. Mr. Speaker, it will be apparent to the electors that the government can't buy them with that kind of candy any more; it should stop doing these cheap things and come forward with fundamental policies in order to put the economy in the province on a firm and sound footing.

The second thing I want to say is that this budget, which is able to give \$20 million to people who are old or who are on modest incomes, gives \$410 million in a payout to large corporations in order, it is said, to encourage their investments. The largest single handout in this particular budget, in an election year, goes to big business, rather than to the taxpayers or the people of the Province of Ontario. That, it seems to me, reflects

where the real priorities of the government lie.

Even in an election year, the government cannot separate itself from the fixation that it somehow owes a debt of gratitude to the large corporations that Bill Kelly has been touching, yea these many years, and therefore it must give them this kind of handout. The budget says the money being given to corporations is intended "to encourage investment, to broaden the industrial base and to modernize Ontario's production facilities." If we look at that carefully we know, in the first place, that the last time an investment tax credit at the same level as the seven per cent now being given in the form of a sales tax cut was used in Ontario, it didn't create identifiable jobs. It just didn't work. When the same measure was used in the United States, they had the same kind of problem. And now, very soon after the termination of that particular programme, we find the United States running with an unemployment rate of 8.5 per cent or nine per cent.

Clearly what happens is that the economic situation is almost isolated from this kind of tax credit. There is no guarantee of any jobs. The investment policies of the large corporations, which will take the lion's share of this sum, are already set for the period until the end of this year and well on into 1976. The budget takes the position as a matter of philosophy that Ontario has a short-term economic problem. It needs a short, sharp economic boost in order to get things back on the track; not a long boost over five years but a short, sharp boost. But that boost is not going to come in investment plans during the course of this current year because those investment policies are already set.

Is Stelco at Nanticoke really going to accelerate the rate of its construction on Lake Erie? Or will it not be governed mainly by the availability of certain skilled trades, certain kinds of production capacity for specialized equipment and that kind of thing? I would suggest that is the kind of limitation they're bumping against and not a limitation because of the seven per cent tax that exists right now.

The problem of rising costs has faced every corporation in the economy and every investor in the economy over the last 12 or 18 months. If they are concerned about whether to invest now or to invest later, it was clearly to the advantage of any company to put its money on the line now, to order its equipment now, to start to build now, because of the fact that there have been very rapid cost escalations. The minister is nodding his head.

Moreover, if the Syncrude estimates are accurate—I doubt it but they certainly reflect something happening out there—the costs of investment goods have been rising at a rate of maybe 1.5 per cent, two per cent, or even three or four per cent per month over the course of the last year or the last year and a half.

The government is proposing a seven per cent handout to corporations in order, it says, to try to accelerate these investment intentions. However, if they were going to accelerate they would surely have been putting their money on the line now because otherwise they would face, next month, an increase in cost of three per cent or four per cent; the month after another three per cent or four per cent; and the month after and the month after. Between the period from now to July, the cost of investment goods, at the current rates of inflation, would grow by more than the seven per cent which is provided for in this particular credit.

What this comes to, then, is that the reason business has not been putting its money into capital goods of one sort or another and has not been increasing its investment is because of uncertainty among investors about being able to sell the goods produced by the equipment they are deciding whether or not to install. If there's not going to be a market it doesn't matter whether they get a 50 per cent rebate on their investment, and a seven per cent rebate certainly doesn't have any particular impact at all.

We now have, as everybody admits, a period of inflation which is a cost-push inflation. Costs that were created by excess demand a year or so ago have now turned into increases in costs which are compelling workers to seek more generous settlements or are pushing up the costs of other resources, pushing up the costs of business services and that kind of thing. If costs are pushing up in order to create inflation and people are not investing, it isn't because they can't save by investing now, because they obviously can, it is because they have questions about the amount of demand they are going to have.

You have got to ask yourself in addition, Mr. Speaker, what is the stimulus if there were to be any increase in investment intentions as a result of this particular measure. Let's look at it.

One, there is no guarantee of any jobs.

Two, we think that most of the money will go into profits, as it has done in the past. It is very significant in the budget estimates that the profits will be fairly flat this year, and that's the area where the

Ontario government comes in to bail out its friends.

Three, there is a lot of leakage in any programme which acts directly to subsidize capital investment, because the Swedes and the Germans and the British and the Americans and the Japanese and the Italians provide such a substantial share of the capital goods that are used in this particular province. It is very noble of the Treasurer to try and bail out the British or the American economy—the Swedes don't need that much help, thank you very much—it is very noble, but that's not the job of the Treasurer of the Province of Ontario. The job of the Treasurer in this province is to ensure that the funds that are used for economic stimulus are used and have an impact right here within the province.

I want to make a suggestion, Mr. Speaker, which flows again directly from the analysis in the budget, about how that \$418 million could have been much better used, both to benefit the people of the Province of Ontario and also to benefit the investment sector.

There is a very funny anomaly in the budget, because when the budget comes to talk about the housing sector, it talks about resurgence, it talks about an improved outlook, it hopes for a federal commitment of municipal support, and then it predicts a very disillusioning level of housing starts in the province as a whole.

When you look at the figure of 90,000 starts, that is bad enough; but when you go beyond that, Mr. Speaker, and read the small print in the tables at the back, you find that the government anticipates that non-residential construction in 1975 will rise by about \$1 billion, or by 24 per cent. It will be very buoyant. The Royal Bank tower and other such useful contributions to Ontario society will be duplicated and triplicated and quadruplicated by investment in commercial construction, and in other such structures as the CN tower.

Non-residential construction will rise by the biggest increase in Ontario's history, from \$4.2 to \$5.2 billion. But when it comes to residential construction, we find that there the picture is even worse than we on this side had feared; and certainly far worse than any kinds of figures that have been proposed by the ministry.

Residential construction is slated to increase by only 10 per cent, from \$3 billion to \$3.3 billion; that is certainly not a record increase of any measure. In fact, I suspect that the amounts to be spent on residential

construction will actually be less than the amount in 1973—no, that is not true; it is a bit more.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, you have this imbalance where \$2 billion more will be spent on non-residential construction than on residential construction, at a time when the housing crisis in Ontario is greater than it has ever been before. If it is correct, and I think it is, that housing construction costs have risen by somewhere between 15 and 25 per cent, then a 10 per cent increase in investment in residential construction means that there will be, in fact, a decline in the real resources that are going into housing in this year, 1975.

No amount of chicanery and no amount of saying it is so by the government can make that picture any different. The government is presiding over a picture in which the real resources going into housing are actually going to decline.

Now, the ministry says that the homeowners' grant will have an effect on that; but we all know that when you have a temporary measure—whether it is a sales tax cut or a homeowners' grant that it is only around for a few months—that it is only election candy and won't have any long-term impact, not any long term impact at all.

I want to suggest Mr. Speaker, that rather than having the kind of uncritical adulation for the corporations mirrored by the Premier in Ottawa yesterday and mirrored in the budget where so much money was given to corporations, that we could have seen a very sharp turn around in the housing picture in the province; we could have seen assured investment; we could have seen assured jobs; we could have seen social needs being fulfilled if that \$418 million, which is now dedicated to corporations in this bill, were to have been put into housing.

You're talking about an additional 15,000 to 25,000 housing starts, Mr. Speaker, that could have been funded directly by the province, not counting those that would have been accomplished if the province had found some matching money from the private mortgage sector. This would have been an assured boost to the economy, rather than an assured boost to the profits of the large corporations. It could have been directed to meet social needs which are being so pitifully handled by the housing programmes of the government as they stand right now. And it would have been a heck of a lot more constructive answer to the problems of the province than we're having in this bill right now.

The crazy thing is, Mr. Speaker, if the government was looking for some election bait, then the possibility of increasing Ontario's housing investment from the area of \$200 million or so to something approaching \$1 billion, is being lost. It could have used and seized that opportunity and we would have applauded any attempt by the government to do that, because housing is such a grave social need and such a grave problem at this time.

But we certainly do not applaud a bill which on the one hand gives a bit of candy to the electorate, but tells him that we're going to go back to the same old regressive tax system come December; but on the other hand guarantees to large corporations that they're going to have a \$400 million increase in their profits over the next few months, thanks to the courtesy of the Treasurer and the Premier.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kent.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few words on this amendment to the Retail Sales Tax Act. I might say that I was very glad to hear the Treasurer announce the other night in the budget speech that the sales tax would be reduced from seven per cent to five per cent. This is welcome news to spur the economy of this province, but it was very disappointing to hear that it would only last to Dec. 31, 1975, which is about nine months.

Mr. Good: We're going to amend that.

Mr. Spence: That's right. I'm glad to hear a colleague in my party say there are going to be changes there at Dec. 31, 1975.

I must say I think this will spur the economy. However, in 1969, when the government here increased the sales tax from five per cent to seven per cent, this party voted against the increase. Now, when they're only going to reduce it for nine months, it sounds like something I used to hear from the salesmen selling snake oil at country fairs. It looks as if something is just not right by leaving it at five per cent for nine months. It makes me feel that there is something behind this whole thing. I would be more impressed if the government said they would continue the reduction until the economy was back to its normal level.

I don't know how the government can see the economy being strengthened to carry on in nine months. So I would say, Mr. Speaker, it is very disappointing to see that they've limited the time to just nine months. As I listened to the whole budget, it kind of

sounded to me as if later the tax might be increased higher than seven per cent.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is something of a disappointment to me that the reduction will only last until Dec. 31, 1975. I was wishing the Treasurer would announce that the reduction would continue until our economy was in the same position that it was a few years ago. So with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, we're going to vote for this amendment. The reduction is only for nine months and I'm very disappointed about that; I would like to see the government reconsider its decision on the time limit of Dec. 31, 1975.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to participate? The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to rehash old ground that has been covered by my colleagues with regard to Bill 30, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act, but I wonder why it is that the Conservative Party can't do something worthwhile for the electorate and just leave it at that.

I recall very specifically that when the former Treasurer increased the retail sales tax from five per cent to seven per cent, we spoke long, and I thought very convincingly, against that increase. Now, when we all know that we are faced with either a June or an October election in the Province of Ontario, we have the government trying to stimulate for a very short term and a very intermediate length of time an unemployment situation and an economic situation that is less than desirable in this province.

I have asked some of the veterans in this Legislature if they have ever known any government, regardless of stripe, to bring in a taxing measure for less than a fiscal year. I'm told that this is indeed a precedent. There has never been a previous occasion when there has been a reduction in a form of taxation for less than a fiscal year.

I even suspect, Mr. Speaker, that if it hadn't been for the Conservatives in the Province of Ontario having to tip their hands to the opposition about the precise date of a provincial election, they might even have considered making this two per cent reduction in the sales tax effective until the date of the next election. That's the way it appears to me.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Now there's sense.

Mr. Stokes: I stand here representing people from northern Ontario who really know what effect the retail sales tax has on them.

As everybody knows, the retail sales tax is based on the cost of a taxable consumer item, which almost invariably is much higher in the north than it is down here in the south. I find it extremely difficult to stand here and to say I will not vote for the two per cent reduction in the sales tax. I'm not opposing this measure because it reduces the sales tax. I'm not opposed to the two per cent reduction in the sales tax on consumer items as it affects consumers. But this government has the slyness, the foxiness and the uncanny ability to bring in an omnibus bill masqueraded to assist the consumer. The majority of the benefits that accrue to society generally under this Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act don't go to the consumers in the Province of Ontario. It's been well documented where the majority are going to go. I find it extremely difficult to be standing here and later on opposing a bill that is going to have the effect of reducing the sales tax for nine months for the consumers of the Province of Ontario. I find it extremely difficult, Mr. Speaker, standing here and saying I am going to oppose a piece of legislation that will have the effect of reimbursing in some small measure the thousands of small retail businessmen for their collection and remission of this tax on behalf of the Province of Ontario.

Those two portions of this piece of legislation have a good deal of merit. Had the minister brought in those two amendments, I would have no difficulty at all. I wouldn't even be on my feet this afternoon. But he is suggesting that it is going to have the effect of getting the economy rolling again.

Then there is the temporary exemption from provincial retail sales tax for production machinery and equipment. In order to get the exemption they are going to have to spend that by—what is the cut-off date for that particular provision? It's not Dec. 31, 1975. It runs for 21 months to Jan. 1, 1977. Why didn't the government do that on behalf of the consumer?

If the government wanted it to have the effect of getting the economy rolling again, why didn't it give the consumer a break of the same extent, magnitude and duration as it did for those who were going to take advantage of this?

The government is suggesting that the theory behind this tax relief is that it will reduce costs and encourage investment which will in turn create jobs and stimulate investment.

In fact, there is no guarantee that any jobs will be created. What may actually happen is that capital equipment will be

substituted for labour, thus decreasing the number of jobs. The minister might stand and say he hopes that it will create jobs. We all know what the effect was when this attempt was made a few years ago. Nobody over there on the government benches could point to one job that was created as a result of this tax measure.

I might have even persuaded myself not to speak against this bill if the government had said it will grant the sales tax reduction where it can be proven that jobs were created. The government does this on the number of loans that it gives out to the Ontario Development Corp., the Eastern Ontario Development Corp. and the Northern Ontario Development Corp. One of the basic criteria used for extending financial assistance to businesses in the Province of Ontario is that it will create X number of jobs the minute the plant opens and an increase in the certain number of jobs over a five-year period. And the government is able to determine with a fair degree of accuracy the number of jobs that will be created immediately and the overall effect over an extended period of time.

Hon. Mr. Meen: EODC.

Mr. Stokes: That's right. Why didn't the government apply the same criteria? Why didn't it say that if those purchasers of production machinery and equipment can come to the government and show that X number of jobs have been created as a result of the purchase of this equipment and machinery, if they could show that it was responsible for creating X number of jobs, then it will grant them the remission from the tax?

As I say, the government does it with EODC, NODC and ODC. Why didn't it insist that the same criteria be put forward here? It didn't work the last time. I doubt very much if it is going to work this time. Mr. Speaker, without going on at any great length, I find I have to oppose the bill, but not because it's going to be a two per cent reduction to the consumers I represent. Even though it's only of a very short and temporary nature, I would like to support this bill because it does provide a very small measure of assistance to them. I would dearly love to be able to support it.

I would love to be able to support it because it does have the effect of compensating to some extent the small businessman, who will be compensated to a maximum of \$500 for the collection and the remission of sales tax. But I can't associate

myself with something that is so obviously devious and such a crass political manoeuvre just to delude the taxpayers of this province that they're really getting something worthwhile.

Had the government brought in legislation and said, "Here, unequivocally, it's going to help the consumer and the small businessman," I would have had no trouble supporting it. I would have been the first to be on my feet to applaud the government for it. But it masquerades as a kind of assistance that presumably is going to accrue to the consumer while giving a handout to the corporate sector which isn't warranted.

Just to show members how tight it is, I asked the Minister of Health (Mr. Miller) a few weeks ago if he couldn't see fit in his budget to provide assistance to northern communities by putting a mobile dental clinic in areas where they haven't had dental services. I'm talking about school-age children who haven't had dental services for five years. He wrote back and said: "I agree that there is a problem. I agree with the severity and the magnitude of the problem. I would like to be able to acquiesce. I would love to be able to help. We don't have the money." For something as basic and as essential as dental care to remote northern communities in northern Ontario?

He said, "I would love to help you. Forgive me; I don't have the money." It's estimated that \$410 million is going to the corporate sector as a result of this change in the Retail Sales Act between now and Jan. 1, 1977.

Mr. Speaker, I think that's indefensible. I'm sorry, I have to oppose this bill.

Mr. Speaker: Do any other members wish to speak to the bill? The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: I want to take two or three minutes to talk about some things that my colleagues may have discussed, one by one, and also two or three other areas that are of concern to me.

I don't want to leave members with the impression that it's easy to decide to vote against a tax cut. I don't want them to think for one minute that it was a very easy decision to come to and that we took the matter lightly. In fact, it was the subject of considerable discussion in this caucus as to how we deal with what is ostensibly an omnibus bill. How we deal with it when it contains two principles, one which we might be able to support and one which we would be unable to support. How were we going to put

our position to the House and to the public so that it would at least be understood?

We began to wonder about it. It became more and more apparent, the more we thought, that maybe we didn't have to put it to the public in a way that would be understood because the public well understands what the Tories are about. They understand it very clearly. We don't have to explain to them what the tax cut means. We don't have to tell them that it's only of nine-months' duration just to get the government past the next election.

We don't really have to tell them the amount of dedication and honesty and integrity the government has when it comes in, moments before it's ready to announce an election, and brings about a tax cut at a time when the economy could stand some assistance. But that tax cut is only going to be of short duration. The public is much brighter.

I think one of the minister's colleagues said the public wouldn't be taken in by the position we put forward and I think the alternative is more likely to be the case. The public isn't going to be taken in with what the government has offered. That's where the problem lies for you the government: the people are not going to be sucked in by this.

Every single person I have spoken to outside of this building—people you don't even know who you meet in a restaurant, when you are getting gasoline or when you go into the hotel where you are staying—has given the same answer when I ask, "What do you think of the budget?" "It's an election gimmick," they tell me. That's the feeling of the public. That's what they think of the government. Not one bit of good has been done for the Conservative cause by bringing in this kind of budget.

If the government had had the kind of integrity that is necessary to lead a government in difficult times, it could have said a number of things to the public. It could have begun, I suppose, by saying to the public that while we would very much like to cut taxes, there are a number of programmes which, if gone ahead with now, would be such job motivators that we would be able to create a great deal more employment in the province by so doing and therefore we have decided to put a sizable amount of money into one or more of those programmes.

The public would have responded positively to that. The public would have said: "Yes, if you think that programme is going to motivate more people and get more em-

ployment in the Province of Ontario, both in the short and the long run; if you think that that programme that you're going to institute is not only going to create more employment but is going to create an answer to a need that is so obvious across the province; yes, you are right, government, you should go ahead and you should put the money into that, rather than distributing it among us, because what we'll get from this reduction in tax over the nine months will really not be very much and therefore, if when pooled together it could bring about a major economic thrust, then go ahead with it."

What I am saying is that there is a tremendous need for a major housing programme in the Province of Ontario, and that the minister's colleague, in spite of all the statements he has made, and with all the good intentions in the world, hasn't been able to develop a housing programme that will begin to meet the needs of the vast majority of the people in the province. I am talking about the people who earn less than \$10,000 a year—and they make up more than 60 per cent of the working population of this province.

The government could have said that because of inflation and because the private sector hasn't been able to produce decent programmes to provide housing for people at a cost they can afford, it was going to take the more than \$500 million it would have received as a result of these tax measures and pour it into a housing programme to motivate employment and to meet social need. If the government had done that, its stock in the eyes of the public would have risen considerably.

The public have seen through this game. They are not going to be bought with their own money any more. They are not going to allow the Conservatives to buy themselves back into government by giving small hand-outs over short periods of time. I think the government has made a terrible mistake.

If the government had told us that the economy was healthy, that we had been making some major shifts in our taxing sources, that we now could afford to reduce that regressive tax, the sales tax, to five per cent, and over the course of next year and the year after that it hoped to further reduce that tax as more and more progressive tax sources are brought into play, then I don't think we would have found one single voice in this Legislature or outside of the Legislature in opposition to the government.

If the government had brought in a companion bill that said the government was

going to spend \$500 million in addition to the money earmarked for a major housing programme aimed primarily at accommodation for people who are earning the average wage in the Province of Ontario and that the money, essentially the same money that we are talking about here, which could have been used for tax cuts is going to be used for housing instead, then I don't think the government would have found many people in the Province of Ontario who would have opposed it, not here and not outside.

Let me go through some of the things. Do you realize, Mr. Speaker, that in 1963-1964 we had auto insurance rates go up. Where was the government to protect the consumer when that happened? We had living costs rising day by day. Where was the government to protect the consumer when that was happening? We had housing costs doubling, tripling, quadrupling in some cases. Where was the government trying to protect the average income earner in the Province of Ontario while that was happening? We had rent costs going up by 30, 40 and 50 per cent in the Province of Ontario for rental accommodations in the private sector. Where was the government to protect those people against those exorbitant increases?

We had gasoline prices rising as a result of the inability of the Premier and his advisers to understand the way in which the oil industry works and therefore signing an agreement which took more out of the Province of Ontario than they understood was to be taken, and that reflected in higher costs for both gasoline and fuel oils. We had hydro costs in the Province of Ontario rising. Where was the government of Ontario protecting the consumer when that was happening? Of course, then we have hydro telling us that it is going to spend \$24 billion on expansion in the next eight years. Where is the government of Ontario speaking about that expansion and the need to find new and different ways to generate hydro-electric power and the need to conserve hydro-electric power? And where is the government moving to try to make sure that there isn't a bonus feature contained in the hydro-electric power billing system which allows people to use more and pay less?

We had telephone costs rise. Where was the government to protect people? We had the food industry investigated, a quasi-investigation of the food industry, as food costs rose, and they found out that the profit margins in the food industry were adequate to meet their needs and they then continued day after day to raise the prices. Where was

the government to protect the consumers in Ontario against that.

We had municipal taxes rise. We had beer, liquor, cigarette costs rise. Car prices went up, but in addition to that, we had something else. We had a fairly major shift in the profit margins, an upward shift in the profit margins of the major corporate bodies in the Province of Ontario in the year 1973-1974, and where was the government of Ontario to say that you can't take more out of the economy than the economy can stand, that you now have to start planning for the future, that we have got problems in certain sectors and that we need more money in order to develop those sectors.

It was nowhere to be heard; nowhere to be heard. During all of the two- to three-year period, from the last election until today, it has done virtually nothing in any single area that affects the average working person in the Province of Ontario; virtually nothing; and then it comes in on the eve of an election and has the gall to say to the public: "We are going to reduce your tax by two per cent."

Let's assume that every single dollar spent by the average wage earner in the Province of Ontario was taxable at the rate of seven per cent. Let's assume it was all taxable, and the average wage in the province is somewhat less than \$10,000, but we will say it is \$10,000; the saving would have been about \$200. I am telling them right now, knowing that that isn't so, the saving to the average taxpayer in this province might run about \$80 by the time we are finished. It might run about \$80. Do we have to accept \$80 in compensation for all of these other increases that took place and all of the time that this government failed to act on behalf of the consumer? No, I am afraid not.

I think they have seen through this gimmick. I was saying to my colleague that it reminded me, as I was listening to it, of the saying, "Oh, what a tangled web we weave . . ." That's the government sitting there trying to figure out how it can tangle things so that no one will quite understand them.

It's not in the same little poem, but there is another part. It says: "'Come into my parlour,' said the spider to the fly." Well, I see the government as the spider in that, and the electorate out there as the flies—and they're not coming in. Because they know once they're inside, my friend, nine months later they've had it. They're gone. They're back to seven per cent or worse, because they don't trust this government any more.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): With reason.

Mr. Deans: They know that the government intends to bring in supplementary estimates the minute the election is over. They know full well that it intends to bring in supplementary estimates. And they also know that without a moment's hesitation it will bring in a supplementary budget, and that supplementary budget will contain tax increases.

Mr. Laughren: Shame. It's deceitful.

Mr. Deans: Oh, it may not raise the sales tax from five back up to seven per cent, but it will do it in another way. It will do it in a number of other taxing areas in order to recover the money that it has used to try to buy the election. If I sound cynical, I am. If I sound cynical, I'm really cynical—I'm telling you. Because, Mr. Speaker, you know something? I've watched this government operate for nearly eight years, and even in the dead of night when I sat and I wondered what sort of thing it would do, what it would conjure up in an effort to save itself from defeat, I didn't think it would sink this low. I really didn't think it would sink this low.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: He doesn't surprise me, because he's been cynical since I have been here.

Mr. Deans: And that minister is one of the main reasons why I'm cynical.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Why doesn't the member elaborate?

Mr. Deans: I want to go back a bit, Mr. Speaker, because I want to talk to you about another principle in this bill. I'm going to return to this one in a moment, but I want to talk about the other principle in this bill.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: He just wants to hear himself speak, that's all.

Mr. Deans: Would the minister like to get into this debate? Does he know anything about anything that he could speak about that might contribute?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am getting sick of that grind organ or grand organ.

Mr. Deans: Does the minister want me to write him a few notes so he can make a speech?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Nobody in the province agrees with him anyway.

Mr. Deans: Why doesn't he sit and listen?

An hon. member: Don't flatter yourself.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Listen? Who wants to listen to that?

Mr. Deans: That's another problem, by the way.

Mr. J. A. Roy (Ottawa East): Why doesn't the minister hit his desk? He's good at that. Hit the desk. Hit hard.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Laughren: He never listens any more. He thinks he knows it all already.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I wouldn't waste my time.

Mr. Deans: I want to return to the other part of this, because I'm going to be quite frank with you, Mr. Speaker. On the two per cent decrease in sales tax, if that had come about in an honest way—if they had brought in a bill reducing the sales tax for this fiscal year by two per cent, without tying it to the end of the year, without setting limits—

Hon. Mr. Meen: What's the difference?

Mr. Deans: Wait a minute—which heretofore have never been set in the Province of Ontario; never—

Hon. Mr. Meen: Nothing sacrosanct about that.

Mr. Deans: There has never been a time in any other budget when they've introduced a short-term—less than a year—change in the tax structure.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Always a first time.

Mr. Deans: So, don't tell me that there isn't some political chicanery in the back of this one.

Let me say this to you, Mr. Speaker: You'll remember probably as well as I do the discussion on the machinery tax rebate. Remember all the debate we had on it? I remember taking part in that debate, and I remember dragging out all the statistics I could find about how many manufacturers manufactured production machinery in the Province of Ontario, and how many manufactured production machinery in Canada, and how many of the people who use production machinery purchased it from the United States, and how many brought it in from offshore, Sweden, and other parts of the world.

We had a fairly good discussion one evening, lasting until after midnight, as I recall, before the vote finally came about the machinery tax rebate. We agreed—those of us on this side who knew something—that there weren't likely to be many jobs created in Ontario, or even in Canada, by the rebating of the sales tax on production machinery.

We agreed that in every likelihood the plans for expansion of the majority of the major corporations had already been made, that they weren't going to be able to make the kind of rapid alterations in these plans that would enable them to take advantage of this particular taxing measure. On top of that, we weren't convinced that by further automating industry we were going to create any jobs.

The position we put forward was that the only jobs that would be created by stepping up the purchases of production machinery were in the plants in which the production machinery was manufactured. We pointed out that since those plants were outside the Dominion of Canada the jobs that would be created would be created in those countries. We pointed out further that because the machinery that would be purchased would be more highly automated than the machinery already in existence, the percentages weighed very heavily in favour of that machinery eliminating jobs in the Ontario economy rather than producing jobs. That was the position we put to the government and it is equally valid today.

I remember asking the Premier not so many months ago if he could tell me just how many jobs were created by the machinery tax rebate scheme of a couple of years ago, if he could give me a listing of the jobs that were created and where they were. There was not one job. The government couldn't put its finger on one single job that was created as a result of the machinery tax rebate of two or three years ago.

Now it re-introduces it and says to us that we should believe that that's going to help stimulate the economy and that that's going to help stimulate employment. No, no, that stretches credulity too far. We couldn't accept that. How could we? How could we possibly accept it when the government's own identical programme failed? How would it have the gall to bring in a programme that had failed two years previously when the economy was in a damn sight better situation and the government in a much better position to deal with it?

An hon. member: People forget.

Mr. Laughren: As the member for Timiskaming's (Mr. Havrot) economic adviser—

Mr. Deans: What is this fixation with production machinery that people opposite have? It seems to be something to do with the Treasurer.

Mr. Foulds: Or the "big blue machine."

Mr. Deans: Is there someone the government knows in the production machinery business that it wants to try to help?

Mr. Foulds: It may be the Treasurer.

Mr. Laughren: It wouldn't be the first conflict of interest.

Mr. Deans: The last time in 1971, when the government brought in the production machinery rebate there wasn't a job created. To January, 1977, I predict as sure as I stand here there won't be a job created. So I ask the government what the purpose of this exercise really is.

If it is to create employment, then it won't work; if it is to put more money in the pockets of the government's friends, then it will work. But the government is going to have to justify this some day. There is going to come a day when the government is going to have to stand up before the public and justify it in hard, cold statistics. It will have to show them how it could be for an expenditure of \$400 million we didn't get a single job in the Province of Ontario.

I am really afraid that these measures aren't the kinds of measures that are going to bring about an upturn in the economic position of this province. This is the major instrument of the government's fiscal policy as it was announced earlier this week. Or is it simply a political document without any imagination and, worst of all, without any integrity? If the government is going to try to use taxpayers' money for political purposes, for heaven's sake, let it do it through the political parties' funding mechanism. Don't try to do it through taxation.

If it is to create employment, then it politically, then let it take a look at the major areas of concern and move with some degree of speed and assurance to resolve those areas, but let it not try to kid the public any more, because they are not going to be kidded any more. There is nobody there who is going to turn down two per cent, I am sure, but every single taxpayer in the province of Ontario knows that the government is bringing it in temporarily

and that it probably has drafted the bill already to bring in immediately after the election which will recover all of the money that it has been handing out prior to the election coming.

An hon. member: It is bribing them with their own money.

Mr. Deans: The government has the bill already drafted ready to come in.

Mr. Laughren: What a bunch!

Hon. Mr. Meen: Utter nonsense!

Mr. Deans: What I said was, and I will say it again, that the public knows that this measure is political chicanery and it knows that the government will be bringing in legislation immediately after the election—assuming that it will still be the government—to raise the level of taxation in the Province of Ontario, just as it did in 1971.

Hon. Mr. Meen: That's utter nonsense.

Mr. Deans: It is not utter nonsense at all, and I'll be prepared to bet \$100 on it with the minister if he likes.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I'll take the member up on it.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Deans: I'm not allowed to do that? Sorry, I would be prepared to, but I can't. I'll tell the minister what I will do—I'll do it outside.

Hon. Mr. Meen: And I would be prepared to take the member up on that.

Mr. Deans: I know that the minute this election is over, if the government is fortunate enough to be re-elected, which could well happen, it will bring in a supplementary budget and that supplementary budget will contain taxing measures and those taxing measures will be aimed at recovering every damn cent except the money it put out in its machinery tax rebate, and the end result will be higher taxation for the people in the Province of Ontario. There will be no more houses. There will be no protection against the increases in the costs and the government will—

Hon. Mr. Meen: I will win that.

Mr. Deans: —without a shadow of a doubt, by the middle of 1976, have recovered every single cent, if the government is re-elected.

Mr. Good: Oh, they won't even be there.

Mr. Deans: I don't know how the Minister of Revenue—and I know him so well—can attach himself to this kind of thing. It's shameful.

I really do think that the government should have had the fortitude to bring in these bills separately and let us deal with them separately. Let's talk about their value individually, because they are designed to do two entirely different things. They are not intended for the same purpose at all. If they had been, then that would have been one thing; but this is, in fact, two particularly different measures aimed at trying to do different things. They don't even expire at the same time. They are unrelated.

Hon. Mr. Meen: They are unrelated.

Mr. Deans: Then why are they in this same bill? They shouldn't be in the same legislation if they're not related.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Oh, come on. Oh, really.

Mr. Laughren: A tangled web.

Mr. Deans: Yes, really. It's like my colleague says, "Oh, what a tangled web we weave . . ." The government has deceived for as long as it can deceive. I'm going to tell the minister right now that I don't worry too much about what the public's reaction is going to be because they have already reacted. They've looked; they've laughed; they've been annoyed.

Does the minister know that they have not only been annoyed, they are offended. They're offended by what the government is doing. They don't believe that in the year 1975 something called a Progressive Conservative Party would have this sort of 19th century political manoeuvring going on. The next thing the government will be doing will be going out with a buck apiece buying people a drink to get them to vote for it.

An hon. member: Oh, come on.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few comments on this legislation.

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): Make them few.

Mr. Roy: Of course, Mr. Speaker, we will be supporting the reduction in the sales tax and the party is going to be consistent. We were opposed to the increase of it in the first place, which was less than two years ago,

and we're going to be consistent in the reduction of it.

Having said this, I think that one must emphasize the extremely cynical and sort of political way that this legislation is brought in. I want to say to the Minister of Revenue that he is the bearer of bad tidings all the time, and I don't know how he can live with himself in his job.

Mr. Good: The last before the Treasurer.

Mr. Roy: Yes, he's brought in more legislation in this House which has caused more controversy, more panic out there in the community and more hardship than any other minister around. It doesn't seem to bother him too much. He keeps doing it and he keeps presenting the legislation. I suppose he's typical of so many on the other side there, that once they wind them up and tell them they've got a job to do they do it faithfully for God and party and so forth.

But the fact remains that as a minister he brought in legislation in this House which has been, to say the least, just terrible, whether we're talking about the Land Speculation Tax Act which was so full of loopholes, his increase in the sales tax on the last occasion or this present reduction. I agree with the previous speaker that the public is extremely cynical about the way the government is conducting its affairs. The people have come to a point and I suppose it should be no surprise to the people on the other side that after all these years the public has serious doubts about the fiscal capability of this government.

You recall, Mr. Speaker, over the years through the Frost and Roberts administrations that this government, the cabinet, under the leadership of those people, had the reputation of running the province like a board of directors. This is not the case any more, and we've had evidence since 1971 of fiasco and chaos ever since.

I hear the comments coming over there. Are the Tories going to say, for instance, that their speculation tax was responsible fiscal legislation? I look in the budget now and what do they expect to collect from that particular tax? I think it's something like \$1 million.

Mr. Good: One million dollars.

Mr. Roy: What a farce that is. I still recall that minister making all these great predictions. We told them at the time they increased the sales tax how regressive it was, how unfair it was. We suggested other avenues of raising revenue but no, they

pressed ahead. This minister, along with his colleague the former Treasurer, the member for London South—what a fiasco. What terrible legislation they brought in this House, some of which they had to withdraw.

Here he is again and he has the gall to think that the public will be bought off by this. I suggest to him that they will not. First of all, all the public have to do is look and see the length of time for which he is reducing the tax, which obviously doesn't make sense. That's the key.

It is being reduced for the election period. It has given the government that gap of eight or nine months to call the election. That has never been heard of in this country. How far the government is prepared to go to try to reacquire its credibility, I don't know, but this is a good example of it here. In spite of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we are supporting the legislation I think it is important that it be pointed out.

Mr. Eaton: Does the member remember the federal milk subsidy? They didn't say they'd take it off after the election, did they? But they did.

Mr. Roy: I see the back-benchers there, smug, just shouting across. They wouldn't know good or bad legislation if they were sitting on it.

Mr. Good: Not only that, they wouldn't be able to understand it.

Mr. Roy: I don't imagine that many of them have even read a bill since they've been in this House, never mind trying to understand it. They never participate in these debates. Surely they must squirm to think they have legislation reducing a tax they cinreased less than two pears ago and reducing it for a period of less than nine months.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): It'd be better if the member never participated.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): He never had it so good.

Mr. Roy: Surely if one has an ounce of common sense one doesn't go about emanating fiscal legislation in this fashion. What kind of responsibility is that? I see the premier, Mr. Speaker, going around the province thinking maybe the public doesn't understand him. They don't understand his fiscal legislation; they don't understand his policy. Small wonder. Where is the Tories'

consistency? They don't have any. It's pathetic.

Hon. Mr. Meen: We have some policies. That's more than the member can say.

Mr. Eaton: We don't wonder when—

Mr. Roy: If they think through legislation such as this they can regain the confidence of this province, they are sadly mistaken.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, if I've done nothing else in this speech I've woken up about six or seven of those people out there and I suppose in that sense the speech was worthwhile.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): It was worthwhile.

Mr. Roy: It was worthwhile to get some response.

Mr. Ruston: Anybody who can wake up those deadbeats is doing something.

Mr. Roy: I would advise Hansard to start recording some of their names in Hansard so the next time I look at the index I'll see that the member does exist.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Would the member return to the principle of the bill?

Mr. Roy: And that he has participated in the debates of the House.

Mr. Good: Even if it is just an interjection.

Mr. Roy: Yes an interjection is something. They are awake.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, could we go back to the principle of the bill?

Mr. Roy: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, thank you.

Mr. Eaton: He doesn't know what the principle is.

Mr. Good: Better wind it up.

Mr. Roy: Yes, my colleague says to wind this up. We don't want them like tigers out there but I doubt that will ever happen.

The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that it is important that we point out in this Legislature the haphazard and cynical way the

Tories are accepting or trying to promote fiscal policy in this province. On the one hand they have this large deficit, mortgaging future generations, and on the other hand they raise the tax one year and reduce it the next year, hoping to score political points. How cynical. The public of this province won't be taken in by this and the sooner they call the election the sooner the government will be facing its report cards—

Mr. Turner: What is the Liberal policy?

Mr. Roy: —and the sooner we'll start having adequate and responsible financial policies in this province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any other speakers before the hon. minister sums up? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to two hours and 40 minutes of budget debate, it seems to me. But that's really being a little bit unkind. At times some of the members have strayed back from the budget to the bill. And for those cogent comments, where I can find them throughout the debate, I am very grateful.

An hon. member: This is part of the budget.

Mr. Deans: It is the cornerstone of the budget.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The member for Kitchener started off on a rather sensible note, I think—

Mr. Roy: He always does.

Hon. Mr. Meen: —when he indicated that at least the official opposition felt constrained to support the government in this progressive legislation.

Mr. Laughren: They're in bed with the government.

Mr. Roy: We are consistent.
[Laughter.]

Mr. Havrot: Tell us another one!

An hon. member: That's the best line of the day.

Mr. Deans: Being consistently wrong is not much good.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Order.

Mr. Roy: It must be close to dinner time—they are away.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, this bill, stemming from the budget, is not a masquerade of an assist to help the consumers of this province.

Mr. Roy: It certainly is.

Mon. Mr. Meen: It is in fact an assist. It is no masquerade. It is a fact that it does assist. It is a responsible bill.

Mr. Germa: I'll bet the minister won't sleep tonight after saying that.

Mr. Deans: But they intend to raise it again.

Mr. Roy: Why did they raise it in the first place?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Now there are the three elements the members have talked about. The three major matters in the budget and carried forward in this bill are our attack on the problem of continued industrial and commercial growth and therefore our removal of the tax on production machinery over a period of time.

Mr. Bounsall: It helps nobody.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I don't know what the member for Wentworth was talking about—

Mr. Roy: I don't either.

Hon. Mr. Meen: —when he spoke in terms of the reduction of that tax back in 1969 or 1970, I think he said.

Mr. Deans: In 1971.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Because that tax had been on 1969 and has remained on since 1969.

Mr. Deans: The government rebated the machinery tax.

Hon. Mr. Meen: What we did was to give a five per cent instalment tax credit against this kind of thing—

Mr. Deans: Right, and that didn't work.

Hon. Mr. Meen: It's not the same thing—and it was for a two-year period. Now, I do not have any facts as to what kind of jobs that created. This is a different approach altogether. With the removal of the seven per cent retail sales tax—

An hon. member: It's a giveaway.

Mr. Roy: Did he type this himself?

Hon. Mr. Meen: —and an outside limit within which the purchases must be made—

Mr. Deans: What is the difference between taking the tax off and giving it back?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, I listened quietly to the member for Wentworth—

Mr. Deans: Not all the time; not all the time.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I suggest he just sit back and listen to me for a few minutes.

Mr. Deans: The minister's colleague was mouthy.

Hon. Mr. Meen: We took off—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Meen: We are taking off this tax for equipment that is purchased from Tuesday on through 1975 and through 1976, a period of about 21 months. We believe that it will be a needed shot in the arm for industrial and commercial development in this province—

Mr. Cassidy: Commercial development? The Royal Bank Tower?

Hon. Mr. Meen: —if that works and there is the incentive to complete these purchases.

Somebody—I think it may have been the member for Ottawa Centre—talked about the increase in costs month by month and asked what incentive was this going to be. Well it will be a real incentive, because they know at the end of this period that tax is going to come back on again. We are telling them it is not off for good. It's off for a period within which they may make these purchases.

Mr. Cassidy: Two years.

Hon. Mr. Meen: And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is indeed a very responsible approach toward getting the economy rolling again. It is not irresponsible. We are not coming in and saying it's any kind of election gimmick or shell game as the member for Yorkview suggested, that now you see it, now you don't—

Mr. Deans: No, no; of course not.

Mr. Lawlor: Not by a pig's ear.

Mr. Cassidy: That's it exactly—now you see it, now you don't.

Mr. Lawlor: How long did they debate in cabinet?

Hon. Mr. Meen: We are saying there is a very definite period of time within which this

tax will be removed, and thereafter it will be returned. That applies to the retail sales tax reduction from seven per cent to five per cent. We are not fooling around by saying, "Look we are reducing it to five per cent and we think we can get by with five per cent." I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, we would be the very first to move it to five per cent and stay there if we felt the economy could justify it. But the economy can't justify it. We need those revenues. We are talking about a loss of revenue of about \$330 million in this fairly short period of time—something less than nine months.

Mr. Stokes: The minister fully intends to recoup that.

Mr. Cassidy: If he can't get it this year, he'll get it next year.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Every point of retail sales tax at present revenues represents something around \$200 million or a little bit more than that.

Mr. Lawlor: It didn't have anything to do with the election at all!

Hon. Mr. Meen: Now with \$400 million every year, we would have to find that income somewhere else. We have our other programmes—our GAINS programme, our Ontario tax credit programme, our health scheme, our drug programme that's coming on stream in August. There is all kinds of assistance that we are extending and have extended over the years. This is not any kind of election gimmick. We are telling the people of Ontario we want them to get in there and buy.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I think the Treasurer put it very well when he indicated that even on a \$100 purchase of a radio, if the tax were only \$5 instead of \$7, that that \$2 in extra money lying in the purchaser's pocket will probably burn a hole in it in a while, and he would spend it on something else—and that's what we want him to do. We want to leave a little bit more money in the economy for further purchases and for assistance.

Mr. Deans: He would spend it on increased housing costs.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The member for Wentworth gave a great long oration on this

whole subject of why we weren't using this money in housing. I would suggest when he gets into the budget debate, he tell that to the Treasurer. That's a completely different thrust from what we're doing here. We're trying to create jobs and we're moving on several fronts in the creation of jobs. We want to create sales and we're improving the sales by the reduction of the tax.

I can see, as some members opposite have indicated, that the retail sales tax is to some extent regressive, particularly on large sales. If you were buying an automobile, Mr. Speaker, you just have to look at the difference between five and seven per cent; and that might just make the difference between your buying a car or not buying a new car. We think this will help. The NDP's friends in the UAW suggested it would. They were after us to do something like this.

Mr. Deans: Housing is the single greatest motivator—housing is the single greatest motivator.

Hon. Mr. Meen: But, it would be far less responsible of this government if we were to say, "We'll reduce it to five per cent and we'll just keep our fingers crossed that things will improve and we can leave it there."

We're telling the people of this province that for this period of time, beginning April 8, and going through to the end of this year—and there's nothing magical about it just going through to Dec. 31; we don't have to take it through to the end of a calendar year—we're taking it through to Dec. 31 and we're telling those people, "Get out and make those purchases. And if you don't make it in that period of time—we know the economy, we know where we can generate our moneys—we are going to have to revert to seven per cent."

There's nothing wrong with seven per cent. Quebec is running at eight per cent. Ours is by no means the highest retail sales tax in Canada. As I said earlier, I would be the first—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please, the hon. minister must have the opportunity to reply.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I would like to see the reduction of five per cent for good. I'd like to see it lower. Somebody over here suggested four per cent. Wouldn't it be nice to go back to the original three per cent? But the fact is we have to have that money

for the various programmes we have going here in Ontario.

The Ontario tax credit programme does give a form of rebate to people with respect to retail sales tax, and I think it's probably an appropriate way to do it. Some of the members here served on a select committee when we talked about that kind of thing.

I have the negative income tax, and I think that this is a very responsible way in which to tackle a difficult problem here in Ontario. The problem is to get the money in in areas where we least hurt the customer. I would suggest that we have taken the most responsible way of saying, "Look, we can do this for a while; but we can't do it forever. And we're telling you it's coming back on Jan. 1, 1976."

Mr. Germa: Yes, then go the full route.

Hon. Mr. Meen: We're not leaving anybody in any doubt. I don't think I can emphasize that too much.

Mr. Stokes: Let's have the next provincial election on Jan. 2, 1976.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I want to touch briefly, Mr. Speaker, on the matter of reimbursement. There was a member of the NDP caucus, the member for Sudbury, I think, who was opposed to reinstatement of compensation to retail merchants.

I remember discussing this at some length on the select committee in 1968—as the member for Lakeshore reminded me—when we dealt with the Smith report. At that time the Smith report recommended the abolition of compensation to retail merchants, and said it should be treated as a cost of doing business.

If memory serves me, the amount of compensation that was being paid out at 2½ per cent or so was of the order of \$6 million or \$7 million. I believe the figures that were given to the select committee, and therefore to us showed that around half of that was going to a very, very few large merchants—such as the big merchandising companies we know around here.

I think we were correct in endorsing the Smith committee's recommendation that the compensation be removed, if we looked at the large merchants, because I think properly that is a cost of doing business. The whole area of retail merchandising has become more complex over the years and I, for one, have

changed my mind as it has applied to the vast majority of the merchants.

Mr. Deans: It is handy being an election year.

Mr. Laughren: It is a measure of his consistency.

Hon. Mr. Meen: It wasn't just recently that I have made my thoughts known, and I know a number of my colleagues also have felt the same way.

Mr. Lawlor: Why didn't the minister cut it off after a certain volume?

Hon. Mr. Meen: The Retail Merchants' Association suggested to us that, rather than use the heavy-handed approach, which had been recommended by Smith and endorsed by the select committee, of simply wiping out compensation altogether, we put in some kind of percentage related to the amount of tax collected as the agent of the Minister of Revenue, and then put a top limit either per return or per year on the amount of the compensation so that we would look after the vast majority of the small independent businessmen without pouring a lot of money into the treasuries of the big companies which don't really need it.

Mr. Bounsall: And we support the minister.

Hon. Mr. Meen: We have adopted that. It has been my recommendation that we would do that and I was delighted when the Treasurer saw fit to do this. Had we simply reinstated retail merchant compensation on the basis that had applied prior to 1972-1973, it would now be costing the government something like \$26 million. This way, with the top limit of \$500 per year, and in this case from July 1 through to the end of our fiscal year, \$500 for that somewhat shorter period will cost us, for a full fiscal year on current revenue at three per cent, something of the order of \$11 million. That's a substantial reduction. I believe all hon. members—and maybe even including the hon. member for Sudbury if he'll think about this a little bit—

Mr. Germa: I agree with Smith.

Hon. Mr. Meen:—will recognize that this is a highly desirable thing to do.

I am very delighted with this provision in the bill. The bill has these three elements in it. I think they are all appropriate in a bill that follows the budget and implements the budget proposals with respect to retail sales tax, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Stokes: Even though they are unrelated.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Although the hon. members of the NDP have indicated they are not about to support it, I think they are trying to talk out of both sides of their mouths at once.

Mr. Bounsall: Oh come on! We told the minister why.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I think at least the official opposition have seen the wisdom of supporting a perfectly good bill.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: Would the minister answer one question on which I didn't get an answer from what he has said?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Yes, I will be happy to answer.

Mr. Deans: Is it the government's intention, in addition to reimposing the seven per cent on Jan. 1, to raise additional taxes in order to reimburse the coffers for the money lost between now and the end of the year?

An hon. member: Oh that's obscene.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I simply say to him in the return to the seven per cent, and with the normal growth of 10.6 per cent which I believe we expect over the next year, we will be back in a position where, at seven per cent, the revenues in this province will be in roughly the same position as they were. Otherwise it—

Mr. Roy: I will tell the minister something. We are opposed to that increase back to seven per cent.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The motion is for second reading of Bill 30.

The House divided on the motion, which was approved on the following vote:

AYES	NAYS
Allan	Bounsall
Apps	Burr
Beckett	Cassidy
Belanger	Deans
Bernier	Duksza
Braithwaite	Foulds
Breithaupt	Germa
Brunelle	Laughren
Campbell	Lawlor
Clement	Samis
Downer	Stokes
Drea	Young-12.

AYES

Dymond
 Eaton
 Edighoffer
 Evans
 Ewen
 Gaunt
 Gilbertson
 Givens
 Good
 Grossman
 Havrot
 Hodgson
 (York North)
 Irvine
 Kennedy
 Kerr
 Lane
 Leluk
 MacBeth
 Maeck
 McIlveen
 McNeil
 Meen
 Morningstar
 Morrow
 Newman
 (Windsor-
 Walkerville)
 Newman
 (Ontario South)
 Nuttall
 Potter
 Reid
 Riddell
 Rollins
 Roy
 Ruston
 Sargent
 Scrivener
 Singer
 Smith
 (Simcoe East)

AYES

Smith
 (Hamilton Mountain)
 Snow
 Spence
 Taylor
 (Prince Edward-
 Lennox)
 Turner
 Villeneuve
 Walker
 Wardle
 Winkler
 Worton-59.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 59, the "nays" 12.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Some hon. members: No.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The committee of the whole House.

Mr. Speaker: Committee of the whole House?

Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, the business of the House has already been announced.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:20 o'clock, p.m.

ERRATUM

No.	Page	Col.	Line	Should read:
15	581	1	48	I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that if there is one area,

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 10, 1975

Ottawa teachers' dispute, statement by Mr. Auld	683
Krauss-Maffei system, question of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. R. F. Nixon	684
Ottawa teachers' dispute, questions of Mrs. Birch: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Roy, Mr. P. Taylor, Mr. Cassidy	684
Ontario Energy Board, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald	685
Carleton Board of Education, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. R. F. Nixon	685
Presentation of grant cheques, questions of Mr. Winkler: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Roy, Mr. Bullbrook	686
Housing starts, question of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Deans, Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Cassidy	687
Housing programmes, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Deans, Mr. Germa, Mrs. Campbell	689
Valport Homes, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Deans	690
Obligations of HOME purchasers, question of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Deans	690
Farm stabilization programme, questions of Mr. Stewart: Mr. McNeil, Mr. J. A. Taylor	691
Nappan Island development, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Riddell, Mr. R. F. Nixon	692
Dore Wrecking Co., questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Shulman	693
Dow Chemical action, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Singer	694
Plant closings, questions of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Samis	695
Burlington Skyway sewage treatment facility, questions of Mr. Newman: Mr. R. F. Nixon	695
Housing programmes, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Sargent	695
Redevelopment of QEWS, question of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Gisborn	696
Ottawa teachers' dispute, question of Mr. Wells: Mr. P. Taylor	696
Pollution of Great Lakes, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Stokes	696
Report, standing private bills committee, Mr. Ewen	697
Report, Ontario Advisory Council on Multiculturalism, Mrs. Birch	697
Harford Ltd. Act, Mr. Apps, first reading	697
City of Hamilton Act (1), Mr. J. R. Smith, first reading	697
City of Hamilton Act (2), Mr. J. R. Smith, first reading	697
City of Hamilton Act (3), Mr. J. R. Smith, first reading	697

City of Toronto Act, Mr. Wardle, first reading	697
Sheridan Place Act, Mr. Beckett, first reading	697
Retail Sales Tax Amendment Act, Mr. Meen, second reading	697
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	734



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Friday, April 11, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, APRIL 11, 1975

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure this morning to draw to the attention of the House that there are students here from Glen Forest Secondary School in Mississauga, Peel South, together with their teacher, Mr. Stroud. Would you join me in welcoming them here this morning?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I draw to your attention that in the east gallery there are some 35 students from Dufferin Heights Junior High School, accompanied by Mrs. J. Foote. I would ask you and the members to welcome them.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

INQUIRY INTO DUMP TRUCK OPERATIONS

Hon. J. R. Rhodes (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, in response to a question by the hon. member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt) on April 7 relating to the dump truck industry, I undertook to make a further statement to the House on a temporary moratorium on the issuance of public commercial vehicle licences, and to comment on the status of the inquiry.

On Feb. 7 I advised the House that I was not satisfied that a moratorium on licences would be in the public interest, and I have again reviewed this matter. If there is a surplus of trucks available in Metropolitan Toronto, that is not necessarily the case in other parts of Ontario. We are approaching the construction season, which will bring increased demands for trucking services, and I am very concerned that construction projects could be delayed, at least in some areas of the province. I am also concerned that such action could prejudice the issues on which the inquiry commissioner has been appointed to inquire and make recommendations.

I am advised that the commissioner of the inquiry is receiving submissions daily and there is public notice being given through the daily press scheduling the hearings to be

held. At this time, the commissioner anticipates completing the series of hearings to be held by the middle of May, and he will be reporting to me the results of the inquiry immediately thereafter. In these circumstances, it is not my intention to impose a moratorium on the issuance of public commercial vehicle licences to dump trucks.

The first public meeting of the commission will be held in Toronto beginning April 21. The hearings, to be held at the MacDonald Block, Queen's Park, will continue through April 2 and beyond that date if required.

Public hearings outside Toronto will be held in London, Ottawa, Sudbury and Thunder Bay, and upon request in other centres convenient to the parties concerned.

I would like to emphasize at this time, Mr. Speaker, that the commission wishes to hear the views of all those in the dump truck industry who have recommendations concerning the present system for licensing and control and how these might be improved. I particularly urge independent truck owners to take advantage of the opportunity to express their views.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

The member for Kitchener.

ECONOMIC PROSPECTS

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer be revising his budget forecasts, including his deficit forecast, now that the federal government has indicated that real growth in Canada this year will be zero rather than the unrealistic 2.6 per cent assumed in his budget?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker. Those figures of Mr. Turner's were basically available in one form or another and have been for two or three months. The report of the conference board and others are generally following a similar pattern. It would be our hope, of course, that the stimulative measures taken in this year's budget by the Ontario government and similar expansionary efforts in other provincial budgets

would play a part in speeding up the economic recovery.

Mr. Turner, of course, has now conceded what others conceded earlier: that we do have a recession; that we had flat growth in the latter part of 1974, if not a decline in growth in this first quarter of 1975. He has indicated that he will be bringing in a budget sometime in May with which, if he has the good sense to be as expansionary as Ontario is in its policies, the economy should move forward.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary. The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Can the minister indicate whether, in light of the statement by the Finance Minister of Canada that the economic prospects for 1975 show a stagnation in the economy and that things would be very slow in 1976 it might be more advisable to deal with it now and to extend whatever benefits he has extended to the public throughout the entire fiscal year rather than just to the end of this current year, in a hope that maybe it will stretch into a period of upturn?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the member's leader was concerned earlier in the week about the size of the provincial cash requirements. I think it would be highly irresponsible to concern oneself, as the House leader of the New Democratic Party is, with those cash requirements on Tuesday or Wednesday of this week, and then on Friday, on the basis of what everyone has known and which Mr. Turner said on Thursday—although he has known for some months—to extend the tax cuts further into the future.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Is Mr. Turner correct or is the Treasurer correct?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They can't have it both ways over there. They must get with it.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Neither can the Treasurer.

Mr. Deans: Can the Treasurer explain, using any responsible fiscal position at all, how he can justify tax cuts for only nine months? How can he justify saying the economy will show an upturn in the final quarter of this year, which flies in the face of all wisdom? How can he then turn around and tell us he can't really afford the tax cuts for the full year? If he can't afford them for 12

months he certainly can't afford them for nine months.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure there was a question there but again I would suggest to my friend, the House leader of the New Democratic Party, if he would sit down and read the budget he would find—

Mr. Deans: I have read the budget. I read the budget very carefully.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —that it is our hope and our expectation that by the last quarter if not the last half of this year, the economy will be turning up and the tax cuts stimulation will not be—

Mr. Deans: Based on whose views?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would ask the member to read the conference board report, the Howe report, the Economic Council report and what Mr. Turner said on Thursday.

Mr. Deans: The Treasurer is the only person in the world who thinks it is going to take an upturn.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Read what Mr. Turner said on Thursday—"We can look for recovery in the last part of this year." That is generally conceded.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): A supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: In the budget statement the Treasurer said he would amend the budget position if the oil talks did not go the way of the government.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. It must be a supplementary on the original question.

Mr. Sargent: This is supplementary to it. We're talking about the Treasurer's visit to Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker: It doesn't seem to be up to now. If you make it supplementary, fine.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, if these jokers can go to Ottawa and talk down there, we have a right to know here what's going on down there.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Oh, go on home.

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): Resign.

Mr. Sargent: I am asking a question and I want to know the answer.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is becoming a debate. Does the hon. member for Kitchener have further questions?

Mr. Sargent: This is supplementary to this question.

Mr. Speaker: Would you make it a supplementary by rewording it?

Mr. Sargent: All right. The Treasurer in his budget statement said that he would be amending his budget if the oil talks did not go his way. Would he define the amendments he plans to give us then?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I said no such thing in the budget to my knowledge. I'm not sure what the member means by the oil talks going our way. I would simply say that the objectives of Ontario under the leadership of the Premier (Mr. Davis) and the forceful position taken by this government ensured that the talks on Wednesday and Thursday of this week were completely successful from Ontario's point of view and provide the kind of leadership which this country needs.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A final supplementary from the member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: The Ontario budget was predicated on the assumption, and in fact its whole thrust was on the assumption, that there would be a pick-up at the end of this year and the budget was to help that. Now Mr. Turner says that our economy is not going to pick up, and indeed it will be sputtering on into 1976. How would the Treasurer reconcile that? What's right, his assessment or the Turner assessment?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would suggest the member examine Mr. Turner's statement a little more carefully. He certainly indicates that the economy is in trouble and has been in trouble, which is exactly what we said in our budget and which had not been conceded by the federal government until Thursday. Stimulation was necessary, the kind of stimulation which was taken by this government on Monday night.

I think it is reasonable to say that the economy will not be percolating at the fullest levels of employment and the highest rates of productivity on Oct. 1, 1975, or on Jan. 1, 1976. It may well be Jan. 1, 1977, before we are back to completely full employment, and before everything is in the best possible shape. What Mr. Turner said on Thursday certainly doesn't change our views as to what was necessary in the budget on Monday night.

Mr. MacDonald: Has the Treasurer a copy of the full text?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would be glad to get the member a copy. Mr. Turner made two statements.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kitchener.

UNIVERSITY ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Mr. Breithaupt: I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development with respect to the reports of comments made by the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. Auld) in the press today. Is the minister expressing government policy when he says that university admissions should be restricted, based on an elitist concept, rather than places provided for those students of ability who can benefit from university education?

Hon. M. Birch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): Mr. Speaker, in reading the review I would suggest that those remarks made by the minister were his own personal remarks. Any further questions should be referred to him.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): What does the provincial secretary do? She hasn't answered a question since she got that job.

Mr. Breithaupt: Further to that point, whether they are his remarks or not, if the standards have been somewhat less than the ministry expects, do these not relate to the operation of the Ministry of Education throughout the 1960s which has allowed those problems to arise?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the member direct these questions to the Minister of Colleges and Universities when he's in the House.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Supplementary; Mr. Speaker: Does the provincial secretary agree with the minister in his comment that it would be all right for a millionaire to send his dumb-bell son to university if he were financing the whole thing?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Or he could run as the member for Port Arthur.

An hon. member: He would probably win.

Mr. Deans: For the Tories. He would be well suited to run as a Tory for Port Arthur.

Mr. MacDonald: That would be pretty cheap.

An hon. member: He would have to be a socialist to run as a millionaire.

Mr. Foulds: Is the minister not going to answer my question?

An hon. member: It was a dumb-bell question.

Mr. Foulds: I asked her if she, as the secretary for policy in the area, agreed with that statement.

An hon. member: Why not?

Mr. Speaker: No answer. The hon. member for Kitchener.

ENERGY PRICES

Mr. Breithaupt: A question of the Minister of Energy, Mr. Speaker: In keeping with his concern about rising gas and oil prices, is he now prepared to empower the Ontario Energy Board to control prices internally within this province?

Hon. D. R. Timbrell (Minister of Energy): Mr. Speaker, in point of fact, the Ontario Energy Board does, through the rate review process dealing with three major distribution companies, do just that.

Mr. Reid: I have a supplementary. Will the minister make provisions so that the price of gas and oil, not just natural gas but gas and oil, will also come under similar review, similar to the legislation that exists in Nova Scotia?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I know that—I guess it was in the last session—certain members had private bills before the House to do that. I've carefully reviewed the information from Nova Scotia and I've compared it to the Ontario situation. In point of fact, we in Ontario enjoy as good prices as in Nova Scotia. I do not plan to impose any further bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener.

YOUTH AND THE LAW PROGRAMME

Mr. Breithaupt: A question of the acting Solicitor General, Mr. Speaker: Is it correct that the Youth and the Law Programme which was run last summer is not being offered this year; and since it proved so popular last year why is that the case?

Hon. J. T. Clement (Provincial Secretary for Justice): I don't think that it's been completely discontinued per se, because we are in the process of taking on students in the Solicitor General's ministry this summer. The numbers are available and I'll get them for the member. We are also taking some on in the Attorney General's ministry.

If the programme is changed from the name of Youth and the Law, I am still willing to take staff on. I don't know the reasons for the change in the programme but we are still taking on students. As a matter of fact, I've got a number of requests in my office right now for law students to identify with either the Solicitor General's ministry or the Attorney General's ministry.

Mr. Breithaupt: Since this programme was basically one that, as I understand it, involved young people working directly with police forces more particularly than perhaps within the ministry, was there any pressure or any unhappiness on the part of the police officials with the operation of the programme as it then was?

Hon. Mr. Clement: No, there was no disenchantment whatsoever, as far as I am aware.

LIQUOR LICENCE ACT

Mr. Breithaupt: A question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations: Can the minister advise us as to the status of his ongoing review of the liquor licence legislation and when we may expect to receive a new Liquor Licence Act in this province?

Mr. Singer: In the fullness of time.

Hon. S. B. Handleman (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): A constructive suggestion may be to tape both the question and the answer, because they've been used so often in this House. The review is continuing, and I hope to be able to make a statement to the House in the near future.

Mr. Singer: It has been continuing for years.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary, the member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Is it not true that the revised bill has been passed by caucus and the minister now has it ready to present next week?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I will have a statement to make to the House in the near future—hopefully in the near future.

Mr. Singer: We might see a liquor bill in the fullness of time.

Mr. MacDonald: Is this second-guessing the caucus by the cabinet?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

HOUSING PROGRAMMES

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Housing. Can the Minister of Housing identify anywhere in the province where there will be houses available for purchase by people earning less than \$10,000 a year in 1975?

Mr. Singer: They will be available, but the people can't afford them.

Hon. D. R. Irvine (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, I can't specifically identify any particular area. I would assume there would be some areas where families earning less than \$10,000, or up to \$10,000, can purchase a home. I said yesterday that I didn't think that it would be possible in urban areas. It's quite possible, in my opinion, that this might happen in rural areas.

Mr. Deans: Supplementary: Could the minister indicate in which rural area of the province there is any major housing effort being undertaken?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I wonder what the member means by a major housing undertaking.

Mr. Deans: More than 100 housing units.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Build a house.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, the member for Wentworth has no idea about housing whatsoever. He keeps harping and harping about housing starts. He proved yesterday that he couldn't add two and two when he tried to say that we would only have 45,000 starts in Ontario in this coming year. We do know that there are housing starts throughout rural Ontario and in urban communities. It's absolutely ridiculous to stand up and waste the time of the House with a question like that.

Mr. Foulds: The minister doesn't think housing is important? Why does he waste the time of the House with an answer like that?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: The minister is doing a great job. He doesn't even need the Housing Ministry portfolio; he's destroying himself with his own mouth.

Mr. Speaker: Question?

Mr. Deans: I would like to ask the Minister of Housing if he can explain how he anticipates reaching a level of 85,000 housing units in the Province of Ontario, when the housing starts in urban Ontario last month were only 2,258?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I guess this is going to be a daily occurrence. The member for Wentworth asked the same question yesterday. I'm telling the member that he just doesn't understand that the housing starts for January, February and March do not project themselves in the same way for the rest of the year. We'll have many more starts in the remaining nine months. Certainly we will achieve, as I anticipate right now, at least 85,000 starts. But you can't relate to January, February and March, Mr. Speaker, and I told the member for Wentworth that yesterday.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary—

Mr. Deans: Supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth with his supplementary first.

Mr. Deans: Would the minister be prepared to table in the House the lists of housing starts that he is now assured will take place in the Province of Ontario during the remaining 8½ months that will make up the 85,000?

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): Doesn't the member know that?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to table anything for the reason that the member for Wentworth asks so many stupid questions. It's almost impossible to table something you can't definitely foresee, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deans: The minister is not making it.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview. A supplementary?

Mr. Singer: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If the minister won't table any information for the member for Wentworth, could he perhaps inform me and some of the rest of us as to what the projection might be for the months April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November and December?

Mr. Shulman: He doesn't know.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, the member for Downsview certainly knows full well what I have said. At least he can understand that I have indicated to the House that we expect to achieve 85,000 starts in the calendar year.

Mr. Foulds: Flattery will get him everywhere.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: If we have not had the anticipated starts in January, February and March, then we will have many more starts in the remaining months of the year. I think that's pretty simple to understand.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. Shulman: How many?

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): How many?

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Don't over-estimate the minister.

Mr. Deans: I have a question for the Minister of Housing, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister of Housing indicate how many of the 11,137 families and senior citizens who are on the waiting list can expect to be housed in Metropolitan Toronto this year? Those are the ones on the waiting list. How many can expect to be housed in Metro this year in new government programmes?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, at this particular time I don't anticipate any new government programmes. I'm going to proceed with the same programmes we had last year. I expect that they will work very well if we have full co-operation from the municipalities and from the people directly affected by the programmes. Now as to the actual number, I can't tell you at this time, Mr. Speaker, but I'm going to make sure that we have as many people housed in Metropolitan Toronto as possible.

Mr. Deans: Supplementary question: Since we're not going to get any new programmes, how many of the 11,137 senior citizens and families who are currently on the waiting list in Metropolitan Toronto does the minister anticipate will be housed under the old programmes?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what is the matter with the hearing of the member for Wentworth. I've already said that we're going to have as many people housed in Metropolitan Toronto as possible. I can't tell him right now and give him a definitive answer. If I could, would he understand it anyway?

Mr. MacDonald: In other words, the minister doesn't know.

Mr. Lawlor: He is just being evasive. He doesn't know his own programmes.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. A supplementary from the member for St. George.

Mrs. Campbell: We're now referring to those people who are on a waiting list, senior citizens and families. Would the minister now tell me, since he indicated yesterday that for families the programme was limited dividend, could he tell me what the current rental is in limited dividend projects as of now, if that's his solution for the poor?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, the member for St. George knows full well that there is more than one programme. I said that yesterday.

Mr. Turner: She wasn't listening.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: The rents depend on each particular project.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the minister suggesting she is stupid too?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I would think that the hon. member would understand that every project hasn't got the same rental scale. In any event, what we have for housing in Metropolitan Toronto—

Mr. Lawlor: Nobody understands.

Hon. Mr. Irvine:—depends on the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority proceeding with senior citizens housing and with the city of Toronto and other boroughs accepting housing throughout the entire area. I can't give the hon. member an answer as to how many people are going to be housed, but I certainly expect that we will have the co-operation of all the municipalities that are involved.

We have had continuing talks with Metropolitan Toronto and with the city of Toronto. We have favourable indications that we will be proceeding with senior citizen accommodation and with rental accommodation this year, with a very large number of units. But, I can't say how many at this time.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: I wonder if the Minister of Housing knows the definition of limited dividend housing, since he has evaded that issue on each occasion.

Mr. Speaker: I suggest that that was not the theme of the first original question, with all respect.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Why doesn't the minister answer the question.

Mr. Speaker: As with the last question, if the minister has an answer for the hon. member I'll allow him to give it.

Mr. Turner: She doesn't know the question.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I would like to answer that question if it is a question. I went fully through the limited dividend programme yesterday, if the hon. member was here. If the member had listened—

Mr. Sargent: Answer it now. What is he getting paid for?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —she would have known that I said it was a 15-year mortgage with rent stabilization and an eight per cent return; and the rents can be escalated according to the inflation factor. Does the hon. member understand that?

Mrs. Campbell: Yes, I do. I understand that clearly.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: If the hon. member doesn't I will write her a letter about it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

METRO TORONTO HOUSING

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Housing. Does the minister agree that there will be 537 fewer units built under all of the Ontario Housing programmes than represented by the need already expressed for housing in Metropolitan Toronto? Is he aware that there will be 537 fewer houses built in the entire province that there is a need for as indicated by the waiting lists in Metropolitan Toronto alone?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: No, I don't accept that, Mr. Speaker. I am saying that there will be as many housing units built by this government as possible. The figure will be finalized at the end of our 1975-1976 fiscal year. To say right now that we will have less than what we need to meet the waiting list in Metropolitan Toronto is a very premature statement.

Mr. Deans: It's true.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: We don't know at this particular time how many units will be built either in Ontario or in Metropolitan Toronto.

RENT INCREASES

Mr. Deans: Unfortunately, it is true. I have a question of the Minister of Housing. Is it true that a person who has a question about rent increases need only write to the minister and he, in turn, will write to the landlord and will then relay the answer back to the tenant as to why the rent increase occurred?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: No, it is not true, Mr. Speaker. I have said before that we will investigate some of the situations. I certainly don't intend to be a rent review board myself.

I have indicated to the House that we are trying to determine whether or not some of the rent increases that are brought to our attention are realistic, whether they should be decreased or whether the leases should be extended. This is what we are trying to do.

Mr. Deans: Supplementary: Is the minister aware that that is the information being given out by Mrs. Churchill in his office to people inquiring with regard to rental increases which they feel are unjustified? And secondly, when the minister finds rental increases are questionable, what does he do?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I'll go over the whole ground again.

Mr. Deans: I heard the minister the first time.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: What I said before is that we do ask the owner of the property to substantiate why he wanted to have the rent increased and why he wanted to have the lease of a shorter nature than usual. We have found out sometimes in doing so that we have been able either to assist the tenant by having a decrease in the rent that was proposed or a lengthening of the lease. In some cases we found that the rent increases were quite justifiable and we have then gone to the tenant and said why we thought it was in order.

Mr. Deans: One final supplementary question: What are the criteria that the ministry uses for establishing justifiable rent increases? Would the minister mind tabling those so that we can apply them universally?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I will not table what I have used as criteria. However, I would be quite happy to tell the member what I have done. We have to take into account the increase in maintenance costs, we have to take into account the increase in taxes if there is any, and we have to take into account the rate of return that should be acceptable to the owner.

Mr. Deans: What is that? What does the minister consider acceptable?

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Let the member ask his leader. He thinks values have gone up 100 per cent in five years—

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): The provincial secretary has been into the Geritol again.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —when it comes to the sale of his house. If he were renting would he expect the same 100 per cent increase—

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Downsview has a supplementary.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): It's the same deal. It's hard for the NDP members to have their cake and eat it too.

Mr. Singer: Can the minister tell me how he conducts his investigation if the landlord refuses to give any information? Is there any compulsion he can exercise? He knows he can't.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to tell the hon. member that up to this date there has not been anyone who has refused to give me the information.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Grey-Bruce.

OIL WINDFALL PROFITS TAX

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Treasurer: In view of the fact that the oil companies are enjoying the biggest profits in history and if oil prices go up the price of gasoline goes up in Ontario, does the minister plan to offset this increase to the Ontario taxpayer by instituting a windfall profits tax?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury.

HYDRO JOB APPLICATIONS

Mr. Germa: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Energy: Is the minister aware of an advertisement in the *Globe and Mail*, April 1, 1975, by Ontario Hydro listing vacancies in the Bruce heavy water plant? Why would Ontario Hydro direct that the resumes by applicants for these jobs should be directed to post office box 4078 in Buffalo, N.Y.? Why does Ontario Hydro have to em-

ploy a foreign post office to receive applications from Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I have no idea, Mr. Speaker. I will investigate and report back to the member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Maybe the mail is quicker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

QUESTIONING OF RAPE VICTIMS

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General. Could the Attorney General advise whether any instructions are being given to Crown attorneys who are acting in rape cases to protect the complainants along the lines suggested by a number of people, including particularly Mr. Justice Haines in an article that he wrote for *Chitty's Law Journal*?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, for some number of years, Crown attorneys have been advised to communicate and discuss matters with complainants in rape cases, to advise them of their rights and to object if the matter in their opinion is not relevant and is only extremely distressing to the complainant in a trial.

I did read the article yesterday, in the *Globe and Mail* I believe. I agree with the first two items dealt with in that particular article. I do not agree with the suggestion that in the event someone refuses to answer that the contempt procedure recommended by the writer of that article be initiated by the Crown attorney. I don't agree with that and by the way the member framed his question I perceive that perhaps he doesn't agree with that either. If the judge rules it relevant, then I think it should go in.

Mr. Singer: In view of the minister's answer, will he then update the instructions to Crown attorneys, because in my experience many Crown attorneys are not aware that these instructions have been given to them over a considerable number of years.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Yes, I will discuss it again with my law officers to make sure that it is again brought to the attention of the Crown attorneys. It is a very delicate thing.

Mr. Singer: But very important.

Hon. Mr. Clement: It is. It's very important—you know, the member and I are getting along too well together. Something may have gone wrong. There may have been a catalyst to assist us—

Mr. Singer: Something might have happened.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Yes.

Mr. Singer: The member for High Park.

LOAN SHARKING

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker: In view of the large number of accidental deaths of people involved in the loan-sharking business in recent months in this area and the fact that there is probably going to be another one within the next few days, has the minister given some consideration to holding a royal commission into this particular problem to bring it under control?

Mr. Reid: He should start with the chartered banks.

Hon. Mr. Clement: I didn't hear the last part of the question.

Mr. Shulman: A royal commission; what does he think of it?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Oh; I'm disappointed. I've been waiting for this question all week. I understood the member was going to ask it on Monday and I came here on Monday to see him.

Mr. Shulman: The minister was low in the priorities.

Hon. Mr. Clement: And on Tuesday; I hung around all day Wednesday and I didn't even see him around the House.

Mr. Speaker, the member for High Park suggested a royal commission with reference to the racket known as loan-sharking, which has been the subject of some comment in the media in the past few weeks.

It would not be in the best interests of the province and the people of the province or the enforcement of law to have such a royal inquiry at this particular time. There are certain matters which are being looked into and being investigated and a royal commission at this time would seriously interfere with the proper investigation of those matters.

Mr. Sargent: Why doesn't the government start on the chartered banks?

Hon. Mr. Clement: It may be of some value later on, I don't know, but at this particular time it would not be in the best interests of the people of this province.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Has a recommendation come from the intelligence section of the Metro police that there be a royal commission?

Hon. Mr. Clement: I read a report some days ago—two or three reports—and I'm trying to recollect whether they did suggest that. I don't think they did. I stand to be corrected on that but I don't think they did.

Mr. Shulman: Read them again.

Hon. Mr. Clement: I was interested in the member's comment that somebody was going to be killed. It wouldn't be anybody on this side of the House, would it?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, may I ask one final supplementary: Does the minister know the name of the man who's going to be killed?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Yes, the member gave it to me prior to the opening of the House. I think he'd have a definite interest in that information and I suggest the member call him and tell him, too.

Just one more item, Mr. Speaker, if I may. I've been advised by my staff that the intelligence report which came in from the Metropolitan Toronto Police did not request the royal commission.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

THERMAL GENERATING PLANT IN ATIKOKAN AREA

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Energy. Can the minister indicate the timetable for the proposed thermal plant in the Atikokan area? Can the minister assure me that the Environmental Assessment Act will apply to that, in that that body will investigate the environmental aspects of the thermal plant there?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, as the member knows, after a lengthy public participation process in that part of the province, Ontario Hydro recommended to me, I guess about a month ago now, that approval be given to purchase a site at Marmion Lake, near Atikokan. If the government gives them that approval they will begin a further public participation process which will involve, of course, an environmental assessment by their own staff, which will eventually be subject to review.

Mr. Reid: I am sorry. Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't hear the last part. The minister said by their own staff?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: They have or will prepare—I'm not sure if they have prepared it yet—assuming they get approval to go ahead with this particular site, an environmental assessment. As the member probably knows, we've heard from a number of Americans about environmental concerns there. I think we've had one letter from a Canadian, and about 30 or 40 from Americans.

Mr. Reid: The minister can disregard the 30 or 40.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: They raise legitimate concerns which are concerns of the government and should properly be concerns of Ontario Hydro. The environmental assessment would be prepared by Hydro staff and I'm assuming it would eventually have to be heard by a competent board.

Mr. Reid: May I ask the minister very quickly, by way of supplementary: Can he give us any indication as to when this will go to cabinet and when we'll know for sure that the approval has been given by the government?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: In the fullness of time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sargent: He's just an office boy. Hydro tells him what to do.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

PLUTONIUM HAZARDS

Mr. F. A. Burr: (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Energy, of which I believe he has received notice. Is the minister aware of the recent discovery that British scientists and technicians who handle plutonium, the radioactive byproduct of nuclear plants, are at least seven times, and possibly 20 times, more likely to die of leukemia than anyone else?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member refers to notice; I haven't had notice and I haven't seen that report. Did the member send me a copy of it? I am sorry. I haven't seen it. It may be in the mail that backed up this week. I will look for it and give a reply.

Mr. Burr: As a supplementary, are the plutonium handlers in Ontario being monitored carefully by periodic health checkups?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: It is my understanding that that is so, Mr. Speaker, but I will confirm it.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

NON-RETURNABLE CONTAINERS

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): A question of the Minister of the Environment, if I can get his attention: Is the minister considering consulting with his colleague to his right and banning the sale of non-returnable bottles and cans in all provincial government institutions?

Hon. W. Newman (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I can't give the details on all of this, but we have had some correspondence and discussions with various groups that are working through the government institutions and we are looking at the total picture now. I believe one small segment has switched over to returnable bottles, and we are having discussions with the other groups too.

Mr. B. Newman: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Has the minister set a timetable by which non-returnable bottles or cans will no longer be sold?

Hon. W. Newman: No, I have not.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur.

THUNDER BAY STUDY

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Treasurer, in his capacity as Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs:

Is the minister aware of a statement, as reported in the Thunder Bay Media on the weekend of March 15, by a TEIGA official in Thunder Bay that a number of sites for "dirty industry" have been located within a 50-mile radius of the city of Thunder Bay? Is this related to the proposed heavy industrial complex, and wouldn't it be more within the bounds of public welfare to ensure that the industry is not dirty, but in fact observes environmental controls?

Mr. Breithaupt: Sounds like dirty tricks.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the statement made by the official, but I suppose "dirty industry" is a phrase that is often used in connection with very heavy industry—steel industry, refineries, that sort of thing. It would be my expectation—and the Minister of the Environment

might want to say something about this—that any large scale industry, such as steel refineries, in the last two or three years have been submitting themselves to environmental assessment and completing environmental studies on their own. At some point that will become mandatory, I suppose, under the Act which is before the House, but the fact is that they are doing it now in any case, and I suppose that the nomenclature “dirty industry” is probably something which shouldn’t be used today.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware, or is it true, that the proposed sites for the heavy industrial complex have been narrowed to two, one in the township of McTavish and one near the Slate River area? And why is there such a shroud of secrecy over this proposed development? I have been trying to get information out of the ministry since last December and none seems to be available.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware if there are one, two or 10 sites at this moment.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Welland South?

ACID SPILL IN PELHAM TOWNSHIP

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the Minister of the Environment.

Is the minister aware of the recent court decision that levied a fine of \$1,000 against a farmer in the Niagara region under a section of the Environmental Protection Act, brought about by the Ministry of the Environment’s regional office in Welland, Ont?

Will the ministry now apply the same initiative to proceed with a court action against the T H and B Railroad, responsible for an acid spill that caused considerable damage to farm lands and property in the town of Pelham?

Hon. W. Newman: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of both cases. If the member read the article where the farmer was fined, our legal staff asked the court to be lenient on the fine and they were reprimanded by the presiding judge for suggesting that he be lenient. He said, “I will decide what the fine is.” So in that particular case our staff got their knuckles rapped.

In the other case of the Pelham farmer, I’m aware that I did talk to his lawyer in Hamilton when the cabinet met there last month. At that time I asked him if he could send me his file, which he was quite prepared to do,

so that we could try and work something out without putting that farmer, who was very kind at the time, through a tremendous amount of legal expense. To my knowledge, I have not received that correspondence at this point in time.

Mr. Haggerty: A supplementary question: Would the same judge be available for the Dow situation?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, the judge is busy with Singer versus Sargent.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur.

MOOSE MANAGEMENT

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. Has the question that I placed on March 21 to the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development, been drawn to his attention, and does the minister have an answer for it?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Yes, it has, Mr. Speaker, and if the member will just reiterate the points that he wanted me to answer, I would be glad to answer him now.

Mr. Foulds: A supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. I asked if the minister has under consideration any steps for moose management in the light of the pressure on the species in northwestern Ontario, particularly around the district of Thunder Bay? I understand, of course, some measures were taken; other than raising the non-resident fee by a mere \$50, is he taking a look at mandatory registration of kills? Is he taking a look at terminating the sale of licences on the opening day of season? What other steps is he taking for a whole moose management programme in light of the endangering of the species?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, let me point out that in some areas of northern Ontario there is a growing concern about the moose population. My people indicate that, as an overall situation, the moose herd remains fairly static at about 125,000 head. We can harvest up to about 20,000 to 25,000 per year. We’re harvesting in the area of about 13,000 or 14,000 moose per year.

Mr. Foulds: How many?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: About 13,000 or 14,000. We’ve taken steps in the last two years to become more involved with the management of this very valuable resource

to northern Ontario. The member will be aware that we've moved from large management units to 45 smaller management units.

This year we've delayed the opening of the season by one week. In other words, we're getting out of the rutting season where the moose are more vulnerable. As the member has correctly pointed out, we've increased the non-resident license fee from \$125 to \$175; plus the trophy fee, which is \$15. A non-resident coming to Ontario now would be asked to pay \$190, if he is successful.

Our studies are continuing. In fact in my budget this year there will be additional funds for a broader moose management programme. Through it we will be working very closely with the pulp and paper industry to improve the habitat right across northern Ontario. I pointed out to the industry that our moose management programme will not be a static one. In other words, what is in place today may not be in place next year. They should look forward to changes, because we're getting more closely involved. We will manage this resource on a much smaller unit basis and in a more efficient way.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. Germa: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: No, we're a little short on time. We should have another question.

GAS RATE INCREASE

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Energy. With regard to the interim rate increase allowed Consumers' Gas and Union Gas as to the \$2-a-month service charge, was this considered as an increase for service purposes or was it considered an increase for covering part of the cost of the increased price of gas?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I believe it was the former, Mr. Speaker; but if the member will allow me, I will check into that and report back. I believe it was the former.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury.

GUN SAFETY REGULATIONS

Mr. Germa: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. Can he assure me that the people holding non-resident moose licences are also made to comply with the gun safety regulations that the people of Ontario have to comply with?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, this is a very difficult area to enforce. I might say that we are looking at some ways and means of enforcing it, because we do get a number of immigrants from other countries who become landed immigrants in the Province of Ontario. This is causing us some concern, because some of them have not really grasped the language, but they do have a hunting licence from their home country, which they present during the hunting season. Of course, if they have evidence that they've been hunting in their own country then they can hunt here because they are efficient hunters and they should be very capable and able to handle a firearm.

This is causing us concern. I'd have to say to the member we are looking at a number of different ways to enforce what he has just pointed out, that the non-resident should comply in the same way as a resident of Ontario, with regard to the handling of firearms.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Before I proceed, I'll recognize the member for Sudbury.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to the House 30 students from Sudbury Secondary School, under the direction of Mr. Kett and presently sitting in the east gallery.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of day, if I may, it is quite—

Mr. Speaker: I'm sorry we are not quite that far yet. Will you just hold?

Mr. Reid: All right.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Now I'll recognize the member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, this is a rather momentous day for the people of Ontario. Today happens to be the birthday of the silver fox, the member for Grey-Bruce. He informs me he is 39 today.

An hon. member: Happy birthday.

Mr. Reid: Can the House leader get him a scroll?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): He doesn't live in my riding.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 21st order, House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

Mr. Chairman: Would the minister like to make a few remarks at this time?

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Chairman, I'm delighted to have this opportunity once again of presenting the estimates of the Ministry of Correctional Services. I would like to bring to the attention of the members that during the past year my ministry has continued the development and expansion of community-centred programmes for both adults and juveniles. I propose today to review some of these and other developments and to outline a number of new initiatives which we plan to undertake within the ministry.

Last April, we launched a programme to establish residential facilities for adult offenders in communities throughout the province. These 8- to 10-bed facilities, commonly known as community resource centres, accommodate men and women who would otherwise spend their sentences inside correctional institutions. Twelve community resource centres had been opened by the start of 1975 and several of these have native persons in the northern areas of the province.

To become eligible for these centres, inmates make application from any of our institutions. Their applications are very carefully screened, having regard to public safety particularly, and selections are made by the local temporary absence committee at that particular institution. The successful applicants are then granted temporary absence permits to live at the community resource centre in order to work at gainful employment in the community or in order to take academic or other training.

We plan to open an additional 10 resource centres this year and a number of these, too, will be located in northern Ontario. These 10 units will provide approximately 90 additional beds in the community.

While we are talking about the temporary absence programme, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that since the ministry launched its temporary absence programme in 1969, we have maintained a 98 per cent success rate. To me, this reflects the careful screening and the responsive support of our staff in the institutions and in supportive community-based programmes.

It is also a credit to the community agencies, to employers and to educational authorities who have helped to make the programme work. And of course in the last analysis the success of the programme can be attributed to the positive way in which most of the participants have responded to the responsibility that this programme has placed in them.

I think it is particularly reassuring and encouraging to note that the number of temporary absence passes granted has increased without any increase in the percentage of violations.

I have mentioned the support being received from the public and the employers, and I am pleased to report that a number of companies make regular and repeated use of the possibilities for selecting, training and employing suitable candidates. I might also add that government ministries also employ former inmates.

Our regular temporary absence placements include a cannery, a sheet metal company and a pulp and paper company that provides training and employment for heavy equipment operators. Naturally those persons who are employed on temporary absence pay a sum toward their room and board, they pay taxes and they help to contribute toward the support of their family at home.

Our largest community-based programme for adults is that provided by the probation parole staff. These individuals conduct presentence investigations for the courts. They provide supervision and assistance to probationers and parolees and to persons who are on the temporary absence programme. They also supervise and co-ordinate the work of the volunteers.

I need not point out, Mr. Chairman, that the pressure on these individuals is tremendous, and it continues to grow as the courts increase their use of probation as an alternative to institutionalization. Fortunately, a reallocation of the complement within the ministry has permitted us to add staff to the probation parole service to help to cope with these increased work loads.

Over the years the ministry has benefited from the dedication and the commitment of concerned citizens who have volunteered to work with us and to work with the offenders. The numbers of these volunteers continued to grow and they are being given increased responsibilities. For example, in Ottawa a highly sophisticated programme has been developed in which over 40 clients are being supervised on a one-to-one basis by volunteers who are

also preparing up to 30 pre-sentence reports for the courts every month.

Mr. Chairman, one of the major challenges in our larger correctional institutions is to prevent the development of an influential negative inmate subculture. In an attempt to offset the development of such a subculture, and at the same time to provide more individual attention to each inmate, the unit system has been introduced at Guelph and Burtch correctional centres.

At Guelph, the reduction in the inmate population allowed us to take some unused cells and convert them into programme space. The extensive involvement of inmate workers who were very enthusiastic about the project allowed the renovations to be carried out very quickly and very economically.

The unit system relies on a team approach by small groups of staff who work intensively with the much smaller inmate groups living in the new units. Under this new setup, there has been a noticeable improvement in the staff-inmate relationships.

Renovations currently are under way at Guelph to enlarge the neuropsychiatric clinic from a 26-bed clinic to one that will accommodate about 100 when completed later this year. This facility will offer an intensive treatment programme for those requiring it. Utilizing professional staff of diverse disciplines, the programme will provide recreational, industrial and occupational therapy, a life skills programme, plus individual and group psychotherapy.

Mr. Chairman, hon. members will be aware that four new detention centres are now under construction as part of our ministry's continued programme of replacing outdated jails with modern facilities. One of the new facilities will replace the Hamilton jail, while another will permit the closing of St. Thomas and London jails. A new centre in Etobicoke is being constructed and another in Scarborough.

A number of steps have been taken to deal more appropriately with persons who have in the past remained at the Toronto jail. Two forestry camps in the Barrie area are fully utilized by the jail. They provide minimum security accommodation for persons who can function with limited supervision. In addition, we are now negotiating with the Salvation Army for the use of the House of Concord. The facilities would be used to house approximately 60 carefully selected offenders who are serving short sentences and who are involved in relatively brief pre-release programmes.

Another problem, Mr. Chairman, which the Toronto jail has experienced for many years is the number of persons who are remanded there for mental examination. Between 500 and 600 of these remands occur annually. This practice has diverted medical and psychiatric services from other inmates at the jail. I'm very pleased to advise members today that we are in the final planning stages toward the creation of a forensic court clinic in Toronto. This clinic, located at the court building, will allow judges to obtain immediate assessment when questions arise in regard to the psychiatric fitness of a person to stand trial or to be placed on bail in the community.

Persons in need of an assessment in a hospital setting would be diverted to an inpatient psychiatric unit which would also be part of the service.

We have continued to develop and to expand our life skills programmes for the inmates. These programmes are aimed at teaching inmates how to function more effectively in the community. They include a variety of subjects, ranging from the budgeting of family finances to how to search for and how to apply for a job. Most of our jails now provide life skills courses.

At Kenora, Mr. Chairman, where a new addition to the jail was opened last year, activity areas have been provided which are being utilized on a co-educational basis. Academic classes are provided. There is an area in which exercise and weight-lifting and so on can be carried out. Beadwork, sewing and native crafts are being taught. A treatment programme for alcohol addiction is being established at the jail and specialized staff have been assigned to the jail to operate these programmes.

In the Brampton area, we have three adult institutions. A co-educational programme is being carried out on an experimental basis. In recent months, women from the Vanier Centre for Women have been taking part in an engraving course at the nearby adult training centre for men and are learning cooking in the kitchen there. Men serving at the adult training centre have taken commercial courses and the dry cleaning and laundry courses at the Vanier Centre.

It is our intention eventually to involve the Ontario Correctional Institute in this exchange programme. We visualize that in the near future there will be a full-time exchange programme involving inmates from all three institutions. Such a programme will broaden the opportunities to make maximum use of existing facilities as well as providing an

atmosphere somewhat akin to that in the out-side community.

Mr. Chairman, in a number of our institutions, inmates are involved in working with the mentally retarded and the perceptually and physically handicapped. Our experience has been that these programmes give the inmates a feeling of self-worth, teach them a sense of responsibility toward others and gain public acceptance for them as individuals who can make a positive contribution to the community.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Useless work does no good.

Hon. Mr. Potter: One of these programmes, Mr. Chairman, has been so successful that it has recently been expanded to include a psychiatric hospital.

Turning to our programmes for juveniles, I am very pleased to report that the trend toward the widest possible use of community-based programming has continued during the past year. At the present time, there are 36 group homes for juveniles in operation in the province, which include seven for girls, 20 for boys, and nine which are co-educational.

Within the next year, it is our intention to open an additional seven group homes. Operated for the ministry on a contract basis, these facilities provide a home-like atmosphere for wards in a residential setting where the children can receive considerable individual attention and attend school in the local community.

A child may be placed in a group home directly after a period of assessment at the reception and assessment centre in Oakville. In other cases, a child would be placed in such a home after a period spent in the more structured setting of a training school.

To illustrate the trend toward a wider use of community facilities for wards admitted to the ministry's care, I would like to point out that approximately 20 per cent of the children who entered the centre at Oakville in the past year were placed directly in a facility other than a training school.

Mr. Chairman, the development of the group home programme during the past year has permitted us to close Glendale Training School at Simcoe, which was the second training school to have been closed by the ministry in the past three years.

As the members undoubtedly know, our reception and assessment centre has operated since it opened as a co-educational setting. Two other schools—Brookside at Cobourg and Cecil Facer at Sudbury—have now been

functioning as co-educational schools for over a year. At approximately the same time that we began to introduce co-educational programming, we began to even out the ratio of male and female staff in all of our training schools.

Both moves were aimed at creating a more home-like atmosphere within our schools, and the positive effects of these steps have encouraged us to a point where we plan to convert almost all our training schools to co-educational facilities over the next few years.

Mr. Chairman, programmes in our training schools are being readjusted in order that each school will be able to serve the majority of boys and girls from that immediate area. Proximity to home will allow more contact with families by both the children themselves and our staff, as well as greater ease of co-ordination with our probation-aftercare staff and the staff of the other health and social service agencies in the immediate area.

The ministry is, as a matter of policy, actively co-operating with local communities on the shared use of recreational facilities in our training schools, Mr. Chairman. At Pine Ridge School in Bowmanville, an arrangement is in effect whereby a local group of retarded children share the facilities. At the Brookside School in Cobourg, a community liaison committee is being chaired by the hon. Speaker of the Legislature, Russell D. Rowe. At Champlain School in Alfred, our first arrangement is with the Board of Education of the United Counties of Prescott and Russell. We think that this sharing of facilities an excellent way of assisting communities to enjoy the use of the existing, limited resources.

Mr. Chairman, to meet the increased workload being experienced by probation and aftercare staff, the complement for this service has increased during the year. Volunteers played an important role in many of our programmes and full-time volunteer co-ordinators are working in a number of areas. Some of them are filling a special need. For example, the Toronto volunteer programme includes nine Portuguese-speaking volunteers who are being trained to work within their own community.

Although the ministry is continually attempting to increase the effectiveness of its programmes, it is acutely aware that its work is primarily in the field of secondary prevention. Mr. Chairman, the children received by the ministry have often already run the gamut of community services and represent serious behavioural problems.

One has to wonder if some of these children could not have been prevented from getting into serious difficulties if more adequate preventative services had been available in the community. With this in mind, the ministry proposes to fund a comparatively small, but I believe, an important experiment in delinquency prevention. An incentive grant will be provided to encourage the municipality to reduce the rate of appearances before juvenile and family courts.

Part of this programme would involve the hiring of community liaison workers to give direction and assistance in developing and carrying out the programme. It would be the role of the liaison staff to stimulate community volunteer involvement with pre-delinquent children in order to divert them from further acting-out.

It is our belief that much greater use could be made of peers and adults who would involve themselves in positive, leisure, recreational pursuits with pre-delinquents in order to aid the children to stabilize their social lives. Obviously the involvement with an emotionally-stable adult will be of utmost importance in this programme. It is proposed that future increased funding would be provided to the participating municipality if there is a demonstrated decrease in the delinquency figures.

To concentrate attention on the family unit, the ministry plans to purchase family counselling services from agencies in various parts of the province. This will further reduce our staff caseloads and provide more intensive and specialized counselling for families than is presently available. We also propose to initiate a short-term training school placement programme. This pilot project will involve placing carefully selected children from one of our training schools back in their home community earlier, with intensified casework supervision being provided.

Mr. Chairman, to meet the needs of native peoples, who are in our care, a number of initiatives have already been taken. I have mentioned the life skills programme at Kenora which involves native staff and persons in the community. We have also at Kenora and in the Rainy River district native staff who are supplementing the work of probation aftercare staff by going on to the reserves to act as counsellors and interpreters for people who are in trouble with the law.

In addition, we have native people who have been hired at Sarnia, Peterborough and other locations to work as full-time probation parole or probation aftercare officers or as

assistants to these officers. A number of our institutions for both adults and juveniles are fortunate to have native staff and we are assisting other persons with potential as correctional workers to complete their education with the help of our Indian scholarship programme. A number of our community resource centres for adults and our group homes for children are serving native peoples and some are fully or partially staffed by native peoples.

As part of the ministry's ongoing commitment to the development and improvement of medical services, two major appointments were made during the year. Dr. James Melvin was appointed as medical services consultant and Mrs. Nora Earle was appointed as adviser in nursing. These appointments were in keeping with recommendations contained in the study of our medical services which was conducted by Dr. Harry Botterell.

Throughout the years, Mr. Chairman, we have continued to receive excellent co-operation from other ministries. For example, I was most impressed during my recent visit to northern Ontario to see the excellent liaison between our institutions at Monteith and the Northeastern Mental Health Centre, Timmins Addiction Research Foundation, and Northern College of Applied Arts and Technology. Working together in that area they are carrying out a very impressive number of rehabilitation programmes for inmates.

The Ministry of Health and this ministry have developed a programme of sharing the services of psychiatrists. For example, one full-time psychiatrist serves the Hamilton jail, the Niagara Regional Detention Centre and the forensic services of the Hamilton Psychiatric Hospital. Another psychiatrist distributes her time between Pine Ridge and Brookside schools and the child and adolescent unit of the Whitby Psychiatric Hospital.

Assistance in staffing is being provided across the province by the Addiction Research Foundation. This programme is aimed at helping staff in institutions, particularly in our jails, to be better able to deal with inmates who have alcohol-related problems.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude my remarks with some comments about staff and staff training. Over the years, as its methods and programmes have become more demanding and sophisticated, the ministry has come to expect much more of its staff. In the old days, it was enough that we insisted on a correctional officer being a humane custodian but in those days he was called a guard. Today he is called a correctional officer and this is not simply an exercise in semantics.

Staff in our adult institutions are called correctional officers because we recognize and we expect them to realize that they play an important role in the correctional process. They are people who daily are in close personal contact with the inmates. Often they are therefore the people with the best opportunities to form helpful relationships with the inmates.

Today, in addition to his responsibilities in regard to security, we expect the correctional officer to be a teacher, a counsellor, a motivator, a good listener and, in the fullest sense, to be an agent of rehabilitation. We make similar demands of the supervisors working with juveniles in our training schools.

Not only have the ministry's expectations of these two categories of staff increased dramatically in recent years, but I do want to point out the pressures they face in the day-to-day performance of their duties. Quite simply, when you remove from our institutions all those who can function safely and successfully in the community, then the institutions are left with those who cannot cope with such responsibilities. Thus, correctional officers and supervisors today are dealing with the most difficult people in our system.

I was therefore very pleased when the important and challenging work of correctional officers and supervisors of juveniles was recognized by this government in salary increases granted recently to these two categories of employees.

It should be noted that educational requirements for an entry into these two positions have been increased to a minimum of grade 12, with preference going to persons with post-secondary school qualifications.

The ministry's plans for the future include an increasing emphasis on staff training and development, for we realize that the programmes in our institutions and in the field will be only as good as the staff who run them. In this connection, a number of training initiatives have been undertaken and others are being planned.

The number of staff directly involved in staff training has been increased. Regional co-ordinators of staff training and development were trained and placed in each of the ministry's six regions in September of last year to place leadership in training closer to the needs of the field.

Task forces were established within the ministry to provide direction to various phases of human resource development. A career planning project was begun in 1973 which provided outstanding staff from the adult field with a two-year accelerated train-

ing and development programme to train them for management positions. The first of these correctional administrators in training, or CATs, as they are known, have finished their training and seven of the participants have already been placed in senior positions.

Staff interchange programmes have been initiated which involve giving staff in one type of institution an opportunity to become familiar with the operations in another. In some cases, probation/parole staff have spent a period of time with staff in correctional institutions. They have also participated in training exchanges with the Ontario Provincial Police.

The correctional worker courses offered at Sheridan and Centennial colleges are working very well, providing trained staff for our institutions. As a means of improving our administrative strength we have also hired many of the graduates from the masters in correctional administration course which is now offered by the Centre of Criminology in Ottawa.

Mr. Chairman, members will be aware of the meetings of the ministers of corrections over the past two years. There has been a great improvement in interprovincial and federal-provincial communication on major issues facing corrections as a result of these meetings and the intervening meetings of senior officials. Over the next year we hope to see introduction in the federal House of a greatly altered Prisons and Reformatories Act, Parole Act and Juvenile Delinquents Act. Each of these Acts is much in need of updating, and I am sure the public debate of this vital legislation will be of great interest to all members of this House.

Mr. Chairman, last year, during the estimates, I stated that consideration was being given to removing section 8 from the Training Schools Act. This section, which has always been a contentious issue, permits the court to admit to training schools those children who have not committed what would constitute an offence if they were adults, but who are deemed unmanageable or beyond control. The interministry committee studying this matter has reported, and I am pleased to inform the hon. members that I intend to introduce, during the current session, legislation that would amend the Training Schools Act by removing from it section 8.

In conclusion, I wish to inform the hon. members that it is this ministry's intention to concentrate in the immediate future on two priorities, the continued development of community-based programmes and the intensification of our staff training programmes.

I do want to say, Mr. Chairman, how very proud I am of the people who work for this ministry. I do want to thank them publicly for the dedication and the loyalty that they have demonstrated over the past year. I am convinced that with their commitment and efforts the ministry will continue to increase the effectiveness of its programmes. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the many volunteers, agencies, other ministries, and the various individuals and groups in the community who have helped us to meet the needs of those in our care over the past year.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, there is not a quorum in this House. I never raise this point if there is another body meeting downstairs at the same time, or if people are tied up in other work in the committees of the House, where we are necessarily divided, but I see no reason why there shouldn't be a quorum when this is the sole body sitting.

Mr. Chairman: Would the Clerk take the count please?

Clerk of the House: There is not a quorum, sir.

Mr. Chairman ordered that the bells be rung for four minutes.

Mr. Chairman: We now have a quorum. The member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wouldn't want to have it said that I was forcing anyone to come up and listen to my remarks, so I will just remind the members that it was the member for Lakeshore who called for the quorum. I agree with the principle, but I wouldn't want to think that I had to force someone to come and listen to me.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): It is always a pleasure.

Mr. Lawlor: We are quite pleased to do it for you.

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): Don't encourage him.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): We make up a quorum in this House.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): That's our problem: we make up the quorum.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks with regard to this

particular ministry. First of all, I was pleased to hear that the minister is taking section 8 out of the Training Schools Act, about which I was going to make a few remarks.

I think I might begin with a few remarks on juvenile care, in which I think we have probably failed more than in other areas. I realize the ministry is trying some new procedures and methods in the care and treatment of juveniles, but still I believe that area probably has been more neglected than other areas. I think it's the most important one.

The juvenile care problem as a whole probably reflects on society more than any other part of the ministry, I believe. The problems that juveniles get into stem, I suppose, from the communities and the broken homes many of these children come from. In addition, we know that separated homes and one-parent families have created some of the problems.

My main concern is the direction in which we should be going to treat these people. The idea of having them in group homes has been tried, and it would appear to be the best way to deal with this, rather than sending them to large training schools, which some people think are only training schools to train them for things they don't need to know and shouldn't know. When they get into a training school they learn a great deal of things they certainly shouldn't be learning.

This is a major concern of mine. I've always said in past years that juveniles should not be under the Ministry of Correctional Services. I think they should be under the Ministry of Community and Social Services. I don't say this in regard to the minister himself; I'm saying this with respect to the general overall operations. I think they would fit in much better with the Ministry of Community and Social Services, because they have general overall control of the whole spectrum of juvenile care—the social services and so forth, which to me are really part of the same thing. By doing this, as I've stressed in other years, we would also involve the federal government in paying for 50 per cent of the cost of operating this programme.

I know that the minister said last year in his estimates statement, and in subsequent newspaper articles, that he has had discussions with the federal people on this matter and he can't get them to change their mind to allow him to keep it in Correctional Services. I think that maybe the minister should change his mind. I really feel that

these could be run under the Ministry of Community and Social Services.

If you want someone to be responsible for them in the Legislature, since there is an appointment announced every other day or two about parliamentary assistants, probably a parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Brunelle) could be responsible for that area of care. He then could answer any questions in the House as to its operations. Then it doesn't leave it back in the bureaucratic area someplace where one can't question its operations. I think that sounds reasonable. It's reasonable too because it would save the province some money as the federal government then would share in its cost of operation.

I also am concerned when I look over the ministry administration programme. We are talking about estimates—and this is what we are supposed to really be talking about, the operations and so forth of the department of the ministry as a whole. It's interesting just to follow the one vote 1401. When we look at the increase in costs from each area of administration, when we take in the general administration, the increase is 18 per cent which is, I suppose, logical for general increases in wages and salaries and so forth. The next increase is five per cent and this is for health care services. This is something that I think is really lacking.

If we go back to the report Dr. Botterell made in 1972 to the then Minister of Correctional Services he found that health care services in the jails were very poor. He came in with about 10 or 15 main recommendations. We will admit that a few of them were instigated, but very few; hardly any of them, when you look at what we are putting in health care.

When you go down the line farther to planning and support services, I suppose that planning and support services are not a big item. Totally they are \$810,000, but they are only increased seven per cent from the previous year.

Administrative and financial services are increased by \$730,000 or a 40 per cent increase. We always are concerned about how we keep having more money going out for administration. It reminds you almost of the school boards in our area, where the director of education now gets \$39,000 a year, as much as what the deputy minister actually gets. Yet there are about 40 directors of education all over the province and we didn't have that before we had the centralization. I'm concerned that we keep spend-

ing more of our tax dollar on administrative items.

Personnel services went up by 25 per cent. Staff training and development—and I certainly have no argument with it at all for any increase there, as I think that's an excellent place we should be looking at—increased 30 per cent. But the next one is the one that really throws me, and that is information services. Last year the estimate was for \$392,000. This year it's for \$1,074,000. That's an increase of about 200 per cent.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): It is an election year.

An hon. member: That's normal with this government.

Mr. Ruston: I suppose I have this package that I received with 14 folders for all the items the ministry has. Some of them are hard-covered, which I know is very expensive, but some others are not. There are pamphlets of every kind in all different colours. They have them in purple, green and blue, and others are orange.

An hon. member: You don't see any red.

Mr. Ruston: I don't see any red ones.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Purple Potter.

Mr. Ruston: There is a partially green one and there is purple. That must be for the minister. But, anyway, I just can't understand why it is necessary to make up 14 folders when I am sure that anybody could sit down and put that in about three. I just don't understand why it's necessary to spend an extra \$681,000 for information services.

I think someone mentioned here that it is an election year this year. I suppose it's like every time you open a daily paper or the weekly paper, there are about four large advertisements—a quarter page, a half page—saying that Mr. Robert Welch is the new Minister of Culture and Recreation, and Mr. Jim Auld is the Minister of Colleges and Universities. Well, we've had colleges and universities in Ontario for, I guess, 100 years or so. I don't think we have to advertise with massive ads in papers to say that we have a Minister of Colleges and Universities.

However, it's an election year and I guess that is involved in what they are trying to do. But this to me is really a waste of public funds when we see this type of thing going on.

Mr. Haggerty: It must be printed in the United States, is it?

Mr. Ruston: Another thing in vote 1401 is services. We have never got into that one in very much detail. When we get going through the estimates, I intend to bring it up again. But I just want to make a note here that in the first vote, which is a total of \$7,674,000, the services in the total of the seven votes comes to \$1,611,000. Of course, in the information services vote alone the services come to \$573,000.

Now, I am under the impression that a lot of these are contracts and so forth that the ministry has, and we will question that later. But, I just don't see how this particular item keeps rising so fast. Of course, none of them rises as fast as the advertising. It is really criminal to have such an increase.

As far as the operations of the jails, staffing and so forth are concerned, I don't think that I am really going to get into that very much this year, Mr. Chairman.

Right now, as you are aware, Mr. Chairman, we have the royal commission by Judge Shapiro on jail guard brutality and so forth. I'm sure he will be presenting an enlightening report. It might be the basis of some future consideration by the ministry and so forth.

I would think that in the planning of new jails that television should be utilized to provide coverage of what is going on in many areas. It is impossible to keep men in areas all the time to check on what is going on. Of course, there have been suicides in some of our jails.

Another concern is the parole system. Many people in our province are now aware, of course, that a major part of the parole system is operated through the federal parole system. There have been discussions on that; I think we discussed it last year.

In a report in the *Toronto Star* of May 30, 1974, the minister said he was concerned that the parole changes were too slow in coming. And he wants some changes made so that the province would have more control over the parole system, especially of the people in the provincial jails. I can agree with him completely on that. I think I mentioned that last year.

Another concern is how one can really rationalize the decision made by the ministry to close Burwash. In the last four or five years, from what I can gather there has been about \$3 to \$4 million spent on repairs and major overhauls, and then there is a decision to close the large farm acreage. I understand that it has been closed or its closing is about to be finalized.

The thing that concerns me is why major repairs have been made to it—and they are major; I have a list of them here but I think they have been mentioned before—and why they were made at that time. It just doesn't seem reasonable that there wouldn't have been more planning on what was to be done with this institution. Repairs are made and major overhauling carried out and then they decide to close it. It concerns me considerably as to how the ministry could come to this kind of a decision so quickly after having all the repairs done to it. They must have thought it was a reasonable place to keep open, and yet all at once they decide it's going to be closed.

I'm also concerned with regard to a report which the minister mentioned the other day when he was asked questions about brutality in training schools and statements by a Mr. Brewer, who is having the hearing with the minister's department, as to what was going on in the training schools. I think that what we have to do is open up our training schools to people who are interested and let's see what's going on. I know that we as members can go into them and so forth, but I think there must be responsible interested citizens in the community who could have a little input into this and check into their operations.

It's very difficult—when people read reports in the newspapers and so forth, especially with regard to this particular instance—if you are a layman and you read a headline, "Probation Officer is Discharged for Criticizing Training Schools," and the write-up, and the next day or a few days later the *Globe and Mail* comes in with an editorial on the muzzling of government. It's very concerning to the general public when they read that; they're just not sure.

I'll admit that I have a great deal of faith in the people who are working in the ministry. A civil servant doesn't always have the best of both worlds. He has to answer to the department and he has to be responsible and yet he's treating people who come in from the community whom somebody else can't handle, so they bring him in and expect him to see that they get taken care of properly. I realize that that is not an easy matter, but I think we have to keep it out in the open. I think people have to know what's going on. If these charges are not true then naturally it should be shown that they're not. There should be an open hearing, it seems to me, to let these things out so that we know what's going on.

I don't really have very much more that I want to lead off with, Mr. Chairman. In

the estimates in past years sometimes we get up and speak for an hour and then when each vote comes along either you repeat yourself or it goes sailing through. I think that we should maybe go over each vote a little more thoroughly rather than spend so much time on the leadoff, Mr. Chairman, that's all I have to say right now.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Hamilton Centre.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if first we could get a copy of the minister's opening remarks so that we could have an opportunity to look at them.

Over the years, Ontario has slowly been giving greater emphasis to rehabilitating prisoners. We no longer stuff the sentenced individual into a cell and forget about him, except for his physical needs, until he is eligible for parole or until he completes his sentence. We have taken this new approach simply because the old way did nothing to correct the tendency toward crime and because of the high cost of custodial care that continues to increase as offenders return time and again.

A couple of years ago, Kenneth A. Carlson, an assessor of prisoners at the Guelph Correctional Centre, did a study, following up over a period of six years 1,070 adult first offenders admitted in 1965. He found that 686, or slightly more than 65 per cent, had returned as a result of being convicted of further crimes. Almost one-third of those returning did so within six months. More than half had returned within a year and three-quarters within two years.

Obviously, jailing offenders did not alter their ways. Equally obvious, the cost of keeping up with the new offenders, aggravated by the high rate of repeat offenders, could do nothing but go up. On top of this, of course, one must add the inflation factor. Something must be done, we decided, to reverse the trend of repeaters, and so we took some steps. But they are slow, and the feedback of information from the results is still slow. Sometimes we seem to be fighting against our own knowledge.

It is generally considered that smaller institutions give more desirable results in rehabilitation and vocational training programmes. The number of inmates should be about 160—certainly under 200. Yet a grand jury recommended increasing the size of the Whitby institution since it has almost reached its maximum. I would hope that the enlargement of any existing institution

would not increase its use beyond the most effective size for treatment. I also hope that none of the new institutions being built will be too large.

An interesting programme was initiated about two years ago at the Joyceville institution by its chaplain, Rev. Glenn Jackson, under the general sponsorship of the Kingston district of the United Church. It was called "Link Fellowship" and was organized so as to establish a relationship between the penitentiary inmates and citizens on the outside. I haven't heard how this programme has gone on since the first year. I am interested that 85 inmates showed up—the first night the group gathered at the institution, but Joyceville's administration limited the number of participating inmates to 25 because it would be unmanageable if the group was any larger. So you see, a large institution would prevent the participation of all inmates interested in such an innocent thing as outside social contact, however desirable such a programme might be.

Whitby has a pilot programme to provide the prisoners with a night out once a week to use the recreational facilities of the Whitby Hospital. I understand this programme is to be evaluated some time this month and I hope the hon. minister will advise us of the results. I don't think, however, that this kind of a programme could be carried out in a large institution.

I am pleased that we are phasing out our training schools. I have had many parents discuss with me their dissatisfaction with what has been happening to the children in these schools. Their dissatisfaction was not so much criticism of the staff but more of the effect which the experience had on the child, such as carving initials with a sharp object in their flesh and other such undesirable behaviour. The child becomes very hostile and has great difficulty adjusting when he is returned to society. Recent figures indicate 34 per cent of training school graduates are convicted of an offence and 48 per cent are returned or sent to another institution within 18 months of their release. It is the same kind of history we experienced in our correctional centres.

I am very hopeful that the different atmosphere provided by the use of group homes will be more appealing to young people. It is my opinion that they might gain a whole new outlook on life and rid themselves of some of the frustrations which have caused them to become offenders. If we can't find the proper way to reach these young offenders I don't feel we will be very

successful with the next age group. Only by rehabilitating the young offenders will we ever be able to reduce the crime rate. This is one area where we don't want our young people to go on to bigger things.

I would be interested in learning if the federal government is now sharing with Ontario the cost of our training schools and group homes. A year ago the minister reported that one training school had been closed; a second was in process of closing, and in 18 months—about October, 1975—a third would be closed down. He also reported that a total of 28 group homes were in operation; 17 for boys, seven for girls and four co-educational, with a further six expected to be in operation by the fall of 1974, for a total of 34 group homes. I assume that the 34 homes would provide accommodation for the inmates of the two training schools which I assume are now closed.

I understand that other uses are being planned for the closed training schools, such as the use to which Glendale is being put, as a young offenders unit for the 16 to 18 age group. I am pleased to see that this age group will be segregated from the older and, perhaps, repeat offenders. This is a fairly large group representing about 15 per cent of the inmates of our adult institutions. I would hope that complete segregation of this age group will be accomplished at the very earliest possible time.

Regarding the programme recently instituted at Guelph Correctional Centre and that planned for Maplehurst, the minister stated last April:

Our concerns are, primarily, that the rent paid by employers for our facilities is fair to the taxpayers of Ontario; that the type of work is consistent with our rehabilitation aims; that wages and other fringe benefits are commensurate with those prevailing in the industry for persons of similar skills; and that the employer will show willingness to provide employment elsewhere in his enterprise to suitable inmates on release.

I am interested in learning what guarantees we have from Essex Packers that they will provide employment elsewhere in their operations to suitable inmates on release.

I would also like to learn how they define suitable inmates. I think this is the key to the success of this programme. Acquired skills and knowledge are of little advantage when an inmate is released if he is unable to find employment in his new field of knowledge. If, however, the employer is prepared to add the released inmate to his employees

on the outside, it would seem to me to provide the best insurance we could have in our efforts to rehabilitate the prisoner and to make possible his return to society without the need to return to his old habits and, once again, return as a prisoner to the institution.

I am particularly pleased that the minister has consulted with the Ontario Federation of Labour and is going to pay going wage rates. Like them, I would object to providing an employer with a captive pool of low-paid labour. This would be exploitation of the worst kind and would only breed resentment in the prisoner which would exceed anything previously experienced.

On the other hand, proper wage rates would enable him to maintain his family so they are not cases for welfare. They would enable him to pay his own board, to be able to pay his share of unemployment insurance to provide a cushion against future unemployment; to pay income tax so he is paying his share of operating our country; to have spending money of his own which he has earned and if he is single, to have saved a little nest egg. This would add to his sense of worth, a sense that was formerly stripped from him as he entered the prison doors.

Newspaper speculation as to whether they will have the right to vote returned to them, based on the fact that they would now be paying income tax, is a little silly. Any number of people who do not pay income tax have the right to vote—18-year-olds who have not yet entered the labour force, anyone who has been unemployed for a lengthy period of time, many old age pensioners, and certainly other pensioners like the blind and disabled. The inmates of our institutions did not lose their right to vote because they ceased to pay income tax, nor will it be returned to those inmates who are employed in these projects because they are again paying income tax. They lost their right to vote because they had committed offences and crimes for which they were imprisoned. This is the law.

Personally, I have no objection to any inmate of our correctional institutions retaining their right to vote. It would give them an interest in the outside world, and perhaps they could have a more objective view of our political parties. Perhaps serious consideration should be given to amending our laws to return the right to vote to all inmates 18 years and over.

I am pleased that our temporary absence programme remains successful and seems to have stabilized its results at about a 98 per

cent effective rate. Has any follow-up study been made on the rate of repeat offenders of those released inmates who had participated in the temporary absence programme? I know the programme has been in effect for only a relatively short length of time, but I would like to see a comparison with the findings of Mr. Carlson, who discovered that 64 per cent of first offenders in a six-year period had committed further crimes that returned them to the institutions, and that three-quarters of those returning had done so within two years. I think we could do a comparative study of this two-year period. We need some kind of yardstick to measure this programme's success in rehabilitation.

I feel the hon. minister should maintain a constant flow of these kinds of statistics for the hon. members, because none of us represents an area that is totally free of crime. All of us must concern ourselves with the process of rehabilitation.

I would like to know what programmes are being made available to our female inmates. Making sure they have a welfare cheque in their purse when they leave is hardly the same as being taught skills by which they can earn a living, nor does it give them any guarantee of future employment. Sewing, laundry and hairdressing seem to be somewhat limiting in scope and in imagination, and I am wondering why a programme similar to that planned for Maplehurst, together with some guarantee of employment upon their release, is not made available to them.

I don't believe we can really complete the inmate's rehabilitation unless we follow through after his release with some kind of placement assistance and a counselling service. I think it is important that they be made to feel that there is concern and help so that they can make it after they have been released and get back into society.

Perhaps some of our problems might be solved in a new approach to sentencing. The Law Reform Commission has issued some thought-provoking publications. One, "The Victim vs the Offender", begins by asking, "If your colour TV set were stolen would you rather have it back or send the bum to jail?" They suggest that hundreds of relatively minor offences are being processed through our courts each day, often resulting in no compensation for the victim's loss and imprisonment for an offender who may be young or in court for the first time.

The commission suggests further that in minor offences which are not contested and where there is no risk to society at large,

conciliation proceedings, as opposed to court trials, could provide a more satisfactory settlement for all. Under their proposal, if your TV was stolen, for instance, a settlement could be worked out whereby the offender would replace the set. I believe this might work out well in the case of a first offender. The victim recovers his loss and the offender, having had to work to earn the money to replace the set, probably would determine never to replace himself in this position again; and our tax dollars would not be spent to support the offender in jail.

In any event, it is an interesting and new approach and I think bears a close examination of its possibilities. It is an approach that would probably meet the general approval of George Street, former chairman of the National Parole Board, who states:

I am convinced that imprisonment should be used as a last resort and should only be necessary if the person cannot be treated in any other way.

The John Howard Society supports alternatives to imprisonment for individuals not dangerous to the community and supports the wider use of probation.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to see work has started on the old Barton St. jail in Hamilton. It is in a way unfortunate that Pat O'Neil will not be there as supervisor when the new building is completed. He made the most that was possible out of this century-old jail. However, I assume his new job as associate co-ordinator of the temporary absence programme for Ontario is in the nature of a promotion for him, and most certainly it is in line with his interests. I wish him a successful future in this new area.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. minister wish to respond?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I could, Mr. Chairman, but I think most of the questions that have been asked will be discussed when they come under the votes. So if it is okay, we will respond to them under the votes.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1401, item 1.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Chairman, may I ask before we get into it, where we can discuss jails—construction of, and so on? Would that be under vote 1402?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Vote 1402 would be the adult facilities and 1403 would be the juvenile facilities.

On vote 1401:

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1401, shall item 1 carry? Item 1 agreed to.

On item 2, health care. Any comments?

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Chairman, I mentioned health care, and asked has the minister anything for us in regard to the Botterell report in 1972? How far has he gone with regard to those recommendations?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, most of the recommendations in the Botterell report have been followed. We have provided for full-time nurses in many of our institutions, and nursing care is available on a full-time basis in the majority of them. Doctors' services are available every day.

We have followed his recommendations in co-ordinating with the Ministry of Health the availability of health services that are provided in the community. OHIP has now agreed that they will cover health services for us under their programme so that an individual can be treated the same in jail as he is on the outside.

In health services this year, Mr. Chairman, you will note that there is very little change as far as actual costs were concerned, with only an additional cost of \$14,000. That was because of adjustments that were made during 1974-1975. We were able to pick up a fair amount, and it wasn't necessary to ask for more funds to provide for some of the services that we have had to provide there. The funds were already available, but were not being used by the director of medical services.

As I have said, in the hospitals we have made the changes that have been recommended by Dr. Botterell. There were one or two minor things that we disagreed on concerning some of the advisory committees. It's rather a lengthy report but I would be glad to make it available to you to show you what we have, and you can study it.

Mr. Chairman: Does item 2 carry?

Mr. Lawlor: May I say a word on item 2?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: What it will come down to, after I make a brief statement, is just how many psychiatrists—yes, let's stick to psychiatrists for the moment, not psychologists or paratherapeutic personnel—are involved in the various institutions. The second question would be is each institution covered? We won't pretend they are adequately covered.

What I want to say initially, because it seems to me to be pretty well established now, is that the distinction between sin and mental illness is pretty well established. For people like me, sin exists. It's something deliberately done; it's an act which infringes basically societal norms for which the person can be held responsible, accountable and in control. Responsibility is the word in this regard. But for an awful lot of people involved in prisons, involved in jails and various incarceration institutions, that's not so in my opinion.

I think the minister is a particularly good minister for Correctional Services, although we've had a string of men over the other side there who have over the years since I've been acquainted with these matters done yeoman service. I don't want to be invidious and start at any particular place but the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Grossman) seemed to me to give an impetus when I was first in this House in this particular direction. He responded well when the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) and myself visited many of these institutions. We haven't done so much of late. His attitude was in itself psychiatric. In other words, it wasn't defensive. He responded, admitted and corrected.

You, sir, have done likewise. It's easy to approach you on difficult issues connected with training schools—as between the two of us we well know—in various areas. Being a doctor, you have an insight into matters of pathology and physiology that is not available to all members of this House. You know the alienation, the sense of disturbance, the imbalance that exists in the society and manifests itself as a symptom—as a running sore to some extent—in terms of penitentiaries, in terms of reform institutions, in reform, and in terms of the whole penal system.

A recent book was reviewed in the New York Times Review of Books this week about Attica. I don't pretend that our position is anywhere comparable in tough terms, but the same breeding grounds is there. Attica was a particularly vile thing which was the pus in the system and needed lancing, which the new vice-president of the United States totally failed to do, as the article points out, in a vein of cowardice and in a vein of bourgeois blindness. That is the tendency and the difficulty with your department. People are not interested. They're a tiny coterie of the whole population.

By and large, we turn our eyes away from jails and penal institutions of all kinds. We find them perhaps as little boys find cemeteries, something that you avert your eyes from and get quickly past, particularly after dusk. They tend to be sewers in the society. This is the difficulty. They tend to inflict greater wounds than anything they ever helped to cause. I know you're trying to rectify that and that's why you're getting my support.

Ten years ago that wasn't so. Everybody blinded themselves. They let the thing rot and let the sewers overflow and stirred a bit of the pot in the process, throwing up their hats. But that is not the attitude of this minister and it is not what will take place as the programmes here, particularly the temporary absence programme and other programmes, are expanded and resolved.

The chief thing, and we'll come to it in the next vote, that I'm interested in is decreasing the size of the institution. You are doing that with the group home concept. In matters of this kind direct, personal intimacy is the only cure so a person feels he is respected, he is a human being, he is not a cog in some wretched machine and he's not being driven through a corral all the time. Millbrook has still got a great deal of improvement to be done and some day that wretched fortress should be razed to the ground. It was erected as a monument to somebody's perverse penology I think. I forget the colonel or something there; I think he used to erect concrete fortresses in Brazil or somewhere in far-off portions of the world, in the Ardennes, and with the military mentality present in that particular situation.

I don't know if the minister in this particular regard, too, has had an opportunity to look at an article by George Woodcock—it is some years ago; I haven't got it in front of me—as to some recommendations. It has largely to do with British Columbia and some of the peculiar situations out there because of their vast resources situation, particularly with respect to tourism and recreational facilities.

It has a certain application here. The sense would be that you involve inmates, in a greater sense, in the ecology thing, in the environment, working closely with the minister thereof, and widen their horizons. This would put men out in the field. These various camps, farm camps and others that you have around, near Barrie, etc., are excellent institutions in this particular regard. There is no question that you already have a foun-

dation for it. If you could expand that a bit it would not only give them a deeper sense of relationship with nature itself and the healing powers contained there, but would be something fruitful, useful and highly beneficial in an up-to-date way in the community itself.

Sometimes you or the federal government hire students to clean up highways, to do various trenchment projects, to bank rivers, to set up sanctuaries, bird sanctuaries and a hundred tasks that are possible. They would get the fresh air, the open air, a certain regimen which many of these people would benefit by, the toughness of life. Even, perhaps, a certain Spartan character about the open air.

I shouldn't talk about that; I don't know anything personally about it. But there you are. Particularly of young people, some often say "send them into the army" type of thing. For those who aren't disposed to do that I can't think of anything more wrenching and more diminishing. It would twist a human person and take many years to get them back into some kind of rehabilitation or in line with this society.

Not that I think being in line with this wretched society is a particular sign of mental health; on the contrary. If you are that much in line you just might be completely psychotic. In any event there is some kind of balance there.

I return at this stage to my original question at the beginning. I'm terribly concerned about it. I know there is a shortage of psychiatrists. I think that you, as Minister of Health previously and in your present portfolio, should do everything in your power to stimulate that. It's the expanding field; it's the thing that's coming. Therapy is even becoming somewhat acceptable now. It is a new discovery whose foundations and whose full potential has not even begun to be felt.

You feel it first because you have to deal with people who are the most alienated in this society, and from themselves, and can't find accommodation with other human beings, who don't know what love means and do know what hate means and know how to offend, and in masochistic guises twist both themselves and, sadistically, others in the process, and you do know a good deal about the playing out business as you get these resentments and things. You'll test anybody and you will twist any arm; you will put a knife between ribs just for some absolutely trivial, absolutely meaningless and asinine motive.

Judges who aren't trained in this regard sit there and they pause; they don't know and they can't understand it because they themselves haven't gone through those particular periods, and haven't really got into it. But you do, and your institution does. You've got all kinds of first-class people on that staff who understand these things, who know all the correctional literature, who follow it closely, who attend the conferences and are up to date in these particular regards. All I can say is hail and farewell in this regard and keep up the good work. Couldn't you have the answers to those couple of questions?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the hon. member for his comments. As he has said, it is difficult to get psychiatrists. As far as we are concerned, we have full-time psychiatrists at the neuropsychiatric unit at Guelph. We have one at the OCI in Brampton. We have 44 part-time psychiatrists in the province, and they are assisted by 37 full-time and 22 part-time psychologists and psychometrists. I spoke earlier about the facilities we were going to make available at the Don Jail, which I think will be a big asset, particularly in this area, if we had the psychiatric unit established there.

Mr. Lawlor: It's great to get that out of the way. That is a mess.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I think it will be too. It's not going to happen overnight, as you know. We are working on it. We hope to have it finalized and get moving very quickly. It takes a lot of co-operation from various areas to do this.

I appreciate the comments of the hon. member on our facility in Millbrook. It reminds me of the comments that were made by his leader some years ago about Burwash. I only hope, when the day comes that I close Millbrook, that I don't get the same criticism as we got in closing Burwash.

Mr. Lawlor: No, you can't have it both ways.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to ask of the minister, under health care services, if the ministry or the institution conducts a fairly intensive study of the body chemistry of the individual who is brought into the institution.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I think I can answer that question, Mr. Chairman, by saying he gets a

complete physical examination the same as any individual would from his own family physician. But to say that he gets a complete study of the body chemistry would not be true, sir. There are very few individuals, unless they go for specific purposes to an internist for a specific reason, who would get a complete study of the body chemistry.

Mr. B. Newman: Then may I bring to the attention of the minister some of the studies found in England as a result of two researchers' quite extensive analysis of the topic under consideration? In the Manchester Guardian, a writer by the name of Allan Smith—this is in England—makes the following comments:

Vandalism, hooliganism, and some more serious criminal behaviour might not be the inescapable ills of life in the 20th century. They could be caused by lead poisoning.

I bring it to your attention that if the ministry undertook certain studies concerning the body chemistry there could be some correlation found between some of the new pollutants that affect society today and the behaviour of the individual.

Professors have traced the links between high levels of lead in the blood and hyperactivity in children and adults, and there is a further link between hyperactivity and criminal behaviour. Over there today they are actually studying the lead levels of individuals in the downtown centres of London, in the heaviest traffic areas, because they claim that lead in the bloodstream has long been known to affect organs such as the brain, the kidneys and the liver.

Further evidence of this effect on the brain and the possible connection with profound changes in behaviour have been charted by Prof. D. Bryce-Smith, lecturer in chemistry at Reading University, and Prof. H. A. Waldron, lecturer in social medicine at Birmingham. In a paper that they presented, they have drawn sort of a relationship between hyperactivity and the presence of lead in the body system, and their recommendation is to attempt to de-lead. How you do that to an individual's bloodstream, maybe the good doctor, the good minister, can come along and reply.

They say that children with lead poisoning show an abnormally high incidence of educational and behavioural disturbances, such as hyperactivity, and that other research shows that workers in the lead industry are generally prone to feelings of hostility and depression more than people in other industries.

I ask the minister if his ministry possibly could undertake such a project to check the blood for lead concentration to see if there actually is the same type of correlation in the Province of Ontario as has been indicated in studies in England by the learned gentlemen that I have mentioned.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, it certainly brings up an interesting aspect of lead poisoning. As the hon. member is aware, we are neither equipped nor do we have the financial resources to get into the research field. He's also aware that lead is a substance that is being researched rather extensively at the present time.

I'd be most interested in the findings of these researchers. I don't think any of them really have come up with any concrete evidence to prove any of the points that have been mentioned. They have suggested, at least in the reports I have seen, that it would be a possibility that many other substances also could cause changes, as they have suggested here.

As far as lead itself is concerned, I see no reason why we couldn't look into what would be involved at the time of the commitment examination, and, providing it wasn't too expensive, I suppose we could go ahead and have the blood levels done. Probably it would be more interesting to those researchers who are developing this view at the present time to correlate the information to help them.

Certainly I would be delighted to look into it, but I don't want anyone to get the impression that we're going to do this type of complete analysis and examination on every individual who comes in. It would be just too much to expect.

Mr. B. Newman: I can understand that, Mr. Minister, but when we go through the estimates of various ministries in the course of the year, we find all kinds of moneys allocated for every type of exotic study you can imagine. If there is some correlation between lead and the unusual behaviour of an individual, in the long run it would be money well spent. Even if you started on a small scale or get the results of the studies by the two gentlemen from Europe, it would be to our advantage.

Mr. Chairman: Item 2 carried? Carried. Are there any other items in vote 1401 for discussion?

Mr. Lawlor: I don't know how I can fit this in, but perhaps with a little indulgence it might be discussed under item 3, plan-

ning and support services. In your report, you mentioned that the House of Concord, the Salvation Army house, was being acquired. That's a pretty old building, isn't it? Could you give us a bit more information about those plans and what is involved there?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, we have been having discussions with the Salvation Army on the possible use of the House of Concord at the present time as more of a temporary measure to help us alleviate the situation at the Don Jail in which they would operate it much like an overgrown CRC, you might say, for selected individuals who don't need any special supervision, people who are serving short terms of maybe a month or two months.

Mr. Lawlor: There is a lot of money going to have to be spent on that building.

Hon. Mr. Potter: We are not talking about buying it. We are talking about buying service from them.

Mr. Lawlor: It is going to have to have renovations though.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I doubt it very much. I think it can be used without that. We are not putting any money into it, I can assure you.

Mr. Chairman: Is item 3 carried?

Mr. Lawlor: Just one other thing, the mention of the Don Jail perennially in these estimates brings up the perennial question of what on earth are we doing with it. What are your plans in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Potter: The old section of the Don Jail, hopefully, will be destroyed. I understand there is a group of people around here now who don't like to see old jails or old mental hospitals or anything else destroyed. I think that we can keep them for people to look at.

Mr. Ruston: Tear it down.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Potter: As far as I am concerned, the old part will be removed. As the hon. members are aware, the new section can be used, and undoubtedly in time we will have some new construction there to supplement it.

Mr. Lawlor: Has the minister any time scale? When is this going to be done?

Hon. Mr. Potter: You are aware that the new facilities, at both the east and the west end, are started. It will be next year

before they are finished. Until they are finished we can't take the pressure off the Don Jail so that we can make the necessary changes there. Just as fast as the building goes up, we'll make changes.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister says in about a year and a half maybe.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I would think so.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3 carried. Is there any other discussion on vote 1401?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Under section 7, if I may; I just couldn't let this one go by, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member for Essex-Kent made some comments concerning the terrific increase in the budget for information services and about putting out pamphlets. I would like him to come down some day and to show him what information services do in our ministry. Putting out the odd pamphlet is really intended for persons like himself who know very little about the system; we would like to let them know what goes on.

Mr. Ruston: I know what is doing.

Hon. Mr. Potter: At the same time, there has been an increase of \$682,000 this year in the estimates for information services. Of this \$682,000—now write this down so you make sure you have it straight—\$87,000 is provided for the increase in salaries and wages that were granted to the civil service; \$13,000 is related to the increase in employee benefits; \$2,000 to cover inflationary price increases in accommodation and meals; \$23,000 to cover inflationary increases and to provide additional services; \$534,000, which is the one the hon. member should be interested in, is the provision for the United Nations Congress which is to be held in Toronto in September and October, 1975.

The United Nations Congress is being hosted by both the federal and the provincial governments, of which we are picking up, apparently, 25 per cent of the cost up to a maximum of \$534,000. We expect to have over 3,000 people from all over the world in attendance.

Another \$23,000 is to cover inflationary price increases in supplies and equipment. You can see, Mr. Chairman—and I think all members will agree—that this was warranted. I am sure the hon. member didn't or wasn't suggesting for one minute that the increases in wages for the civil servants weren't warranted.

Mr. Ruston: I never said that at any time, Mr. Chairman. I would think that the increase that was given to the civil service, especially in the Ministry of Correctional Services, was well needed. I have known this for a long time, because I have been very close to a number of the people who worked there. But when I see \$500,000 going for one provision and the large increase in services, naturally I am concerned. I am still concerned about this \$534,000 for this conference. Maybe the minister can explain who is going to be here. That still seems to me to be one hell of a lot of money.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I couldn't agree with you more. It is one hell of a lot of money, but it's a conference which was planned some years ago as an annual conference by the United Nations. Some years ago the federal government, with the assistance of this government agreed that we would host it this year. It is held in various countries in the world. This year it is being held in Toronto.

I think that we should be very proud that this conference is coming to Ontario. It will probably be the last time it will be held here for a good many years, when you consider every nation in the world is represented. We expect to have a total of around 3,000 people here, of whom at least 1,500 will be official delegates from many nations in the world. Personally, it is a lot of money, but I think it is money well spent.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I wonder if I might have your indulgence. That grant to the department of criminology in Ottawa; what's that about?

Hon. Mr. Potter: That's the MA course they run for us in Ottawa on correctional administration. I referred to it in my opening comments. For students who have graduated with a BA or BSc and intend to go on and do further work in correctional work, they have this special MA course at the correctional centre in Ottawa. We assist them in order to keep the course operating. We take advantage of the flow of graduates from there. We take quite a few graduates every year.

Mr. Lawlor: How long have you been doing that?

Hon. Mr. Potter: About five years.

Mr. Lawlor: You absorb the people into your ministry?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes. Not all of them; some of them go to other provinces. This is a national programme.

Mr. Lawlor: Do many of them go elsewhere?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I wouldn't say many of them go elsewhere, but some of them I suppose. I am sure we don't get all the graduates from the college, because it is a national college.

Mr. Lawlor: The ones you assist, have you any strings tied to the assistance in any way?

Hon. Mr. Potter: If we assist anybody to go there, yes, we do; but we are giving a grant to the college. What happens is that we give a grant to the college to assist them with the programme in order to keep the programme going.

Mr. Chairman: Does the member for Lakeshore wish to continue?

Mr. Lawlor: Are you on this vote?

Mr. B. Newman: I am on staff services.

Mr. Lawlor: I want to say a word on staff training. I don't think we can jump from a spending figure of \$1 million in the estimates last year to practically an extra half million in this particular area without probing a little bit with respect to it. Could you give us an idea of why there is that fairly substantial jump—well, it's a 50 per cent increase.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I sure can, Mr. Chairman. I think the hon. member will appreciate from his knowledge of the institutions in the province the great need for improved staff training. There is the inquiry which is being held at the present time into the Don Jail. The second part of that commission was to investigate staff training as we have been doing in the ministry. We have had our own committee set up and which just reported last month, as a matter of fact, on recommended improvements that we could carry out. But in the meantime, we have made many changes to try to improve the situation as it is within the ministry. We now have area directors of training.

Mr. Lawlor: How many areas?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Six areas were reorganized in 1973 and six regional co-ordinators were appointed to the six regions that the ministry has. In addition to that, we have one person in each institution who is in charge of development and staff training.

We have had an increase in the probation and aftercare training development section in the branch, because we have reorganized this and increased it in size and enlarged the programme. We have developed a staff training handbook, which we have available for all members of the staff, pointing out the aspects of training and development that we expect them to accomplish in this area.

There has been considerable improvement and we feel that it's an area that has to continue to be improved. As I said in my speech, the success of our programme depends upon the quality of the individuals who are involved as correctional officers. We must make sure that it's an ongoing training programme.

There was a time in corrections, as there was in the police force, when an individual was hired and put to work without any training at all. Now we're trying not only to have developed a basic training programme but to have an ongoing training programme, and at the same time, to encourage those who want to go on to get further academic training, to assist them in going back to university or to get specialized degrees. Of course, when we do that, we must insist that when they finish their training they're available to us and don't go somewhere else.

Mr. Lawlor: I wonder if the minister saw in the Globe and Mail this morning a fairly long article—I forget the name of the woman writer—about the Don Jail and about a particular guard who has recently complained to Judge Shapiro about the lack of discipline, the falling apart, the chaos that reigns as a result of the initiation of the investigations before Judge Shapiro. You must have a very considerable problem with respect to a lot of older guards. Their kind of inertia in the system would be, I suspect, perhaps your chief difficulty in trying to change established modes of thinking among the guards.

The Attica situation, as I mentioned a few moments ago, is largely an outgrowth of brutalization of prisoners by guards. That was the way it was. Again, I have inspected enough of these institutions to know that, by and large, that is not the case in Ontario. Nevertheless, it has its spots and its places too, I suspect, as has been revealed in the course of the Don investigation in that single institution. I suspect, to make a quite blunt statement, that the situation at Guelph needs continued looking at as to what has happened there in the past with the record of running gauntlets and various forms of unnecessary and completely venal harshness on the part of those who run the institutions and should know better.

When you instituted that new warden, or whatever you call him there, I got a sense of enormous change. That was $2\frac{1}{2}$ or three years ago, if my time sense remains with me at all. There was a fellow coming from Britain with a very strong—not liberal, thank God, but a humanitarian—instinct with respect to penology and to the workings of the jails.

The problem here is therefore particularly with the older guards. What I would like to know—perhaps if I could get a copy of the handbook for future reference that would be enough to clue me in as to the kind of thing I'm after—is: How much time are they allowed off? Are set periods given to all guards? Are certain guards felt to require greater amounts of training than other guards? The introduction into the system of the new guard—what periods of time, probationary time, and time in the classroom or whatever it is? What is the content of the sessions? What is the mix and who teaches it? What goes on? Why do you think it's an upgrading, simply because you provide the forum? That's not necessarily any indication at all. Maybe on the contrary. What is the linkage with community colleges in this particular regard, particularly with respect to the outlying reformatories of the province?

In other words I want you, for a few moments, to flesh out a bit the justification for that added spending and for the \$1.5 million being spent on this single vote. In any event, I take it that the jump has largely to do with salary increases. It seems to be always the case in the various votes. Just to wind the thing up, at the end of your reply could you give us a bit about the bursaries programme to Indians? I know you mentioned it in your initial statement; I mean the \$31,000 for bursary programmes to Indian students. You mentioned it in your opening statement.

Hon. Mr. Potter: In order to get the information the member requires, I could spend, I suppose, the rest of the session until the end of June telling him about the need for educational programmes for those employed in correctional services and what has gone on as far as our studies are concerned, our training guides and so on. I would be delighted to make the information available to him and he can see for himself, because really there is far too much to get into discussion about it.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, I suspect we could spend the rest of the time on this.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I would be glad to see that this is made available to you, because it is the result of a great deal of work and a great deal of study by those in the ministry who have come up with this. We have a training manual now and, as a matter of fact, nations in Europe and other parts of the world are asking to see it because they want to take advantage of what we have done.

Mr. Lawlor: Is your claim like that of some of your contrères, that you have the finest people, etc.?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, far from that.

Mr. Lawlor: Good for you.

Hon. Mr. Potter: In Correctional Services we have established over the past few years, mainly through my predecessors, as you mentioned here earlier, an international and interprovincial conference that is held on a regular basis in which there is a great deal of input from all countries, and of course we all take advantage of it. In this case we had a training manual that other people thought was good and were interested in, and the other provinces have accepted, but there are many programmes they have suggested that we think are good and are prepared to try.

As a matter of fact, earlier here today a suggestion was made by your critic that we should give consideration to a new programme of restitution. You would almost think that he had read one of our policy papers that was being prepared by my former deputy minister, recommending that we proceed in this manner. You can imagine how dismayed I was in discussions in Europe, particularly in Sweden and Norway, when they listened carefully for half an hour to the proposal and said "Yes, it works. We have been doing this since 1898." So it is not new, but it is successful in many areas.

Mr. Lawlor: You have got the right kind of humility.

Hon. Mr. Potter: These are the types of things we are trying to do. We are trying to upgrade the quality of the people who work with us. We are trying to assist them because we know they have a very difficult job. We know that we can't do it overnight; we know it is going to be a continuing basis. In our service, as in almost any service, and as far as members of the Legislature are concerned, I would venture to say, all of us have a certain length of

time in which we can be useful, and I think that it is the smart man who can realize that his time is up and it is time to leave.

Mr. Reid: Are you resigning?

Mr. Lawlor: You could apply that to the whole government as a collective mentality.

Hon. Mr. Potter: By no means, As I said earlier, in our training programme we have been trying to give people experience in the various institutions. We have been arranging exchange programmes. We have been working closely with the provincial police and having some of our staff switch with provincial policemen and so on, so that each of these people will learn an appreciation of the other man's job and some of the difficulties under which he is operating.

You have heard, as I have on many occasions, policemen complaining that they risk their lives and get a guy in court only to have the judge throw it out, or else he gets sentenced and goes to an institution, where they let him out on TAP. Unless such a policeman is in there and knows what goes on and is able to work with these people, he doesn't appreciate why an individual is let out or why we are trying to make these changes.

You made reference to a great number of the older staff. I wouldn't say there is a great number. There is the odd one, yes, who is still digging in his heels and running interference. But, believe me, there is one hell of a lot less interference in this ministry than there was in my former ministry.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): It's still there.

Hon. Mr. Potter: But I don't think you will disagree that this money is well spent, and I can assure you it is not being wasted. But I would be delighted to make this information available to you; I will give you the whole works.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the minister has answered the question.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 1401 carry? The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: I will be very brief. I have two main questions under information services. How many people does the salaries and wages cover? Can you tell us what they do? And under services, \$573,000, what does that amount cover?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Under information services? What was the other one?

Mr. Reid: Yes, the last item.

Hon. Mr. Potter: There are 14 staff altogether. I want to point this out—only five of them work in information services. The others are librarians; a librarian at headquarters and librarians in various institutions.

I think what you people have to appreciate is that while we have it listed as information services in this ministry that includes the libraries in the various institutions; the books that are supplied there and the librarian.

Mr. Reid: Do you mean the books are part of salaries and wages?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, no, I'm talking about the total budget for information services. But when you're talking about salaries and wages it does include the librarians in the institutions, yes.

Mr. Reid: Okay. I don't want to pursue this too far, but as the minister may know, it's a matter I'm very interested in. How many librarians would that cover? Would the 14 people include the librarians, because what we're looking at, Mr. Minister—

Hon. Mr. Potter: Seven librarians.

Mr. Reid: And seven information officers? Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, five information officers and nine librarians. I'm sorry. It says seven librarians out in the jails, two in the central region and five staff.

Mr. Reid: Five staff. All right. Since your people have that there, that comes to roughly, very quickly, somewhere around \$20,000 apiece for salaries and wages, whether they're librarians or information officers. It seems to me a little high. Could the minister break it down further for us and tell us what the nine librarians in total get and what the five information officers get?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I haven't got the salary scale for them all here, that's quite obvious.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Why not?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I should advise you that in addition to that—those are full-time librarians—we do have part-time people working in some of our smaller institutions.

Mr. Reid: But they're not part of this 14 are they?

Hon. Mr. Potter: They're a part of the money. They are a part of the budget.

Mr. Reid: Excuse me, Mr. Minister, I asked you how many people that \$295,000 covered and you told me 14.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I haven't got the total number of people. I can give you our permanent staff but I haven't got the number of the others. I'll get it for you.

Mr. Reid: I would appreciate that. Can you tell me then today what the \$573,000 in services covers, unless you've given us that already? I may have missed that.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I did mention it. I just answered that a few moments ago.

Mr. Reid: Yes, okay, fine.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, is the minister aware of what the definition of "services" is in the back of the book? It doesn't cover what you're talking about. It should have been put in there under a different item. I would like the minister to look at page J74, because I think if we're going to start with the first ministry not following the description of services as set down by the Ministry of Government Services, we're not going to get correct information if we ask it concerning other ministries.

Mrs. Campbell: Read it to him.

Hon. Mr. Potter: The only reason I can suggest that it was put in information services is because they didn't know where else to put it. I don't know where else you would put it. If you can tell me a better place to put it, we'll put it there.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It would certainly be helpful.

Hon. Mr. Potter: If you people know so much about it go ahead. Do you suggest that we have a special area to put the \$500,000-odd?

Mr. Ruston: It's a one-shot deal. It should have been listed by itself.

Mr. Singer: This is the whole purpose of this exercise.

Mr. Reid: So we can find out what you're doing over there.

Mr. Singer: You are supposed to know these things.

Hon. Mr. Potter: You found out. You weren't here. You haven't any idea of what we're talking about. You just came in at the last. Sit down and shut up.

Mr. Singer: I have been here long enough to know that you don't know what you're talking about.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Potter: We've already explained two or three times what that money was for.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The member for Rainy River has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Potter: There's no sense in saying you don't know what it's going for; you've been told what it's going for. It's immaterial.

Mr. Reid: A further question under services: If we deduct the \$534,000 that leaves \$39,000 for services, which, in relation to the rest of your budgets under the various headings is a very paltry amount. What services are being provided for \$39,000? The people are interested in how their money is being spent. It may come as a surprise.

Mr. Good: We intend to find out. Even if we keep you here for a week.

Hon. Mr. Potter: News letters, printing services. That's it. No outside contracts; it's all done in the ministry.

Mr. Reid: No outside contracts? May I ask one more time, under salaries and wages did I gather from the minister's response that some of the \$295,000 goes to people on contracts? Would it be possible for the minister now to tell me how many people on contract in total you have in the ministry?

Hon. Mr. Potter: We submitted that report in answer to a question you made just recently.

Mr. Reid: My question of seven months ago?

Hon. Mr. Potter: The report has been submitted from my office; I haven't got a copy of it here. We have a fair number of people on contract.

Mrs. Campbell: Doesn't everybody?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Because of the nature of the work we are doing, we have a fair amount of part-time help, particularly in the institutions. We have a lot of part-time physicians and part-time nurses and we have some part-time correctional officers and probation officers in areas to help cover off on

weekends and that sort of thing. All that information is in the answer to your inquiry that you made in the Legislature and we have submitted it.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Chairman, with respect to the recent information in the budget concerning the civil service establishment—I'm attempting to find that now—the public service complement with respect to this ministry is shown on page B18 of the budget as being 5,056 people. Presumably the temporary, part-time and contract people to whom you are referring would not be included in that figure, would they?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, they are not.

Mr. Breithaupt: And did you have an approximate number of the persons who are in those areas and not included in the 5,000 who are on the full-time complement? That might be of help to me.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Altogether we have 242 full-time contract people.

Mr. Reid: How many?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Two hundred and forty-two.

Mr. Breithaupt: How would one find any addition from part-time or casual employment? I presume you would have none in those particular categories?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Casual employment?

Mr. Breithaupt: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes we have about 900 or so, in round figures.

Mr. Breithaupt: Nine hundred of those. And are there any under the part-time category?

Hon. Mr. Potter: That's what I was referring to.

Mr. Breithaupt: Your casual figure is the one you used?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, part-time, and I'm talking about 242 full-time.

Mr. Breithaupt: Accordingly, then, between those two figures there would be some 1,100 or so who are beyond the actual civil service complement in the ministry?

Hon. Mr. Potter: It all depends on how you would interpret it, I suppose. Some of these part-time people would work one or two hours a week.

Mr. Breithaupt: I understand that. I'm just wondering about the people who might be involved.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes.

Mr. Breithaupt: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 1401 carried?

Vote 1401 agreed to.

On vote 1402:

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1402, are there any comments on any of the items?

Item 1, the member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I use item 1, admittedly, Mr. Chairman, because my remarks again are going to be somewhat wideranging in the area of adult centres. The key note of the address will be: What liaison have you? How extensive is it with the Attorney General's department?

In this set of estimates my concern is largely with policy matters, not the figures particularly. I think it's agreed that however beneficent the institutions may appear to be superficially, they are necessary evils; and that they are, ineluctably, breeding grounds for crime. It just can't be helped if people of the same mentality and disposition are placed together deliberately. Can you imagine anything more fatuous than that 19th century notion, except the 17th century notion?

I mean, the 17th century notion was the business of penitential institutions. They were all monks in monasteries living in seclusion and working out their salvation by prayer and fasting. And there was more fasting than there was prayer, as far as I could figure out.

The whole business of the kind of thing we are doing here today didn't even exist 150 or 200 years ago. There weren't jails in our sense of the word in western civilization. There were holding places, little jails where people would stay or be held pending their trial. But once their trial took place, there wasn't any permanent institution to which they sent them.

They sent them out to the penal colonies to get rid of them, out to Virginia—and smoked Walter Raleigh's tobacco—or off to Australia. They were sent to any spot they could find around the world which was overheated and under-populated.

Or they fined them. One of the favourite tricks was to strip people of all their property. That would sufficiently teach them

a lesson, by George. They wouldn't likely bounce back in a hurry. Of course, the master criminals among them had to find more invidious ways of restoring the lost property.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): They couldn't make 100 per cent on a house in those days.

Mr. Breithaupt: Only the ones that came here.

Mr. Reid: Yes, they went into politics. Federal politics.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, the new phase into which I am going to insert myself would be better done on another day, if the House feels that it is time to rise. I want to talk about a new phase.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, as previously announced we will deal with item 1 on the order paper on Monday. On Tuesday

and Thursday I expect we will return to consideration of the tax bills, as announced previously in the week. Next Friday I will announce in due course.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Before the adjournment, is it expected that we will be able to deal with the Representation Act as well next week, or can the minister give us any idea when that might be called?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It will depend, Mr. Speaker, on the progress of the tax bills that we deal with next week. It is my intention, if that occurs, that we will deal with both of the bills, the election expenses bill and the redistribution bill, if that time is given to us next week, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Breithaupt: Might I suggest that if the tax bills are going to take some time, that it might be worthwhile to consider an evening session next week?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Because of other previous arrangements I haven't yet seen fit to do that, but it is a matter that I certainly will consider. We will start sitting evenings, I would suggest to you, on April 21—that's a week Monday.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to:

The House adjourned at 1 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, April 11, 1975

Inquiry into dump truck operations, statement by Mr. Rhodes	739
Economic prospects, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Deans, Mr. Sargent, Mr. MacDonald	739
University admission requirements, questions of Mrs. Birch: Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Foulds	741
Energy prices, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Reid	742
Youth and the Law programme, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Breithaupt	742
Liquor Licence Act, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Shulman	742
Housing programmes, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Deans, Mr. Singer, Mrs. Campbell	743
Metro Toronto housing, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Deans	745
Rent increases, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Deans, Mr. Singer	745
Oil windfall profits tax, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Sargent	746
Hydro job applications, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Germa	746
Questioning of rape victims, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Singer	746
Loan sharking, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Shulman	747
Thermal generating plant in Atikokan area, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Reid	747
Plutonium hazards, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Burr	748
Non-returnable containers, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. B. Newman	748
Thunder Bay study, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Foulds	748
Acid spill in Pelham township, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Haggerty	749
Moose management, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Foulds	749
Gas rate increase, question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Ruston	750
Gun safety regulations, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Germa	750
Estimates, Ministry of Correctional Services, Mr. Potter	751
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	772



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, April 14, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 14, 1975

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: I recognize the member for Huron.

Mr. J. Riddell (Huron): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At this time I would like to draw your attention and the attention of the members of this House to a very distinguished group of ladies, sitting in both the east and west galleries, who are here from the great riding of Huron. These ladies, Mr. Speaker, arrived at the building around 11 o'clock and were given the customary excellent tour by the tour guides. They were dined at the government cafeteria and now they are in session with us this afternoon to observe, first-hand, democracy in action.

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): How did they like the food?

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): Tell us who they are.

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, I would say that their only disappointment probably is their introduction by a member sitting on this side of the House, but we will endeavour to change that and if they choose to come back next year I will be pleased to introduce them from that side of the House.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): The member must be thinking of crossing the floor.

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, the ladies are representing the Huron Progressive Conservative Ladies Association.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale.

Mr. J. Duksza (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce students and their teacher, Mrs. S. Halloran, from the West Toronto Secondary School who are sitting in the east gallery.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.
The hon. Premier.

PORTRAYAL OF VIOLENCE BY COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I have two relatively brief statements.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Most extraordinary. Welcome home.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, it's welcome home, although in spite of what some people may think, Ottawa is still home. It is still part of the Province of Ontario and, in spite of various reports, I think it will be this government's position that it should stay part of the province. However, that's a subject for another occasion that may upset them across the House a bit.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): What was that all about?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have two brief statements to make. The hon. members will recall that the Speech from the Throne indicated the government's determination to ensure that Ontario's cities and streets remain among the safest and most secure in North America. That determination, I might say, is shared and endorsed by a great majority of our citizens, who have a profound respect for the rule of law and are deeply conscious of the basic decency, civility and tolerance of Ontario society, which are a vital part of the quality of life in this province.

Later in the session, the Provincial Secretary for Justice and Attorney General (Mr. Clement) will be proposing certain measures with respect to this area of public interest and concern. Today I wish to inform the House of the government's initiative in a related matter.

We are establishing a royal commission to inquire into the effects upon society of violence as depicted or portrayed in the communications industry, notably in films and on television, and to recommend to the government of Ontario what steps could be taken to counteract the influence and inhibit the presence of violence in the media.

Mr. Lewis: It has been studied to death.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am pleased to inform the House the hon. Judy LaMarsh has agreed to serve as chairman of the commission.

Mr. Lewis: That is the next best thing to running for Tories, I suppose.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I need not remind the hon. members of the unique qualifications of Miss LaMarsh for such a responsibility. As we know, Mr. Speaker, she has considerable direct experience in and knowledge of the print, television and radio media. At one time, during her distinguished public career, she was the minister responsible to the Parliament of Canada for broadcasting. As a former federal Minister of National Health and Welfare, as a member at the Ontario bar and professor of law, and as a person widely respected and admired for her qualities of common sense, wisdom and judgement, there is no one I can think of in this province more capable of serving in this capacity, and I'm delighted, Mr. Speaker, that she has agreed to do so.

Other members of the commission will be announced, after consultation with the chairman, to enable sittings to commence in May.

Mr. Lewis: We understand if the Liberals come to power they will replace Judy with Dalton.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Public hearings will be held in various locations in the province, starting in September.

Mr. Speaker, the government of Ontario shares the concern of many thoughtful parents and others at the increasing portrayal and exploitation of violence in the commercial entertainment industry. We believe there is a danger to the general society that the continuing and increasing exposure to young or impressionable minds of needless and extreme violence may have a relationship to the manifestation of violence in the community.

At the very least, the continued portrayal of violent acts and conduct in the communications media must desensitize the individual to the sufferings of others and condition the individual to consider violence as an acceptable means of resolving human conflict and differences. I am not impressed by the argument that the casual portrayal of violence does not or could not affect human behaviour. Obviously, television is deemed to influence behaviour. Television advertising for a wide range of products, such as children's toys, non-prescriptive drugs, beer and spirits, and other consumer products is subject to regulation.

While this has been done, it seems little is being done to diminish or restrict the portrayal of violence, or casual brutality and killing, which logic suggests would also have some influence on the minds of impressionable viewers.

One study, reported last summer, indicated that the average child may be exposed to as many as 18,000 television killings by the time the child reaches adolescence.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Some are reruns.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is difficult for me to believe that this would not encourage anti-social behaviour—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): How high does the government have to build that wall to keep out American TV?

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Davis:—since the very fact that it is accepted by society gives it sanction.

I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that there are many causes for lawlessness and crime. That need not deter us from making sure that we do not incite and encourage it by allowing violence to be exploited in the media while, at the same time, trying to contain it through the conventional means of society.

I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that we have limited powers, as a province, to regulate television and radio programming. We do have certain responsibilities with respect to the film industry. But this aside, we have a responsibility as a government to respond to the concern of those we represent—

Mr. Deans: How about building houses?

Hon. Mr. Davis:—and as a government, we are not without influence or the power of persuasion with those who do have the power to act in areas where we do not.

As with so many other public questions, we have two basic options. We can ignore this concern of parents and others and do nothing about it—

Mr. Lewis: But that is what the government is doing.

Mr. Singer: Or?

Hon. Mr. Davis:—or we can give leadership by making a thorough study of the problem, determine what we ourselves might effectively do, and doing it.

Mr. Lewis: That is leadership. That's leadership. It has been studied to death.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I recommend the second option.

The commission will have broad scope and powers to hold public hearings, conduct research, and seek the participation of all who have an interest in this subject. It will be asked to submit a final report within 18 months. The terms of reference—

Mr. Lewis: Well, it is good politics, but it is nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party may not be concerned. This government happens to be concerned about it and we are attempting to do something about it.

Mr. Lewis: It is good politics, but the government has enough studies on which to base action; it doesn't need a royal commission. What a lot of nonsense.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The terms of reference, very briefly Mr. Speaker, are as follows:

First, to study the effects on society of the increasing exhibition of violence in the communications industry.

Second, to determine if there is any connection or a cause and effect relationship between this phenomenon and the incidence of violent crime in society.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, that's ludicrous. Imagine the possibility of that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Third, to hold public hearings to enable groups and organizations, individual citizens and representatives of the industry to make known their views on the subject.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And fourth, to make appropriate recommendations, if warranted, on any measures that should be taken by the government of Ontario, by other levels of government, by the general public and by the industry.

Mr. Lewis: All of which have been made.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should report very briefly—

Mr. Lewis: That's an incredible cop-out.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Order!

Mr. Lewis: I thought he really might do something.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, that's something the opposition's federal friends are—

Mr. Singer: Oh the Liberals, the fellows in Ottawa, it just has to be their fault.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Lewis: Silliest royal commission in years.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Lewis: I am surprised at Judy LaMarsh.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, the member shouldn't be.

Hon. Mr. Crossman: Judy will get to the truth.

An hon. member: Prime Minister LaMarsh.

Mr. Lewis: I don't understand it.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE ON ENERGY

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I want to report briefly to the House on the meetings of Wednesday and Thursday in Ottawa related to the question of the economy, and to the discussion of the cost of energy—

Mr. Lewis: I thought that was coming.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —oil and natural gas. I might say very briefly, Mr. Speaker, the objective of the government—

Mr. Lewis: Why not wait until September?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —of the Province of Ontario was to inform the public of this province and of Canada, on what we believe would be the harmful impact on the economy which an oil and gas price increase would create at this time. We opposed then and will continue to oppose any increase in the price of gas and oil at this time, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that one can very modestly and objectively state that we, to a very great extent, achieved those objectives.

It was also encouraging to note that the Minister of Finance in his presentation recognized many of the points that the Province of Ontario had made earlier in the conference as they relate to the state of the economy and, of course, we were encouraged to hear that the Minister of Finance intends to introduce a budget some time in May.

This will give the federal government an opportunity to relate to the problems of inflation the need to stimulate the economy and—in a constructive sense, of course, Mr. Speaker—we offered several suggestions to the Minister of Finance as to what could be contained in his budget.

I think, Mr. Speaker, and I say this very objectively, that as a result of this conference, more serious consideration will be given to stimulating oil and gas exploration and development through means other than an across-the-board price increase.

We would look forward, Mr. Speaker, to some positive action by the federal government in terms of stimulation. We have recommended that one of the priority areas should be more funding for housing because, following our own approach in the budget, we believe this would be felt, in terms of employment, almost immediately.

We've also suggested ways and means of restoring a climate of investment confidence and redressing some of the imbalances that have been growing among income groups in parts of our own country and among industries, as well as creating more jobs and putting a damper on inflation. In fact what we're saying, Mr. Speaker, is that they should follow, in certain respects at least, the general direction and the thrust undertaken by my colleague the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) in this province when he introduced, a week ago, one of the most positively constructive and enlightened budgets I've had the pleasure of listening to here in this province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would also say to the members of this House, so there is no misunderstanding whatsoever, that while it is not easy for the Province of Ontario at federal-provincial meetings to take a position other than one seeking compromise, Ontario has always, I think in the national interest, demonstrated this capacity. But the Premier felt, and I believe that I speak for the people of Ontario, that the position we took was not a parochial interest; that inflation, the state of the economy, and the effect that an increase in energy price would have on it at this precise moment, was of interest to the total country and not just the citizens of the Province of Ontario.

So, Mr. Speaker, while it was—not uncomfortable; that isn't the way to describe it—it was different, shall we say, than the positions Ontario has traditionally taken, we took our position with the full confidence that we believed it to be in the national interest as well as the interest of the citizens of our province.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Transportation and Communications.

INTERMEDIATE CAPACITY TRANSIT SYSTEM

Hon. J. R. Rhodes (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, it has been some time since I went to Munich to renegotiate a contract for the continuance of the intermediate capacity transit system programme—

Mr. Breithaupt: That's what Chamberlain said.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes:—following the decision of the West German government to discontinue funding to Krauss-Maffei. On Nov. 13 I put before this House the situation as it then stood. I remember the day well and how different were the many reactions to the news that I brought.

Mr. Breithaupt: When the wheel fell off.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: At that time I explained our intent in terms of how government proposed to proceed with the programme to develop an intermediate capacity transit system to meet the needs of Ontario municipalities. I indicated that the Ontario Transportation Development Corp., which was to take over management of the complete development programme, was to provide me with regular reports during the transition and evaluation. I wish to make a statement today about their progress in this work, but before doing so I would like to review with the House the objectives of this programme, for we must begin with the objectives.

To many, August, 1975, the date when a research and development demonstration system was to be put into operation at the CNE grounds, became the date for a spectacular. What has been missed is the recognition of the original engineering challenge and the accomplishment that had been performed in the K-M programme, which was intended to be demonstrated at the CNE. Contrary to previous opinions, a substantial amount of progress was achieved and will turn out to be a major step toward delivering an intermediate capacity system. The cancellation of the CNE demonstration does not mean that GO-Urban is dead, regardless of what the headlines may have said in November. What it does mean is that we have had to change course to meet the programme objective; and that objective, quite simply stated, is to be able to provide municipalities with a tested, commercially viable, intermediate capacity transit system, meeting user, community and

operator requirements, and produced to the greatest extent possible under Canadian leadership with Canadian resources.

I would like to say again that our evaluations in the last several weeks, which have been directed toward ensuring the continued feasibility of meeting that objective, leaves no doubt in my mind that with the exception of one criterion this objective can be reached. The one exception is time. We have lost some time in this process, and that is regrettable.

I would now like to report our progress in dealing with the acquisition of data from the Krauss-Maffei trans-urban programme as it relates to the intermediate capacity transit system programme being carried out by the Ontario Transportation Development Corp. Since last November, our staff in Munich have been receiving and reviewing technical data and reports related to both the trans-urban and transit development system programmes. All data connected with the TDS programme was provided, in accordance with an agreed schedule, prior to the end of February. Data from the trans-urban programme is being provided, in accordance with the termination agreement, and will be completed by July, 1975.

In the meantime, local MTC staff have received and reviewed all technical data associated with the facilities which were to be built at the CNE. This valuable research and development information has aided the Ontario Transportation Development Corp. in defining the continued course of action toward the development of the production-model intermediate capacity transit system.

In order to maintain and continue the substantial progress which we had achieved in automatic train control, OTDC has retained Standard Electric Lorenz of Stuttgart (an ITT subsidiary), who were responsible for that sub-system in the CNE contract, for ongoing use in our future development programme. This includes testing now under way at the Krauss-Maffei test track using specially equipped test vehicles. A number of engineers from ITT Canada have been active, from the outset, in the SEL programme in Stuttgart.

The costs to date for this continued effort, including our estimates of both ministry and OTDC overheads, come to approximately \$275,000. This covers data acquisition, technology review and programme administration. In addition, OTDC has committed \$304,000 to carry on the automatic train control technology programme, which I have just mentioned. These figures are current estimates

of all expenditures incurred during the period since Nov. 12.

While this consolidation and review of the Krauss-Maffei programme is being completed, OTDC is preparing an operational requirement document for the intermediate capacity transit system. It is also forming up the industrial team, which will conduct the future stages of the development programme in Canada leading to the completion of an the K-M programme.

A Canadian system development contractor is being selected, responsible to Ontario Transportation Development Corp., who will be the prime contractor. This system development contractor will co-ordinate the endeavours of the group of sub-contractors, including many of those formerly involved in the K-M programme.

A major effort is being made during the negotiation of such contracts to increase the Canadian content in research, development and manufacture. This emphasis is being undertaken upon the advice of the board of directors of the OTDC, and of their technical advisory board. I am advised that the corporation will make a further announcement on this within a matter of weeks, and they will provide continual reports on the progress of the project to this government.

As it is now proposed, the ICTS development programme will be divided into five phases, or more properly four, since phase 5 is the provision of production tooling by industry and the installation of passenger-carrying transit service.

Phase 1, which will begin with selection of the development contractor, will include complete data acquisition and programme definition activities. An important product of this phase will be an operational requirement statement, which will be co-ordinated with transit operators, such as the TTC, and with municipal planning authorities. This work will be completed by July, 1975. The TTC has already agreed to assist the corp. in this phase and future phases of the programme.

Phase 2 will be devoted to continued concept development and preliminary design of a prototype system, incorporating as much of the past work as possible. This phase will also provide detailed estimate of system costs, both operational and capital, in relation to current alternative intermediate capacity transit system technologies.

These two phases will take approximately 13 months. The result will be technical specifications, preliminary design, programme plans, schedules, and cost estimates on which to base the decision to proceed with the con-

struction of prototype vehicles and test facilities.

I have authorized the Ontario Transportation Development Corp. to conduct phases 1 and 2, at an expenditure ceiling of \$6.1 million. In addition to forming the basis for phase 3 of the programme, this work will significantly advance the technology for ICTS and conventional rapid-transit.

This programme is being integrated with parallel programmes in conventional transit being conducted within OTDC, such as the light-rail project. The results from phases 1 and 2 will form the basis of the detail design, manufacture and test of prototype hardware, which comprises phase 3, estimated to last 2½ years, including operational test activities.

Phase 3 will entail the use of a test facility to be located in a suburban location, which may have potential for future revenue service.

Phase 4 will include the manufacturing and test of pre-production vehicles which will be constructed in limited quantity, using soft tooling, to enable the preliminary testing of the revenue service production model. The operational test track in this instance can be a length of intermediate capacity transit system guideway constructed for a specific operating system. This pre-production and test phase is expected to last 18 months. The final element of the programme would be commercial production of systems for passenger carrying transit service.

When the industrial team has been selected and has had the opportunity to refine the schedules and proposed programme organization prepared by OTDC, it will be possible to confirm the various programme time-spans and to supply detailed programme cost data.

A recent report of the Metro Toronto transportation plan review has indicated a strong need for an intermediate capacity system in Toronto. During the last three months, our evaluation has confirmed to us that an intermediate capacity transit system which would provide to Ontario communities an alternative form of mobility to the automobile has become more and more important.

All municipal studies on urbanization, on energy consumption and environmental issues have convinced us that, in addition to the LRV currently being developed by Ontario Transportation Development Corp., the need for innovative intermediate capacity transit is imperative. The corporation will be continually reviewing the mag-lev aspects of the intermediate capacity transit system and will continue to research mag-lev technology.

I am not closing out the option of linear motor propulsion and a wheeled suspension system in combination, or other suitable suspension systems. The corporation's technical advisory board reviewed the present situation during this evaluation and also reviewed what has been known as the tiger team report. Their findings have encouraged us to carry on with the option of mag-lev and to conclude that the proposal put before us by OTDC to consider a number of alternative suspension systems, including mag-lev, is the most appropriate line of progress. The technical choice of the sub-systems, magnetic or wheeled, will be ultimately an engineering decision. It must, however, conform to the needs of the municipalities.

This ministry has a commitment to provide an effective intermediate capacity transit system to municipalities and to transit operators. Transit operators and municipalities may gain confidence from this activity, for I am encouraging them to participate with the OTDC. It will be the customers' requirements that will have to be met. This innovative intermediate capacity transit system will be one of the options available to Ontario municipalities to provide their public with the finest public systems in the world.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, does the minister have copies of that, perhaps in English?

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Does he have anything in plain English?

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): And does he have a dictionary to go with those terms?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, there will be copies made available. If the hon. members opposite don't understand it, we will have a translation.

Mr. Renwick: Please do. That goes for the public of Ontario as well.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions, the member for Kitchener.

PORTRAYAL OF VIOLENCE BY COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I have a question of the Premier: I am wondering, in response to his statement with respect to the royal commission whether he can advise us how the report of the commission will be helpful in dealing with violence in an area which is not his particular responsibility, when in fact his Attorney General can't deal with violence in hockey which is his responsibility?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have always found the Attorney General of this province able to deal quite properly with any problem within his area of jurisdiction. He does it extremely well, and the member for Kitchener knows it.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: Though I have the most immense respect for Judy LaMarsh and so on and so on, why is the Premier establishing a royal commission some months hence to analyse the impact of violence on television on kids, on society and so on, when there are at least half a dozen to a dozen different North American studies which have chronicled it to death and indicated what might be done? While it is nice to have another royal commission, there is absolutely no point to it—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: —in terms of what we already know.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the leader of the New Democratic Party, unlike the official opposition, sometimes is a shade contradictory. While I recognize the official position of the New Democratic Party supports economic and cultural nationalism and while its leader likes to see this within our school system, he still, to a great extent, on many issues depends—

Mr. Lewis: There are many Canadian studies.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There are not many Canadian reports. Basically, the documentation and the study have been done in the United States, and he knows it.

Mr. Lewis: We don't know it.

Mr. Renwick: He's fooling the people.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This will be an Ontario study related to the needs of this province in a way to create a public interest that we think will be extremely helpful.

Mr. Lewis: This is an election stunt. He is not serious.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If the member doesn't like it, say so.

Mr. Lewis: I thought he was serious about this.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I believe the public of this province will support it.

Mr. Renwick: Will she study the violence in the National Hockey League and the WHA?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview, a supplementary.

Mr. Singer: Could the Premier tell us what possible recommendation an Ontario royal commission could make that would have a real effect on the National Broadcasting Co., the Columbia Broadcasting System, or any of the other American television sources, insofar as their portrayal of what they think is appropriate?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I recognize that once again the official position of the Liberal Party on an issue of this kind would be to sit back and do nothing, because that's the kind of people they are.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The position here is, we know that we have limited legal power in areas of television—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: For instance, the Prime Minister of Canada's language.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —but we also know that we have a responsibility in this province—

Mr. Breithaupt: Switch channels.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —to the parents and others who have a concern. It can be, through public interest and persuasion, that perhaps something can be accomplished. That's the route we're going. We know the route those people would be going, and that is to nowhere.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): When is the Premier going to clean up the violence in organized labour?

Mr. Singer: The Premier has to claim modesty, as it has been so frequently said.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Liberals would do nothing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And not even do that well.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Breithaupt: We wouldn't do it as often as the Tories do, though.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They are doing it perpetually.

Mr. Lewis: If this isn't a sham, if the government is really serious about it—

Hon. Mr. Davis: We are.

Mr. Lewis: All right. If the government is serious about it, then why doesn't it announce the appropriation of some additional funds for OECA to provide it with the possibility of creating alternative programmes? That's the Ontario Educational Communications Authority. It produces television shows. The Premier may have heard of it; the government established it. Why doesn't he provide it with money to provide alternative programming, in prime time as well as Saturday mornings, to offset the violence of which he speaks, rather than just another royal commission which will mean nothing?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The member knows who controls the content.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I recognize that as being a constructive suggestion from the leader of the New Democratic Party, but I also say to him it is totally unrealistic.

Mr. Lewis: There is more than just Saturday mornings.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am delighted that he now has such great respect for the educational television in this province. It happens to be probably the finest we will find in North America, and I know that he agrees with that.

Mr. Lewis: Then use it to provide alternatives, but don't have bogus royal commissions.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We could increase funding, but I just say, with great respect, Mr. Speaker, that we don't see that as being the answer. If the answer is not to come to grips with some other aspects of it, then I say we won't find one. We're looking for it, and I believe this royal commission will be helpful in the process.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Supplementary.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We'll allow one more supplementary. This is developing into a debate and taking a lot of time. The hon. member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Singer: Shame. Let the record show what the Minister of Transportation and Communications has to say about OECA.

Mr. Lewis: They've done nicely on Saturday mornings.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, they have.

Mr. Good: I have a supplementary of the Premier.

Mr. Singer: Let the record show what the Minister of Transportation and Communications just said about OECA. Put it on the record.

Mr. Good: In conjunction with the Premier's sudden interest in violence on TV and in light of the fact that the government does have control over movie censorship in the Province of Ontario, what steps has it taken to curb violence shown in movies in the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am talking about both, in terms of the royal commission.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): The government has the power now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think it's important that there be a thorough public discussion and airing of points of view, as they relate to the amount and the kinds of violence in movies as well as in television, and this will be a part of the commission's responsibility.

Mr. Lewis: This is a stunt and not a very credible stunt either.

Mr. Ruston: An election ploy.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener, further questions?

INTERMEDIATE CAPACITY TRANSIT SYSTEM

Mr. Breithaupt: I have a question with respect to the statement—what I was able to understand of it—from the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Can the minister advise us, as part of the background for that statement, whether there have been any formal contractual arrangements entered into with Alberta or with the McDonnell Douglas Corp.? Or are those still only gentlemen's agreements to use the soft tooling or whatever else they might have lying around when the time comes?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, at the present time, regarding the original arrangements made by those involved in the original programme—including McDonnell Douglas, Alberta and the interest that was shown by the federal government—at this stage, the Ontario Transportation Development Corp. is renegotiating the whole position with other interested industrial partners, if you will, as well as with Alberta and with the federal government. These discussions are going on now.

Mr. Breithaupt: If I might ask just one supplementary, Mr. Speaker: With respect to that figure of \$275,000 that the minister gave to us, are those costs to the taxpayer including all of the public relations work and costs that have been associated with the trips to Germany and the costs of having our people over there since May 1, 1973?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, Mr. Speaker, the amounts I am talking about here are amounts which have been incurred since the cancellation of the contract with Krauss-Maffei.

Mr. Breithaupt: Can the minister get them for me with respect to the public relations expenditures from May 1, 1973?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Those figures may be available. I will have to look into it and see. I don't know.

Mr. Singer: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Could the minister tell us whether my understanding is correct that all the ministry has been able to rescue out of the great Krauss-Maffei experiment is the possibility of an automatic system to control trains?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, Mr. Speaker, that is not correct. I think the member knows there are a number of components which were being developed in that programme including the type of guideway that would be used, the type of vehicle that would be used in the system, the propulsion system and the command and control for the automated trains. All of these components were part of the experiment which was going on and the development programme which was going on, including the preliminary work carried out for the development of the magnetic levitation suspension system.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary, is there any possibility that we will see, within our lifetime, any train run by magnetic levitation?

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): That depends on how long the member lives.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Not having any control over the Maker on the question of the member, I would say that probably in my lifetime yes, indeed, because I intend to be around longer than the member.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Scarborough West have a supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: I take it that all the minister really said in the statement is that for another 13 months, beyond the six months he

has already used, which will make it something more than 1½ years, the minister is going to study a continued concept development and the possibility of a prototype design without any guarantee at all? In other words, if I understand it, this statement simply says we are continuing the conceptual stuff around Krauss-Maffei without any guarantee of future development?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I should say the relationship of the contract with Krauss-Maffei is over.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That was ended some time back. What we are now proposing to do and will go ahead and do is to continue the development programme of an intermediate capacity transit system. A great deal was made at the time, and has been made ever since, of the question of magnetic levitation. I am saying that from the information we have been able to receive, the technical data we have been able to gather, we find there is every real possibility of being able to develop magnetic levitation as a suspension system.

I am also saying, as I have said in the statement and have said before, there are other suspension systems which can be fitted into the various components we have already developed, to lead to the development of a much-needed intermediate capacity transit system. This programme is to continue that development programme.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York-Forest Hill.

Mr. Givens: But the minister was supposed to salvage something from that debacle. He says it is going to cost \$6.1 million and 13 months to give the government prototype vehicles. What happened to the vehicles that Spar Aerospace was supposed to have developed? They were supposed to have been prototype vehicles. Didn't the minister salvage those?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The member, first of all, is erroneous when he says that Spar developed a prototype vehicle. Spar was developing and has developed a linear motor; the best in the world, by the way.

Mr. Givens: Did he salvage that motor?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That motor is part of the component. Yes, it is there. We know that's there. The vehicle itself was developed at Krauss-Maffei in its plant and we have

found that is a usable vehicle. We are going to continue to develop this programme to put the components together. The major problem has been in the suspension system and that was the mag-lev. We are going to attempt to change the suspension system, if need be, but many of those components are there and they are real and can be improved upon.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: One final supplementary on this question.

Mr. Germa: Can I ask the minister what other type of suspension the ministry has been experimenting with other than mag-lev?

Mr. Singer: A whole new system—wheels.

Mr. Ruston: They're going to use round wheels.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We have been experimenting with the addition of wheels to the linear propelled cars—

Mr. Lewis: Come on. Not really for \$6.1 million?

Interjections by hon. members..

Mr. Lewis: It costs \$6.1 million for the wheel.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —and motors. We have also looked at the—

Mr. Lewis: That is the most expensive wheel ever bought.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that if the leader of the New Democratic Party had been around when the first wheel was invented he would have attempted to say it wouldn't work. There is no point in trying to answer.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kitchener.

MAPLE MOUNTAIN PROJECT

Mr. Breithaupt: While we are talking about recycling, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could ask the Minister of Industry and Tourism how his Ontario Place North is coming along. What can he tell us about the Maple Mountain project?

Mr. Lewis: A big wheel in the cabinet.

Hon. C. Bennett (Minister of Industry and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, as I explained to the House on more than one occasion, the

entire Maple Mountain project is presently in the hands of the legal authorities. The Attorney General—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: It's a great thing to be able to sit there and laugh at a serious answer because it was not this government that put the claim against the proposal of advancing Maple Mountain.

Mr. Lewis: No, it was the member for Timiskaming (Mr. Havrot).

Hon. Mr. Bennett: It came from the native people. We have respected their claim. It's with the Attorney General and the solicitors for the Indian groups and we are looking into it.

Mr. Lewis: About 13 months.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: When there is a decision made from that aspect of the programme we will then give it further consideration as to whether we're going to advance it or not.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Should we take away their rights?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kitchener.

EMERGENCY MEASURES ORGANIZATION

Mr. Breithaupt: I have one further question, Mr. Speaker, of the acting Solicitor General with respect to the emergency measures situation. Perhaps the minister could first of all explain if the term that is being used in the press is "lead ministry" or "lead ministry"? There seems to be a difference in view.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I say to the member for Kitchener that is one of the unfunniest remarks he has made.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): You can certainly tell the Liberal leader is away today.

Mr. Breithaupt: Secondly, if it is "lead ministry," as I rather expect it is, will there really be any saving, when these other things are taken care of, to match what he proposes to save for the \$1.5 million by getting rid of the emergency measures programme?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Even his own members don't grasp it. They didn't smile.

An hon. member: The member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) is smiling.

Mr. Lewis: He will laugh on cue.

Hon. J. T. Clement (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Mr. Speaker, the emergency measures decision was brought about—as you know, the federal government subsidized the programme, I believe, to the extent of \$1.5 million per year; that sum was matched by the provincial government. We were advised some time ago that financial support was to be withdrawn by the federal government. We reviewed this situation and came to the conclusion that we, likewise, should withdraw from the programme.

The concept that the member for Kitchener mentioned is the “lead ministry” concept. I gave a statement the other day in the form of a news release—perhaps the hon. member has not seen it; I will make it available to him—which demonstrates how the operation is to work. It is really a financial consideration made at one point in Ottawa by virtue of their withdrawing from their participation in it and we, likewise, have had to withdraw from it too.

If the member would like a copy of that I will see that one is made available to him.

Mr. Breithaupt: I would appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

PORTRAYAL OF VIOLENCE BY COMMUNICATION INDUSTRY

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier, just out of curiosity. How much is that royal commission going to cost? What are the payment arrangements for the commissioner and for others who attend?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the commissioner will be paid a per diem. I would assume the commission will have counsel. There will be a certain amount of research work and the period of time is about, as I say hopefully, 18 months. I can't give a guesstimate. I will try to do so and work it out for the hon. member, but I can only say, in our view, the investment will be very worthwhile. I will try to get an accurate figure if I can.

Mr. Lewis: Has the Premier resolved on the per diem?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think it will be the standard per diem. I believe it is \$225 or \$250 per day for the chairman. It's something in that neighbourhood.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier doesn't know?

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary. The member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: May I ask the Premier how he can justify a study like this when, as has already been pointed out, his government hasn't taken any steps to deal with actual and real violence in the hockey rinks in the province—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question had to do with the cost of the investigation.

Mr. Reid: —and why isn't there a commission on violence in the construction industry?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It's a different question.

The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Reid: The Premier has an answer to the question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I'd be delighted to answer the hon. member. When it comes to the question of hockey violence this government initiated, once again, a study—

Mr. Reid: Have any charges been laid?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and I would tell the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, the study done by William McMurtry as it relates to violence in hockey at the amateur level has had a tremendous impact in this province—not only here, in other provinces of Canada.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reid: And what did he say about the professional leagues? He said that professional leagues were setting the example. The government hasn't done anything about that. No charges have been laid.

Mr. Singer: Did the Premier see the game on TV yesterday?

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Reid: Not one charge has been laid.

Mr. Singer: Look at the violence in that game.

An hon. member: Played in Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Premier a further question?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Does the member for Scarborough West have further questions?

Order, please.

The member for Scarborough West.

Interjections by hon. members.

OIL AND GAS PRICES

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Premier a further question? Since he must recognize that the price of oil and natural gas will inevitably be going up in the next three months whether done by consensus or by the federal government through legislation, effective presumably in July, what measures does Ontario intend to take to cushion the impact for the consumers of this province?

Some hon. members: Call an election!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'm not as prepared as the leader of the New Democratic Party to say that it is that inevitable. As I pointed out when I was asked this question by him in a little different way—was it last Monday or a week ago Friday?—when he asked whether there would be legislation or a policy of limiting, controlling or rolling back prices, I pointed out that if in fact a price was imposed, a lot would depend on the manner or what form it would take—whether there would be further royalties or a federal tax and what the amounts would be. But, Mr. Speaker, I think it isn't helpful to deal with it in a hypothetical way at this time. I can't answer the question because our position is opposed to it.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, is the Premier arguing that there will be no price increase? I understand that may be Ontario's stand. The Premier keeps on using the words "at this time" and "at the moment." Suppose he continues to do that, is he arguing that there won't be a price increase? Surely he recognizes that what the Prime Minister said was that there would be a price increase regardless, and shouldn't the Premier be suggesting plans now to counteract it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I said, and I hope I said it very clearly, that we were opposed to a price increase. I have not said, nor am I saying, the federal government will not impose a price increase; I don't know.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

HAZARDS IN KITCHENER AREA PLANTS

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Health. Has his ministry's occupational health

branch looked into or had contact with the B. F. Goodrich Co.'s various plants in Kitchener-Waterloo, the Uniroyal plants, and specifically the Morval-Durofoam plant, and has it made any reports to the minister on the use of chemicals and other substances?

Hon. F. S. Miller (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, no specific reports have been made to me on those plants.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Minister of Labour if the industrial safety branch of his ministry has made any inspections recently of the tire and commercial products division of B. F. Goodrich, Uniroyal and the Morval-Durofoam plant in Kitchener-Waterloo?

Hon. J. P. MacBeth (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I have a little information here dealing with the matter which the House may be interested in. The Ministry of Labour's industrial safety branch, in co-operation with the Ontario Federation of Labour, has drawn up special guidelines for registering complaints on industrial safety. I have a copy of those here if the hon. member would like to see them.

Every complaint made under this procedure is investigated fully by the branch. During the fiscal year ended March 31, 1975, the branch received 195 union complaints from the Kitchener area. Not one single complaint came from any of the unions representing the workers at these three plants. Unions, too, have a clear responsibility to ensure the safety of their members.

The industrial safety branch inspects plants regularly; but if hazards are discovered in the interim, it is up to the union to try to eliminate them in co-operation with management. If it is unable to do so, it should use the machinery provided in the agreements with the Ontario Federation of Labour.

There were some specific questions resulting, I believe from the member's visit in Kitchener. I have answers to them, and rather than take the House's time I'll pass them over.

Mr. Lewis: I have one supplementary: Could I use this occasion to ask the minister to have the industrial safety branch look into the condition of ventilation, dust, fumes and chemical usages in the Morval-Durofoam plant and report back as to whether any directions are issued?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Shall do, sir.

Mr. Lewis: Thank you.

SALES TAX EXEMPTIONS

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a question of the provincial Treasurer? In the lockup preceding the budget, one of his senior officials indicated to us that a job estimate had been made of the impact of the removal of the sales tax from production machinery and equipment. Can the minister indicate to the House the job impact that he anticipates in the first year and successive years?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: Why does the Treasurer regard information like that as private information, since it is part of the basis for a particular tax policy change?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I don't necessarily regard it as private information. I went into the design of that specific policy, simply regard it as one of the inputs which and I see no reason to table it here particularly.

Mr. Lewis: I want to understand this. The minister doesn't see any reasons for a tax remission to the corporations of \$108 million in one year and \$410 million by 1977 to produce jobs? He feels no compulsion to share with the Legislature the study of the number of jobs to be produced; that is, in his hands now? He would understand, would he not, that we would regard that with some suspicion? Surely it is part of the debate. But he won't table it? The minister won't indicate to us any prediction or number at all?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, we have produced such predictions before. The hon. member completely refuses to believe them. What is the point?

Mr. Lewis: Well, try me again—try me again. Don't give up so quickly.

Mr. Speaker: Any questions?

Mr. Lewis: Does the material exist, as we were told? Do the material and jobs exist? The government is putting \$400 million away to create jobs. It has a study which shows how many jobs will be created. Why doesn't the minister share that with the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, after the endorsements of the UAW, I really didn't think it was necessary.

Mr. Lewis: It wasn't the UAW—the minister corrected that the other day. He admitted he was wrong. How many jobs from that programme? He knows how many it's predicated upon. We are asking him how many.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the art of forecasting is very imprecise.

Mr. Lewis: The art of evasion is not so precise.

Mr. Singer: Modestly and objectively it is, let me say.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The hon. member would recognize one kind of figure as being genuine—the number of people he could put on the public dole in one way or another, and that would be a job of some sort or another. We propose to stimulate the economy in different ways.

Mr. Lewis: I am not going to take that. How many jobs? Why is he hiding the figures? Why doesn't he table the study in the Legislature? It is \$400 million of public money, and the minister won't account for it.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. This has developed into a debate. Are there any further questions?

Mr. Lewis: No jobs, that is why—not a job to be created.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Does the hon. member have further questions?

Mr. Lewis: Not a job—throwing money away.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. provincial secretary has the answer to a question asked previously.

GRAND RIVER FLOOD INQUIRY

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, on March 24 the hon. member for Kitchener asked the following question:

With respect to the Grand River flooding last spring and the inquiry that has taken place, can the minister advise as to when we might expect to receive the report of the inquiry commission?

I have been advised that the commissioner has reported that his report will be out in the next few weeks, and certainly within a month.

May I answer another question at the same time, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Certainly.

FACILITIES ON THE TRENT-SEVERN SYSTEM

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On March 26, the hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. R. G. Hodgson) asked the following question:

I wonder if the minister could take a look at the 1906 water agreement between the federal and provincial governments in relation to this matter and see whether that is not the vehicle for determination of fees and lockages through the canals?

Mr. Speaker, I would advise that the order in council dated July 22, 1905, covering the transfer to the federal Minister of Railways and Canals, does not make reference to fees and charges. However, item 2 of the order in council referring to the operation of the canal reads as follows:

That the Dominion government shall assume, operate and keep in good repair and condition for all time, the lock and three swing bridges at Lindsay, the lock at Balsam River and the lock and swing bridge at Youngs Point, together with all minor works in connection with the maintenance and operation of the locks and bridges at Lindsay, Balsam Lake and Youngs Point, relieving the province from all expense and responsibility in connection therewith.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the canal system is operated by the federal Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, and the decision to impose fees was a decision of the federal government, not the Province of Ontario. Indeed, the Ontario government was not even consulted in this matter.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland South.

PORT COLBORNE TUNNEL

Mr. Haggerty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Due to the slow response and full employment in the Niagara region, in particular to the construction industry, can the minister indicate to the Legislature the possible date of announcing the commencement of the construction date of the tunnel project in the city of Port Colborne?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot give a date as to the commencement of that project. As the hon. member knows, there will be a number of discussions that have to go on between my ministry and the federal Ministry of Transport before any decision could be made.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

HOME BUYER GRANT

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Housing, if I can get his attention for a moment. Can the Minister of Housing provide for the House any statistics based on the average sale price and the income level required in order to qualify for a mortgage, or any other statistics based on income levels in the Province of Ontario, to show how many people earning less than \$10,000 a year will qualify for the government's \$1,500 first-time purchase homeowner grant?

Hon. D. R. Irvine (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, we discussed this last week in some detail. I told the member before that it's impossible to come up with definitive answers as to how many people in a particular area will qualify. If he read the papers on the weekend, he would have noticed that there are some people who could qualify with an income ranging from \$9,400 or less for a home. It's not possible to come up at this time with a definitive answer to the question he is asking. For the fifth time, I have said that.

Mr. Deans: Has the minister conducted a study of the average price of the average house sold in the Province of Ontario last year? Can he, on the basis of that, determine the income requirements in order to qualify for a mortgage? Could he then tell me how many people earning less than \$10,000 a year are likely to qualify in the year 1975 for a mortgage, to begin with, and secondly, how many in that income group will then qualify for the \$1,500? That's not that difficult.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, at this particular time I cannot define to the member exactly how many people under the family income range that he has mentioned will qualify. There are indications that some will.

Mr. Deans: One supplementary question: Is the minister aware that the average single income in the Province of Ontario is less than \$10,000?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: That's single. I'm talking about family income.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Renfrew South has a question?

ONTARIO TRUCKERS

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of

Transportation and Communications. It's a difficult question and it could be in a number of parts.

Is the minister aware of the difficulties that Ontario truckers are enduring at the hands of Quebec transport authorities? Is he aware that on the Ontario side of the Ottawa River we allow Quebec truckers to travel perhaps 100 miles from Mattawa down Highway 17 to the interprovincial bridge at Portage, without demanding of them anything in the way of additional licences, etc., but that our truckers, who cross over at Portage and go eight miles within the Province of Quebec, are being asked to obtain bulk carrier licences and to pay sales tax on the vehicles and trailers?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, this is a lengthy question.

Mr. Reid: That is the longest speech he has ever made.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It sounds like an opposition question.

Mr. Yakubuski: I'm wondering if the minister could tell the House whether there is a reciprocal agreement between Ontario and Quebec to cover such situations.

Mr. Speaker: Does the minister have an answer?

Mr. Yakubuski: May I add, Mr. Speaker, that the situation is very serious.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. member for Renfrew South that we are aware of these problems and that we have been trying to resolve them in an amicable fashion with the government of Quebec. We have not been reasonably successful. Officials from my ministry are meeting presently with officials from the Province of Quebec in the hope that we can come up with an understanding that the truckers for Ontario will receive the same treatment in Quebec as is extended to the truckers from Quebec in Ontario.

We do not want to retaliate if we can possibly avoid it. However, we are aware that it is a serious situation and we would like to think that the matter can be resolved at the political level and get an understanding between the two provinces. We are working to that end but, so far, I can't guarantee that it's going to be successful.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary.

Mr. Yakubuski: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering at what stage the negotiations the minis-

ter refers to might be, because I would want to tell the House that this is not a new problem. It's one that I have brought to the attention of his authorities over a period of three years requesting action at that level.

Mr. Breithaupt: They don't listen to the member, do they?

Mr. Speaker: Any answer?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that we are attempting to resolve the problem by negotiation. The only alternative we have, if we can't negotiate a resolution, is to go ahead and retaliate. We're attempting to avoid that if we can.

Mr. Singer: Right. We will march right on to war.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

INTERMEDIATE CAPACITY TRANSIT SYSTEM

Mr. Singer: I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Could he tell us how many dollars the Krauss-Maffei experiment has cost the people of Ontario, from its inception until the commencement of the programme which the minister announced today?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I would have to get the figures and break them down. As the hon. member well knows, there is a substantial sum of money—in fact, \$10 million—which will be recovered from the programme that we cancelled.

Mr. Singer: Yes, I know; but approximately how much is it to cost us?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I cannot give the member those figures today. I will get them for him and table them here.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary: Would the minister's figures include all publicity expenses, reception expenses, trips backwards and forwards to Munich and other places—all the expenses?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, all those expenses which have not been covered by the money that we recovered from the cancellation contract.

Mr. Givens: Supplementary: Would the minister please also include expenses and executive salaries of the OTDC—expenses of that kind—and public relations expenses, which the president of the corporation refuses

to reveal at estimate time? And, as the minister is the spokesman for the OTDC in this chamber, would he please reveal those expenses, which we consider to be very important?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, Mr. Speaker, I will not include that in that report. I think the hon. member knows full well—he has been told before—that is a matter he should take up with the board of directors of Ontario Transportation Development Corp.

Mr. Singer: How does one do that?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The hon. member should write them a letter.

Mr. Singer: Oh, come on.

Mr. Givens: Is the minister responsible in this House or not?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please, the member for High Park.

Mr. Givens: Is the minister responsible in this House or not?

Interjections by hon. members.

MOPEDS

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): A question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications, Mr. Speaker: Since there is now fairly common agreement, both within and without his ministry, that allowing the sale of motorized pedal cycles without a licence was an error, when will the minister be bringing in Legislation to require licensing of these contraptions?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is correct. I have received many communications and certainly the various editorials from around the province have been brought to my attention in which concerns have been expressed over the type of vehicle that is being put on the market as a motor-assisted bicycle. The legislation, I can tell the member, is now being reviewed. There have been submissions made to me by industry indicating their concern. In fact, we will be discussing this with them at a meeting tomorrow.

Frankly, in reviewing the legislation I am concerned about what is happening. We had thought that we would be simply bringing in legislation that would have permitted these vehicles, which were to be—and I emphasize—a motor-assisted bicycle. Quite frankly, I

am disappointed in the fact that a number of manufacturers have attempted to circumvent the meaning of the Act by bringing in pedal-assisted motorcycles. I am not going to allow them to be unlicensed; and it is causing me a problem.

Mr. Good: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: Does the minister have access to a report from Quebec, where mopeds have been in operation for three years? The accident rate is less with motor-assisted bicycles than with 10-speed bicycles, which evidently have a poor braking system and also create greater speed than do the mopeds.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of that report. It was on the basis of some of that report that we attempted to bring in our legislation that has been passed by this House.

However, Mr. Speaker, I draw to your attention—and I will repeat again—that certain types of vehicles are marketed in this province today that are not motor-assisted bicycles, but they are motorcycles with pedals on them. The present problem is being created by these things being sold within the meaning of the definition of a motor-assisted bicycle. It is not my intention to allow manufacturers to put these on the roads as mopeds—not at all. If it is necessary to change the legislation to keep them off the road as motorcycles, which they really are, I will certainly bring such an amendment to the House.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa West.

OTTAWA TEACHERS' DISPUTE

Mr. D. H. Morrow (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, I wondered if the Premier could advise the House and myself as to the present state of negotiations in the Ottawa teachers' strike.

Mr. Lewis: They should settle today, if the member doesn't ask any more questions.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think the absence of the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) indicates that this matter is still being negotiated at this moment in Ottawa. I would prefer to make no further comment while these negotiations are proceeding.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River.

NORTHWESTERN ONTARIO ROAD PROJECT

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications—it may be an easy one for him: Can he tell me what is the present status of the proposed road between Atikokan and Ignace? Has he taken his programme for the road system in northwestern Ontario to cabinet? Has it been approved? Has it got that far? It has been months since we have had any action.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I recognize the question which the member is asking has been asked by a number of people in that particular part of the province. I think I can only answer him as I have until now—rather indecisively.

The development of that road is contingent upon a number of other developments which may take place in that particular area. Those matters are still being discussed at the policy field level. Until such time as we can get these things resolved and into a package, I cannot make a definite announcement on it.

Mr. Reid: Will it be announced during the election?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, if I thought it would be of assistance to me.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury.

LAURENTIAN HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT

Mr. Germa: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Health: Can the minister advise us as to the results of his inquiry into alleged mismanagement of the Laurentian Hospital in Sudbury, dealing with delays in opening, construction overruns, resignation of management and those other problems?

Hon. Mr. Miller: I can't add anything more, Mr. Speaker, to my last comments. I was away for the last two days of last week and I haven't been filled in this morning but I will find out for the member.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Energy has the answer to a question asked previously.

HYDRO JOB APPLICATIONS

Hon. D. R. Timbrell (Minister of Energy): Mr. Speaker, last Friday specifically the member for Sudbury asked me why Ontario Hydro used a Buffalo, NY, post office box in

connection with an advertisement for employment at its Bruce heavy water plant.

I am advised that during the period when mail deliveries in Toronto were uncertain, Ontario Hydro initiated a contingency mailing system. This system was set up primarily to facilitate the continuous flow of important and time-sensitive supply purchase-related mail such as tender documents, inquiries, purchase orders and so on. This system involved the use of a post office box in Buffalo, NY, with a Hydro vehicle carrying the mail to and from Toronto.

While the system was basically used for supply-related mail, some other uses were also made of it. The mailing directions associated with the Bruce heavy water plant vacancy advertisement were simply meant to give the applicants additional means by which application delays due to the strike could be avoided. This method was used infrequently for employment-related mail during the period of post office disruption and has since been discontinued in this respect altogether.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Huron.

ODC LENDING POLICY

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism, if I could get his attention. Why is it that foreign-owned companies can apply for a loan through the Ontario Development Corp. and obtain that loan with relative ease, whereas a Canadian-owned company, such as J. F. Farm Machinery in Exeter, can apply for a loan and is turned down? This happens time and time again. Could the minister give me the reason that J. F. Farm Machinery would be turned down for a loan for a capital project?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: First of all, Mr. Speaker, to deal with the first part of the question relating to foreign companies making application for loans through Ontario Development Corp., let us get one point very clear. Not all foreign investment in this province is bad. It makes a direct contribution to the economic well-being of the Province of Ontario and the creation of jobs for the citizens of this province.

Companies come in and make application to ODC and if they follow the regulations set down and abide by them, and match the requirements as far as reporting is concerned, they will be given consideration. Foreign companies have a more difficult time in meeting the regulations than do Canadian companies.

As far as the specific company is concerned, I will have to take notice of that and review the application to see why it was refused.

May I add, Mr. Speaker, as well, that a great number of companies when complaining to their provincial members that they have been refused consideration by ODC or NODC or EODC forget to tell members that their lawyers and their accountants quite often have not responded in the period of time as requested—even after many requests—by ODC and its two other associated companies to provide information so that a decision can be made in their favour. There are times when applications are rejected on the basis that the information requested is not supplied.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor West.

VENUE FOR CANADIAN OPEN

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Treasurer and Minister of Economics: Does the minister or his financial advisers agree at all with the Royal Canadian Golf Association that the financial situation in Windsor and district in the summer of 1976—and by district they mean the three counties of Essex, Kent and Lambton—will be so depressed that the gate receipts at the Essex Golf and Country Club could not support the Canadian Open?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid I don't know very much about it. I happened to notice something in the Windsor paper about it. I would hope, in view of the strong stimulative action taken in last Monday's budget, that Windsor along with the rest of the province would bounce back, and that it would be possible to hold the Canadian Open in Windsor at the Essex Golf and Country Club.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bounsall: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: One supplementary.

Mr. Bounsall: Would the Treasurer be willing to give that view directly to the Royal Canadian Golf Association?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would certainly be glad to take that under consideration. It is great to see the New Democratic Party supporting golf in the way that they are; and particularly at such a bastion of elitism as the Essex Golf and Country Club. It's nice to know the side they're on.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The member will get a golf club in his backyard if he buys his leader's house; nine holes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Everybody wants to be a Tory.

Mr. Lewis: That's the new socialism.

An hon. member: Yes, I read something about that in the paper.

An hon. member: Hanlon had something to say about that, I think.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Fort William.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I'm sorry, we can't hear the member.

OFFICIAL GEMSTONE FOR PROVINCE

Mr. J. H. Jessiman (Fort William): I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. Would he recommend to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) that immediate recognition be given to the semi-precious jewel, the amethyst, so that we can recognize it as the gemstone of Ontario?

Mr. Lewis: Oh, shame! That's a straight steal.

Mr. Jessiman: That would support the many letters I have written to the minister, and the member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes) has done the same thing. We'd like recognition given to this gemstone.

Mr. Lewis: The member for Fort William couldn't even pronounce it when he first heard about it. He called it an amphitheatre the first time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to tell the hon. member I had to find out what an amethyst was. I'm not in the class where I know an amethyst.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the matter is under very active, current consideration.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

WINDSOR HOSPITAL FACILITIES

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minis-

ter of Health. Is the minister aware of his ministry's recent proposal for far-reaching changes for the Windsor area, where the hospital centres' Riverview unit was going to be closed; obstetrical units at Grace Hospital would be closed; and paediatric and psychiatric services at Metropolitan and psychiatric services at Hotel Dieu would be closed? Is the minister aware that his deputy, coming into Windsor on May 1, will be meeting only with hospital and medical officials? Would the minister consider holding public meetings so that those whose jobs may be jeopardized as a result of some of these drastic changes would likewise have an opportunity for input, and also the public?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the proposals the staff have made to try to rationalize the health care delivery system in the hon. member's city. I am aware that they are at the discussion stage only and that no firm decisions have been taken as to what will or will not happen.

But certainly, as he knows, discussions have been going on concerning the future, particularly of Riverview, for some long time. We do feel that changes need to be made in the area. We've been working with the groups that are currently recognized and are dealing with the problem. There is a council down there that's been doing a good job, in my opinion, to help us in these areas. It seems only proper that our discussions, which are still at the original stages and are not by any means concluded, should continue with those groups. There isn't a district health planning council functioning. This would have been the logical body for making this kind of decision had one been in place.

Mr. B. Newman: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: We're running over our time. The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

EXPROPRIATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Clement moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Expropriations Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, this amendment will make available to the public and expropriating authorities, when mutually consented to, the services of the Land Compensation Board for the determination of value of land or interest in land taken. I am introducing this amendment at this time to assist in the resolution of certain immediate problems arising from Ontario Hydro's acquisition of land in the Bruce area. This amendment is consistent with the recommendations in the Robinson report, which is presently under study in my ministry.

TOWN OF KAPUSKASING ACT

Mr. Havrot moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Town of Kapuskasing.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF SARNIA ACT

Mr. Singer, on behalf of **Mr. Bullbrook**, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Sarnia.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWN OF COBOURG ACT

Mr. Carruthers moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Town of Cobourg.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF BRUCE ACT

Mr. Gaunt moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Township of Bruce.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF TORONTO ACT

Mr. Wardle moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF TORONTO ACT

Mr. Wardle moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF WINDSOR ACT

Mr. B. Newman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Windsor.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: The member for London North.

CITY OF LONDON ACT

Mr. Walker moves first reading of bill intituled; An Act respecting the City of London.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day might I introduce to you and to the members of the House 80 students from the Fenelon Falls High School, Fenelon Falls, under the able guidance of Mr. D. Murray. These students have come quite a few miles today, and only some of them are able to get in here at any one time; therefore, I wish the members to understand that while some of those students are in both galleries, the whole group is not here at this moment.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

BUDGET DEBATE

(continued)

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) urged members of the Legislature to "sit down for an hour and read this budget" in order, as he said, to have some hope of understanding the finances of this province. The Treasurer said—and I quote: "The financial statements of this province reflect the integrity and they reflect the sound financial management of some 30 years of Progressive Conservative rule."

During the past week, Mr. Speaker, I have spent many hours reading and studying the 1975 Ontario budget. I have consulted with economists, accountants and tax lawyers, with labour leaders, businessmen, municipal leaders and many others. The Treasurer may regret his advice now because, as he promised, I

have learned a great deal about the finances of this province. I have also learned a great deal about the integrity and financial management of the Davis government.

Most of what I have learned is unpleasant; some of it is almost unthinkable. Of course, this is an election budget. The Treasurer has given careful attention to the superficial political appeal. He has announced measures that are designed to win or perhaps to buy votes rather than strengthen Ontario's economy.

Certainly this budget is a clever document—too clever by half. It's worse than slick. It's worse than opportunistic. It's worse than cynical. It's even worse than irresponsible. The only word I can think of for this budget, Mr. Speaker, is incredible. It's simply not believable. The fine words about restraint are false; the commitment to fight inflation is hollow.

About the only believable statement appears on page 16 of the budget highlights. It reads, "Expiry of the temporary stabilization measures introduced in the budget ensures the long-run financial integrity of Ontario."

Why wait for them to expire? Why not scrap the whole budget now and avoid endangering the provincial economy at all? This budget, more than anything previous, makes it clear that the only way to ensure the long-run, financial integrity of Ontario is to defeat the Davis government. That, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what we intend to do.

The voters have seen through this government. They have seen through the smoke-screen. They aren't taken in by the trickery of this budget. It's taken four years of this Premier but the credibility of Ontario's 32-year-old Conservative dynasty has been destroyed. The voters simply don't believe them any more. They are on to the Conservatives' cynical ways and to show that, let's just look at some of the reaction to this budget.

The Orillia Packet and Times, not exactly the staunchest Liberal paper in Ontario, ran a banner headline across its front page "Taxes Cut to Win Votes."

The Kitchener-Waterloo Record, always a rather perceptive commentator, wrote:

Of course, nobody would argue that even a two per cent cut in the sales tax or free drugs for pensioners or reduced income taxes for pensioners and low-income families will not please voters when they find costs reduced. But this will not prevent them from viewing the

whole process with deep scepticism and from judging the Davis government accordingly.

The size of the deficit is such that few are unaware of its significance. The timing of the benefits is so obvious that even the government must have known how they would be interpreted. To many, therefore, it will seem like a blatantly cynical attempt to buy their votes to perpetuate the Conservative regime in power. It tends to confirm that Mr. Davis and his cabinet are deeply alarmed at the political outlook and willing to try almost anything to avert defeat.

From the Attorney General's home town, Mr. Speaker, the Niagara Falls Review reviewed the budget this way:

Darcy McKeough's two per cent sales tax cut sounds sweet until one realizes that it is merely a temporary gesture until Dec. 31, when the seven per cent tax will be restored after the provincial election has been tucked away.

And in the same cynical manner . . . The Ottawa Citizen said:

On the opening day of the baseball season Darcy McKeough appears as the late inning relief pitcher with a mission to save the game for the Davis Tories . . . But the budget also has to do something for the economy.

The London Free Press was similarly concerned about the Treasurer's cavalier approach to budget making. They wrote:

Mr. McKeough is taking a calculated gamble. He is risking more stimulation than he probably would have provided if the Davis government were not facing an election this year.

The Owen Sound Sun-Times made this blunt assessment:

Treasurer McKeough tried to cover the political plight of the Ontario Tories with the economic plight of the province in his budget. He didn't cover it very well. Most of the budget items are election lures. It's just a coincidence, of course, that the Tories expect to call an election before the end of the year and know they are in trouble with the voters.

An hon. member: That's for sure.

Mr. Breithaupt: Down in Essex county, where the voters are again going to demonstrate their good sense this year by electing five Liberals instead of the present number, the Windsor Star noted:

Mr. McKeough pulled out all the stops at a time when an election cannot be long postponed and when polls indicate Conservative fortunes at a low ebb.

The Star's headline read "McKeough Budget Goes for Broke." Perhaps that should be a Liberal slogan for this year. "Go for broke, vote Tory." Or we could adopt, of course, the Treasurer's own line and use that good old one about knocking the rats off the rafters.

Mr. Speaker, from your own riding the Port Hope Evening Guide has this to say:

Apparently . . . the Conservatives are in such bad shape that they cannot afford to be realistic. They prefer to promote an image . . . We know where the rats in the rafters are.

Well, I'm sure, Mr. Speaker—they weren't referring to you personally, of course—that if you were to choose to cross the floor to the official opposition before the next election the people of Northumberland would gladly re-elect you. Otherwise, sir, we certainly shall miss you around here.

In Hamilton the Spectator simply observed: "The budget could not be considered anything but an election document."

The Oakville Daily Journal-Record wasn't conned by the Treasurer either. Its editorial group wrote:

The 1975 Ontario budget clearly is not the anti-inflationary, economic booster of a budget provincial Treasurer Darcy McKeough claims, with a straight face, that it is. And clearly it is the chock-full-of-goodies pre-election budget the Treasurer claims, with tongue in cheek, it is not . . . Politically shrewd the McKeough budget may turn out to be, but fiscally responsible it most certainly it not.

Well, perhaps there are a couple of other places we should hear from—perhaps the city of Brampton. And the Daily Times let it be known that their credulity had been tested beyond the reasonable limits. This is what the newspaper in the Premier's home town said:

There isn't a shred of subtlety about the windfall of goodies . . . [Mr. McKeough] isn't doing a thing for inflation except perhaps feeding it and we resent any suggestion that this budget is an inflation fighter . . . We would like to see Mr. McKeough's reaction a month or two from now when housing prices have risen by not \$1,500 a unit, but perhaps \$3,000 to \$5,000 a unit, to reflect the increased demand and the shortage of supply in housing.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, from Kingston, in the heart of that blue belt of eastern Ontario where voting Tory has been a way of life for the past 32 years, the Kingston Whig-Standard gives a measure of the strength of disenchantment with the Davis government. And this is what we read there:

The provincial budget is, in the long-term perspective, disastrous. Darcy McKeough says the budget is based on three assumptions, early economic recovery in the US, agreement within Canada to hold the price of gas and oil at current levels, and the pursuit of expansionary policies by the federal government . . . Mr. McKeough was conceding that his budget makes sense only on the assumption that the government has a right not merely to count on miracles but to count on three of them.

In essence, Mr. McKeough is inviting the public to an autumn cruise on the Titanic and is financing the purchase of extra deck chairs on credit. The Conservative government has preached restraint. It has chosen not to practice restraint. God works in mysterious ways, but it is doubtful if the Conservatives have earned four miracles in a single year. Three are needed to make the budget work; the fourth is needed to win an election.

Mr. Speaker, all of those assessments—and I have quoted 12 for you—have reached the same conclusion. That conclusion is that the 1975 Ontario budget is an attempt to con the voters. It's a bogus budget. They don't believe the budget. And this government's credibility is in shreds.

Mr. Speaker, this budget reveals the Davis government's lack of competence in economic matters, but also raises doubts about the political judgement of the "big blue machinists" whose pollsters and public relations experts were undoubtedly the directors and producers of the Treasurer's performance here last Monday night.

If this government had had the integrity to produce a responsible budget, some voters might have been impressed. Some voters might have congratulated the Treasurer for having the courage and honesty to face up to his responsibilities. Some voters might even have taken a responsible budget as a sign that the Davis government is more interested in Ontario's welfare than even that of the Progressive Conservative Party, but it didn't happen. There is no sign of integrity. There is no sign of courage. There is no sign of concern for Ontario. There is no sign of a responsible budget.

Mr. Speaker, before I launch into some details of criticism of the budget, I want to review briefly the past economic performance of the Davis government, because this budget is clearly part of a pattern. This government and this Treasurer are nothing if they are not consistent. Of course, they happen to be consistently wrong. They are consistently misleading and they are consistently incompetent economic managers.

In 1971 the first Davis-McKeough budget came to light and the Treasurer claimed that one of his objectives was, and I quote, "to maintain firm control over public spending in order to contain tax levels and the generation of inflationary pressures." Budgetary expenditures increased by \$1.2 billion that year—a jump of 15.5 per cent.

The lofty words about controlled spending were a smoke-screen. That actual spending performance was substantially different. The deficit reached a record of \$1,018 million that year, an election year. Final spending estimates were more than \$1 billion higher than the budgetary estimates. So much for the containing of a generation of inflationary pressures in 1971.

In his second budget, in 1972, the Treasurer promised, and I quote: "Rigorous restraint on spending will make room for expansion of the private sector activity and curb inflationary forces as the economy moves back to full performance." He was no longer talking about those firm controls; now it was rigorous restraint. The phrase was different, but it was equally meaningless. Rigorous restraint on spending in that year translated into an expenditure increase of more than \$450 million or about 7.5 per cent. The Ontario government spending increased 50 per cent more than the cost of living that year.

The Treasurer's version of rigorous restraint applied throughout the fiscal 1972-1973 year. When it was ended, the Ministry of the Environment had overspent its budget by 35 per cent, the Ministry of Agriculture and Food had overspent by 18.5 per cent and total government spending that year was some \$117 million over budget. Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, the present Treasurer was not with us as Treasurer for two budgets, but his successor and predecessor, the member for London South (Mr. White), presently part-time cabinet minister and Progressive Conservative campaign chairman, faithfully maintained the Davis government's tradition of huge deficits and uncontrolled government spending.

In 1973, Treasurer White stated that one of his budgetary objectives was "to exercise maximum restraint in provincial spending." Well, how did he propose to meet that objec-

tive of maximum restraint? By now, Mr. Speaker, the pattern was quite clear. He called for a spending increase of \$760 million—up 11.7 per cent from the previous year.

In place of restraint, the Treasurer of the day provided this little bit of hypocrisy, and I quote:

I would like to focus briefly on the containment of government spending. The point has been made in previous budget statements but it deserves to be emphasized once again. In order to maintain a capacity to establish new priorities and to meet public needs, government must restrain the growth of existing spending programmes. The Ontario government is very conscious of its responsibility to limit growing spending growth.

When all the figures were in, spending had increased by \$811 million—\$51 million more than the Treasurer had estimated. Spending was up 12.7 per cent in a year when inflation in Ontario was advancing by 7.6 per cent.

In 1974, last year, this was the budget's very first sentence: "The most important problem facing us today is inflation." In the budget statement itself, the Treasurer didn't have the gall to claim he was again restraining spending, but two months earlier, at a federal-provincial conference of finance ministers, he had this to say and I quote:

I think it is important that we acknowledge the contribution of the public sector to inflation. In its ninth and 10th annual reviews, the Economic Council of Canada recommended reduced expenditure growth in the public sector. I agree with this recommendation.

He then proceeded to define the public sector as everything but the government of Ontario, and sure enough, at budget time, he called for a spending increase of 14.2 per cent while projecting inflation in the total economy at 7.7 per cent.

Now in this 1975 budget, we see the Davis government in 1974 underestimated its spending requirements for the fourth consecutive year. In every single year since the member for Peel North (Mr. Davis) became Premier, his Treasurers have been low in their expenditure predictions. They always predict low.

Last year's predicted spending increased by 14.2 per cent. This jumped in fact to 20.8 per cent by the year-end.

In the 1974 budget, the Treasurer told the Legislature and the public that Ontario would spend \$8.341 billion in 1974-1975. In the 1975 budget we learned that actual spending

was \$8.726 billion. The Davis government that year overspent by \$295 million.

Every year their estimates have been wrong. They haven't been right yet. Even after 32 years of making budgets they still haven't quite got the grip of it. In the last four budgets, the four budgets of the Davis years, Ontario's government has overspent its own estimates—which were already exorbitant—by \$1.5 billion, almost as much as the net cash requirements that the Treasurer admits to this year. And I will have more to say about the figures that are used there.

As economic forecasters, this government has been equally incompetent. In 1971 the Treasurer predicted 4.3 per cent unemployment for the year in Ontario. The final figure was more than one fifth higher at 5.2 per cent. The Treasurer underestimated the number of unemployed workers by 22,000 that year.

In 1972 the Treasurer's budget was based on a projection of 3.4 per cent inflation and 6.3 per cent real economic growth. When the year was done, prices had risen more than one third faster than the Treasurer's prediction and real economic growth was one tenth less than his forecast.

In 1973, the Treasurer of the day again underestimated the impact of inflation. His budget assumed a 4.8 per cent increase in the cost of living. In fact, this turned out to be a 7.1 per cent figure, one half higher than the Treasurer's estimate.

Last year, faulty forecasting reached some sort of pinnacle in Ontario. The Treasurer predicted 110,000 new housing starts. The true figure turned out to be 85,500 or 22.3 per cent less than the Treasurer's estimate.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Shame.

Mr. Breithaupt: The Treasurer predicted five per cent real growth in the gross provincial product. In fact, the economy grew almost one quarter less than that, advancing only 3.8 per cent in real dollars. And the cost of living, according to Ontario's Treasurer, was to go up 7.7 per cent last year, more than one third less than the actual inflation rate of 10.6 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, already this brief review of the previous four budgets of the Davis government provides some indication of the nature of "sound financial management of some 30 years of Progressive Conservative rule," referred to by the Treasurer last Tuesday during the question period.

Their spending estimates are always wrong—always low. Their economic forecasts

are always wrong—always overly optimistic. But the story has only begun. Let's talk about deficits.

There's a lot to say about deficits because despite an inflation rate of almost one per cent every month, this province has had nothing but deficits since the member for Peel North became Premier.

We haven't had a surplus since the last full year of John Roberts' premiership in 1969-1970. In that year, revenues exceeded expenditures by about \$150 million.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we received a new Premier. Mr. Roberts' last budget had called for a budgetary surplus of \$11.3 million, but before the end of that fiscal year, the member for Peel North became Premier and the budgetary surplus became a budgetary deficit—a deficit of about \$136 million.

The total financing required that year was \$566 million. The next year, 1971-1972, the deficit was more than \$1 billion. In fiscal 1972, it was \$744 million and in 1973-1974 it was \$708 million.

By March 31, 1974, the Davis government had added more than \$3 billion to the provincial debt. The province's accumulated net debt had more than doubled in four years, from \$1.4 billion to \$2.9 billion. Whereas it would have cost \$185.03 per person to pay off Ontario's debt in 1970, that figure had grown consistently and almost doubled to \$359.74 per person by 1974. In John Roberts' last year, it would have taken 16 weeks of provincial revenue to pay off Ontario's debt. By 1974, it would have taken 21 weeks of revenue to pay off the debt. The effect of last year's budget is to increase the provincial debt a further \$591 million.

Here's the record of the Davis government's so-called sound financial management until this budget. Here's the Davis-McKeough-White legacy of fiscal responsibility since John Roberts' last full year.

First, expenditures more than doubled from \$4.25 billion to \$8.8 billion last year. Next, spending exceeded budget estimates by \$1.5 billion. Next, budgetary deficits totalled \$2.1 billion. Next, the province's net debt is more than doubled. It has increased 128 per cent from \$1.5 billion to \$3.5 billion. Next, the net debt per capita has increased 130 per cent from \$185.03 to \$426.06. Then, the net debt as a per cent of the gross provincial product has increased by 42 per cent. Finally, the net debt as a per cent of budgetary revenue has jumped by more than a third, from 31.9 per cent to 42.9 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, that's the tradition of irresponsible spending and deficits of the Davis government. That's the rather dismal history that sets the stage for the 1975 budget.

I felt that the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman) put it rather well last week when, in his remarks to the South Ottawa Rotary Club, he said: "We are not called Conservatives for nothing." You are no doubt familiar with that word, Mr. Speaker. Chamber's 20th Century Dictionary, a volume which some Conservatives have purchased, even though it's a little late, defines a Conservative as "one averse to change." Although one might argue, I suppose, as to the suitability of any 20th century definition for this government, this budget certainly provides ample evidence of the Davis government's aversion to change. It is exactly in the irresponsible pattern of its predecessors this year.

One would think, Mr. Speaker, that a government that was running some 12 points behind in the public opinion polls might reassess its past mistakes and at least try to do better. Surely this government has learned something in the course of four consecutive by-election defeats. Surely it has occurred to someone over there that the old tricks don't work any more, that the voters are fed up with irresponsible big spending government. Yet, apparently not. This government remains blindly loyal to its past policies and seems determined to commit the same mistakes and the same blunders over and over again. Ontario's regressive Conservative government blunders on. Well, hopefully, not for too long, Mr. Speaker. The voters have grown weary of the Davis government's game and they are about to end it. This budget to many is just the final proof of their inability to provide competent government.

Let's look at the present budget. True to form, there are some nice words about restraining government spending but, as in the past, there's no action to match the words. On the very first page the Treasurer states:

The strength of inflationary pressures constitutes the main threat to Canada's economic stability and international competitiveness in the years ahead. [And further on he adds] I am convinced that one of the root causes of the current inflationary problem in Canada is excessive government spending and unnecessary growth in the size and complexity of the public sector.

So far, Mr. Speaker, he seems to be on the right path, if only he has got the courage to walk it. But has he stayed on this

path? Does this budget in any way attempt to implement these policies and directions to which he has paid lip service?

What about the Treasurer's claim on page 16: "We have managed to control the growth in our spending." Is there anything in this budget to support that claim?

There is not a single shred of evidence, Mr. Speaker, not a single indication that spending has been controlled. See for yourself. The facts are clear. There is a whole section of the budget entitled, "Government leadership and restraint." Where's the restraint? Where's the leadership? Where's the action to support the Treasurer's sanctimonious pronouncement that "I believe that continuing restraint on spending is an obligation for all governments at this time in order to set an example of responsible leadership to the community at large." Is that responsible leadership? Look at the figures.

The Treasurer's version of restraint is a \$1,530-million spending increase. He's calling for an expenditure increase of 16.8 per cent. What sort of responsible leadership is that? He is increasing spending by more than \$1.5 billion, or 16.8 per cent. Is it any wonder that the government has got a credulity problem? Is it any wonder that the reaction to this budget was one of complete disbelief, of incredulity?

Let's be very clear, Mr. Speaker: The Treasurer himself is saying that "excessive government spending" is a "root cause" of the current inflation. He is increasing spending by more than \$1.5 billion, by 16.8 per cent. And then he has the gall to claim that this budget "provides leadership in combating inflation" and shows "restraint in the growth of the public sector in Ontario."

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): What hypocrisy.

Mr. Breithaupt: Sandy Baird gave an example of this approach when he suggested in a column in the Kitchener-Waterloo Record last week that the Treasurer is just like a speeding driver who knocks down a pedestrian, then jumps from his car and says cheerily to the victim: "You're in luck. I am a doctor."

The plain fact is that the Davis government is fuelling inflation, not fighting it. The government's admitted deficit is \$1.7 billion. The Treasurer has chosen to exercise his public trust by adding about \$208 to the debt borne by every man, woman and child in Ontario. But it is he and the Davis government who will pay for this extravagance.

They'll pay at the polls before the year is out, and a Liberal government will be chosen to re-establish a sound financial programme in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer concludes that "this budget will be an important factor in restoring Ontario to its accustomed prosperity." Perhaps the Treasurer missed the report of the Ontario Joint Committee on Economic Policy last August. He was exiled in Energy at the time. Like another well-known exile, the member for Chatham-Kent has made it back once; but with this budget he merely hastens the advent of his government's Waterloo, and I don't think there'll be a return from the second exile.

Members may recognize the names of some of those who, as members of the joint committee, participated in the preparation of this report—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): That wasn't the member's crack.

Mr. Breithaupt: It wasn't?

Mr. Lewis: Was it?

Mr. Breithaupt: It was.

Mr. Lewis: Really?

Mr. Breithaupt: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: More laboured than usual.

Mr. Breithaupt: Well, probably. I'm usually a little easier in my *bons mots*—

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member for Kitchener has the floor.

Mr. Breithaupt: However, yesterday was a difficult day.

Mr. Lewis: Was it?

Mr. Deacon: Get on the subject.

Mr. Breithaupt: Before I mention the members of the joint committee who participated in the preparation of this report, I should first of all refer to the name of the report; it's entitled, "Directions for Social and Economic Policy in Ontario."

The chairman was H. Ian Macdonald, former Deputy Treasurer. Other members included the present Minister without Portfolio (Mr. White), the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Grossman), the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch), Deputy Treasurer Rendall Dick, Cabinet Secretary James Fleck, and the Premier's deputy, Ed Stewart. It was,

in every sense of the word, a blue-ribbon budget committee.

There's a small note at the bottom of the title page, which advises: "The following also served earlier on the committee but were not members when the final report was prepared." The list includes such names as the Minister for Culture and Recreation (Mr. Welch), the Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence and the present Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, I guess someone must have banged the rafters. The committee, which met regularly with the Premier, had this to say:

Stabilization of prices must be a major priority of all levels of government. The committee believes that the continued increase in prices at a more rapid rate than output constitutes a major threat to our capacity to achieve longer-run economic and social objectives.

The committee cannot agree with suggestions that we must somehow "learn to live with" inflation. Government can make a significant contribution towards containing inflation by controlling its own spending. Over the next several years, it will be important for all levels of government . . . to introduce measures to contain expenditures.

This is what recommendation 19 said in that report, Mr. Speaker:

The major long-term measure which government should undertake to control inflation is to limit its own spending growth and deficit financing. The provinces and the federal government should adopt, as a long-run target, total spending growth no greater than the overall growth rate in the economy.

I am sure you will want to ask how does this budget stand up to those criteria? The Treasurer predicts that the economy will grow in inflated dollars this year by 12.6 per cent. He expects that his own spending will increase by 16.8 per cent. He therefore misses the target exactly by one-third. It is significant, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Did the member read the rest of the Smith report on the question of short-term counter-cyclical budgeting?

Mr. Breithaupt: I am interested particularly in this report because this was made only a few months ago and the members will recall that the Smith report has existed since 1968.

Mr. Renwick: Yes, but this report is simply a later report.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Kitchener will continue.

Mr. Breithaupt: It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that in a budget in which the Treasurer is preaching restraint and is telling "school boards and municipal councils to carefully examine their staffing, overhead and administration expenses," not one government department has reduced expenditures from last year—not one. In fact, there are only three ministries which even intend to hold their spending increases at less than the rate of inflation.

The Treasurer's own ministry is budgeting for a 23 per cent spending increase; the Ministry of Agriculture and Food is planning to spend 25 per cent more this year than last.

Mr. Deacon: True to its past record.

Mr. Breithaupt: The Ministry of Labour intends to spend 27 per cent more; spending will also be up 27 per cent in the Ministry of Community and Social Services. It is going to be up 18.5 per cent in the Ministry of Transportation and Communications; spending in the Ministry of the Environment will jump by 43 per cent and the Ministry of Energy calls for a 50 per cent expenditure rise in its budget. Consumer and Commercial Relations wants to spend 17 per cent more this year than last; the budget for Culture and Recreation is up 60.5 per cent over the component parts from last year. I suppose, for some reason probably to do more with advertising than with its departmental function, the Ministry of Revenue intends to spend 37 per cent more this year than last.

The Treasurer has had the audacity to tell this House and the people of Ontario that every one of this government's departments is pared down to fighting trim. Who can really believe that? Who can really believe that this budget is going to do anything to stop the problems of inflation? The real concern, of course, is that expressed by the Ontario Economic Council in its report of last year, "Evidence available suggests that the productivity record in the public sector has lagged and that price increases have been excessive."

In other words, we are apparently not getting value for our money. The council made this point, particularly in respect to provincial expending on education, and this is what it wrote:

As an increasing share of the total educational bill was absorbed by the provincial government, costs rose... The issue was whether the political system was structured to maximize the benefits of rising expenditures while at the same time encouraging the most efficient use of available funds... Rising government expenditures did not match a sufficient increase in productivity so that they were inflationary on the economy.

The 1975 Ontario budget makes no reference to the need for higher productivity in the government sector of activity, Mr. Speaker. It makes no mention at all of the concern among taxpayers that in the area of education especially we are not getting good value.

The education empire that the Premier began building more than a decade ago is clearly in a mess. Frustrated teachers are striking; angry trustees feel powerless to cope with student and community needs; parents are worried about their children's futures; taxpayers are losing their patience with soaring costs and students—those people for whom the entire system was created—are coming to the stunning realization that they are wasting their time in schools which don't provide a solid grounding in even the basics of English and arithmetic.

This year this government will spend more than \$2.7 billion on the two ministries involved; \$1.7 billion in Education and slightly over \$1 billion in Colleges and Universities. They will overspend their own education budget set last year by about \$114 million.

Look at what we're getting for this enormous sum. First of all, standards have deteriorated. In 1967, there were 34 acceptable grade 13 courses leading to credits for university admission. Today there are more than 800. The high school diploma granted in 1975 means little to anybody—to the student, to the parent, to an employer, or to the university admissions group. The Minister of Education's 172-page guide to an English curriculum for teachers was replaced in 1969 with a 20-page effort containing far more photographs than text.

Second, teacher-board relations have deteriorated. In 1972, the Legislature's committee of inquiry into teacher negotiations was able to report, and I quote: "Negotiations have taken place over the length and breadth of this province year after year with generally satisfactory results." But so far this year there have been 11 teacher strikes, and as we sit here 26,000 high school students in Ottawa are still out of their classes.

Third, Mr. Speaker, class size is getting bigger. Across Canada, the pupil-teacher ratio has been improving during the past two years, so that today there is an average of one more teacher for every 71 elementary and secondary school students than two years ago. But in Ontario, class size has grown during that period and there is now one fewer teacher for every 71 students than in 1972-1973.

Fourth, university professors are discovering that many new entrants can't read or write English properly. The University of Western Ontario is now offering a remedial English course for its first-year students. The university's decision to make grade 13 English mandatory for admission was vetoed by the Davis government.

Fifth, the dropout rate in our high schools is increasing. In 1970, 29 per cent of all students entering high school dropped out by grade 12 and 62 per cent dropped out by grade 13. Three years later, in 1973, the dropout rate had jumped to 37 per cent by grade 12 and 69 per cent by grade 13. Students themselves are losing confidence in our education system and they are leaving it in growing numbers. Like their parents, they are losing confidence in a school system that doesn't give them a core of subjects. They are losing confidence in a system where fewer than half the elementary schools—only 48 per cent—provide parents and students with reports that include marks or percentages.

While students and parents have lost confidence in the system, teachers and trustees have lost all feeling of goodwill towards the Ministry of Education, with the result that bitter confrontations are becoming more and more frequent. Teachers, whose voice has been ignored in matters concerning quality of education, are left to bicker over salary levels and province-wide arbitrarily-imposed spending ceilings prevent trustees from effectively fulfilling their democratic responsibility to provide a level of education that meets community needs and desires.

The Premier and his ministers try to make much of that ceiling policy as a cost-saving measure. The implication, of course, is that irresponsible school boards need legislative guidelines from a cost-conscious provincial government. But while local school board expenditures increased 38 per cent between 1969 and 1973, administration costs within the provincial Ministry of Education more than tripled—increasing 222 per cent.

So, Mr. Speaker, like the teachers and the students, like the parents and the

trustees, taxpayers too are dissatisfied with the present education system. Despite this government's attempt to convince the voters otherwise, trustees are not to blame for soaring costs and teachers are not to blame for declining quality. They are caught in a system that was designed and built under the direction of one minister, and that person is now Premier of Ontario. That system's failure reflects on his judgement and his competence, and as much as anything else may result in his defeat at the next election.

The education mess, of course, doesn't end at grade 13. The present Premier was also minister of colleges and universities for several years, and our post-secondary institutions still haven't quite recovered from that experience. During his tenure the present Premier unleashed a spending monster that is still out of control. The present efforts to restore sanity to university and college finances are compounding already serious problems.

Post-secondary education institutions in Ontario, particularly the 17 provincially-assisted universities, are facing serious budgetary problems.

For more than a decade, university expenditures were permitted to grow without any controls and provincial government financial support was freely available to the former Minister of University Affairs and his successors. Now, without real consultation or warning, the Davis government is cutting back. Universities have been left to cope with the momentum of their past expansion and inflation however they can, though the government has stipulated that accessibility to courses cannot be restricted and tuition fees cannot be raised.

Many institutions have been forced to choose between drastic spending cutbacks and huge deficits. Commendably, most universities are starting to cut back. The University of Ottawa has cancelled its order for a new computer. Queen's University is cutting back its staff by not replacing those who retire or leave. The Council of Ontario Universities began last December to draft some money-saving alternatives.

But as the council has warned, it will take time to achieve the necessary economies. Without mass firings, for instance, it will take time to achieve the necessary economies. Without mass firings, for instance, it will take some time to achieve a new balance between students and staff, since the annual rate of staff attrition at universities is only about seven-tenths of one per cent.

In the meantime, all but one of Ontario's universities expects a deficit next year. I'm pleased to say that the one with which I was formerly involved—at that point, Waterloo Lutheran University, now presently a provincially-assisted university, Wilfrid Laurier University—has been able over the years to stay in the black in its books. I'm wondering if part of that reason wasn't because the university in those days only received 50 per cent support, which was the federal funds, and as a result had to be somewhat perhaps more careful with its money. But in any event, it's the only one that has been able to continue its programme with a budgetary surplus in this present year. Perhaps it's because I'm no longer on the board of governors, Mr. Speaker; I'm not quite sure.

The University of Waterloo anticipates a \$1.2 million deficit. McMaster is projecting a \$1.4 million shortfall, and the University of Windsor has calculated its deficit at \$4.5 million. Their borrowing activities, and those of other colleges and universities, will be in direct competition with the government of Ontario and at a higher rate of interest—certainly evidence of a false economy.

Mr. Speaker, I've just received a note that I would like to share with members of the House; I'm sure that we will all be interested. I'm informed that as of 2 o'clock this afternoon the teachers and the school board in Ottawa have reached an agreement, which will be submitted to the OSSTF membership immediately.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, after 7½ weeks, I'm sure that we are all relieved, and the students and their parents, particularly, that the students will be back and classes can resume.

Mr. Lewis: The member for Kitchener should tell his colleagues that collective bargaining process can work without compulsory arbitration.

Mr. Breithaupt: I agree, of course, Mr. Speaker, that the collective bargaining process can work. I might add, that the tensions that led to this particular problem originated right here—right at Queen's Park—with the policies of the present government. Certainly, I pledge to you, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues and of the party, that one of the first priorities of a new government will be to ensure that a school strike of this magnitude does not need to occur again.

Surely, as we look back into the comments that I've just been making on education, we find that an example such as this Ottawa

teachers' strike is exactly the sort of thing that we in this province cannot afford to have.

The universities' current plight has been compounded by the Davis government's uncontrolled spending in other areas, which will spur the inflationary spiral with an \$850-million deficit this year. In addition, the Ministry of Health's recent settlement with hospital workers has left the salaries of university hospital staff 25 to 30 per cent below those of their counterparts in other parts of the province. This difference must now be overcome by the universities themselves without, unfortunately, any substantial provincial government assistance.

What about the moneys which the universities have to spend? Fuel costs for them have risen 85.4 per cent in the past year. The cost of paper has jumped by 75 per cent. Library periodical costs, we are told, are up by 27 per cent. And this is at a time when the consumer price index is generally 12 per cent higher. The wholesale price index has risen by 23 per cent, and this government is offering the universities an extra 7.4 per cent per student. But, as Dr. D. Carlton Williams, the president of the University of Western Ontario, has observed: "Universities are not taps to be turned on and off abruptly."

Surely, Mr. Speaker, we can all agree that highly trained academic staff cannot be retained in a financially unstable environment. Precision equipment in scientific laboratories cannot be allowed to deteriorate through inadequate maintenance. Arbitrary, short-term and direct government involvement in the use of universities' financial affairs cannot be allowed to further undermine their autonomy and their planning capabilities.

After more than a decade of rapid expansion, it's time for Ontario's universities to economize, without question. Obviously, the universities of this province have to eliminate any inefficiencies which may have developed and they are going to have to be prepared to assume a somewhat more modest position in the provincial government's spending priorities. But surely, Mr. Speaker, the Davis government's demand for immediate drastic reductions is both unreasonable and disruptive. Our universities should not be forced to compete on the money markets to offset inflationary deficits. Tuition fees which now average some \$650 per year must clearly not be raised further, nor should accessibility to post-secondary education be restricted by other means.

I am sure that all the members of the House were interested in some of the remarks

which were attributed to the present Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. Auld) over this past weekend. They were reported in the press.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, as a result of a question which I had asked of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development in the absence of the Minister of Colleges and Universities, we were informed that the remarks which he made were his opinion and not government policy. His opinion seemed to allow us to believe that the problems of university growth were to some extent the fault of the universities themselves. He called for a new approach which would effectively restrict admissions and an approach which would be, in our view, unsatisfactorily elitist.

We certainly believe that academic excellence is needed within our universities. We also believe that it is a responsibility of this government to ensure that there are places available for those students who are qualified to attend university. We cannot accept his approach that, since the number of students has doubled or tripled, we should, accordingly, be cutting back in the total of those who should attend universities by having the kinds of stopping of enrolment programmes which the minister, apparently, is prepared to consider. The fault, accordingly, is not the fault of the administrators of the universities. The fault, if there is a fault—and I think there is—is the fault of this present government.

We have a new president at York University, Mr. Speaker, a gentleman by the name of H. Ian Macdonald, a name familiar to all of us in this House because his most recent incarnation was that of Deputy Treasurer of this Province. He has charged that the absence of long-term financial planning by the Davis government means that "Ontario's universities can only stagger from year to year under a burden of diminishing quality and declining morale."

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, Ian Macdonald was most recently the Deputy Treasurer of Ontario, so he should know whereof he speaks. He should be aware of the real meaning and background that has led the present government to decide upon the kinds of programmes that are now being placed before us in this budget.

If, in his new position, he is now able to speak out as an independent person, although one obviously favouring the further development of higher education in Ontario, surely his experience as the Deputy Treasurer of the province is something we should

consider to have led him to this conclusion, which I'll repeat: "that Ontario's universities can only stagger from year to year under a burden of diminishing quality and declining morale." Mr. Speaker, if the former Deputy Treasurer thinks that there has been an absence of long-term financial planning, I presume that we are able to take his word on that subject.

Universities clearly need financial commitments far enough into the future to permit orderly planning, whether for expansion or for cutbacks. Only adjustments to offset the effects of inflation are the kinds of things which, in our view, should be negotiated annually. Certainly these crash programmes called for by the present government are wasteful. They are wasteful not only in academic personalities, but they are also wasteful in the kinds of education we are giving to the young undergraduates within the universities, and they're wasteful indeed to our entire economic system.

The interference by the present government in the day-to-day financial affairs of universities has been both clumsy and unproductive. Their post-secondary financing formula based on student enrolment has failed to recognize that even small universities have fixed costs; indeed, this entire approach has resulted in encouragement of the costly and undesirable competitive student enrolment drives of recent years.

I have referred to the former Deputy Treasurer, Ian Macdonald, and he characterizes the Davis government's post-secondary funding policy as "a series of short-term, year-to-year decisions of drastic consequence." Certainly our students and our universities deserve better. That sort of non-planning, which Mr. Macdonald admits to, is clearly not good enough.

Mr. Speaker, any serious effort to combat inflation, any serious attempt to counteract the inflationary effect of an apparently uncontrolled though certainly not uncontrollable public sector, must include some measures to increase productivity. We're simply not getting good value in the area of education, and we're certainly not getting the value we should be in the area of colleges and universities—and in both of those areas there are changes which obviously have to be made. But there is another area which I would refer to briefly, and that is the requirement we must have for greater productivity throughout the civil service.

Our greatest resource as a government, and a Liberal government will certainly

acknowledge it as well, is our civil service. Those expensive and austere towers on Bay St., the red brick buildings at Downsview and all the offices scattered throughout the province, are crammed with talented people. They are also energetic people who have much to give to the Province of Ontario.

But this government has ignored them; it has despised them and baited them, trampled them, pushed them around, manipulated them and even used them, as we will recall over these past few months, for some political gain. They are our employees, Mr. Speaker. They are working for the people of Ontario. And when the government abuses the civil service, it abuses every citizen in this province.

The Treasurer's promise to reduce the size of the civil service is offered in this budget as evidence of the managerial competence of the present government. This is supposed to be evidence of the responsible husbandry by the present minister and by the executive council of public funds. This, says the Treasurer is, "the cornerstone of our plan to control government costs and improve operating efficiencies." Well, that's baloney, Mr. Speaker, and it is not even very good baloney.

What efficiency studies has this government done? What manpower utilization studies is this across-the-board reduction based upon? When was the last time this government did any sort of efficiency study? When was the last time it did a job simplification study by working with the frontline civil servants to help them improve their own productivity?

Is there a single ministry in this government which has a management-by-objectives programme functioning? Is there a single ministry which conducts annual appraisals of its employees and their roles in our massive and impersonal organization? Why are there no career development programmes for civil servants with status below the director level? What ministry has a cost effectiveness programme to ensure that the taxpayers are getting value for their dollars?

This proposed reduction in the civil service is as unplanned and as haphazard as its growth has been. No private industry could get away with such incompetence, such a total absence of managerial ability and efficiency planning. And no government can get away with it forever either.

This government's incompetent management, this government's bumbling as an employer is just one more of the reasons why

the voters are going to throw it out at the next election. There is evidence to suggest that the reduction of the civil service complement is much less significant than the Treasurer has indicated in his budget. He contends that the civil service complement has already been reduced by 2.3 per cent from its high point in 1974 and will be reduced a further 2.5 per cent this year. He claims on page 18 of the budget statement that the number of provincial employees in 1974—the high point of that year — was 70,877.

In response to a request I had made, the Civil Service Commission had advised us that the figures which appear on page 18 of the budget which deal with the civil service complement are as of April 1 in each of those particular years.

On May 16, 1974, the Chairman of Management Board (Mr. Winkler) tabled an answer to a question by my colleague from Rainy River (Mr. Reid) which concerned the number of civil servants employed by the Province of Ontario exclusive of Ontario Hydro. The Chairman of Management Board reported that there were 68,620 such civil servants in 1974. However, that figure, Mr. Speaker, is some 2,257 fewer than the Treasurer claims in his budget.

The 1975 staff figure reported in the budget is therefore nine-tenths of one per cent lower as the Treasurer stated. The net reduction over the two years is 1.6 per cent, not the 4.7 per cent indicated by the Treasurer. There is clearly a serious discrepancy in the figures which have been put forward by the Treasurer and Chairman of Management Board. Just whom are we to believe? Is there a third figure—a somewhat more accurate figure?

Why, Mr. Speaker, does the government's figure exclude part-time employees? Why are we not told the number of casual employees? And what about that category known as project workers—there are more than 240 of those, I am told. There is also the category known as temporary—where are they reported?

Where, indeed, Mr. Speaker, are the contract employees alleged to number some 4,100? I understand that as of February, 1974, there were seven employees in the Kenora area who have been employed on contract for 13 years. How many others are there? Why does the government not produce these figures?

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if the government were to disclose the full civil service complement, it would likely approach

80,000 employees. I would appreciate receiving the information on this hidden army of 10,000 who are the ones who make up the various categories we have been referred to from time to time by the various ministries.

I suppose what we can do and what we perhaps will do is question each of the particular ministers as they appear in estimates and try to elicit the information that I have called for. How many contract employees do they have? How many temporary employees do they have? How many project employees do they have? How many casual employees do they have? And so on.

There is another inconsistency, Mr. Speaker, that adds to my concern about this promised staff reduction. The Civil Service Association has been advised by the government that 1,662 jobs will be eliminated. That's 2.4 per cent of the existing complement reported by the Treasurer, not 2.5 per cent. One wonders just which figure is correct.

One final point on this, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the Treasurer could please advise the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations that the promised three per cent staff reduction has been scaled down. It must be confusing to his colleagues when the figures keep changing as the election grows nearer, but there is really no reason for the member for Carleton to have told the South Ottawa Rotary Club the day after the budget that "a three per cent cut will be achieved by attrition."

Mr. Speaker, both within and outside the civil service, this government has demonstrated appalling insensitivity to women and the changing role of women within our society. While 1975 is almost certainly an election year in Ontario, it is also, as members will recall, International Women's Year.

My leader's father, the Hon. Harry C. Nixon, first became a member of this Legislature and Provincial Secretary in a new government in 1919. Harry Nixon proved the maxim that when a government is turned out—as this present one will soon be—good newly-elected members can also often take on senior responsibilities. The present Premier must agree with this view, in that one third of his cabinet were first elected in 1971.

Many, and indeed most, of my colleagues are prepared to serve in a new Liberal government later this year. We are, each of us, also quite prepared to stand aside if, in the opinion of the new Premier, there are others

who he will ask to serve and who as yet are not members of this House.

We know, Mr. Speaker, that the gibes from across the floor from time to time, as to whether or not we as individuals are such repositories of wisdom and ability that we should presume to become members of the executive council, are really quite irrelevant and even misleading. This is especially so when one considers their source.

If we are occasionally fractious and in high individual spirits, I would suggest, sir, that a quick reading of Ontario's history reveals that such a description of our party is fairly accurate for that of any official opposition since 1871, perhaps with the exception of the 10th Legislature from 1903 to 1905. In 1942, Andrew Brewin, writing in the Canadian Forum, commented that George Drew's Conservatives were "inventing new ways and methods of committing political suicide." And he said that they were also "a motley collection of misguided independents who will never be able to hold office." Yet a year later George Drew became Premier and established a political machinery that has, to use the word of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development, "ruled" Ontario for 32 years, and more than half of that first Tory cabinet came directly from private life.

Do not, therefore, presume that when the time comes later this year to repeat that transition a new Liberal government will be unable to cope, even with the mess that we will inherit. My present colleagues and our future ones will do the work we are given to do, and I trust it will be done well.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, the year 1919 was the year of electoral success for Harry Nixon. It was also the first Ontario election in which women had the franchise and their votes helped to defeat a 14-year-old Conservative government. Perhaps that bodes well for a Liberal success in this Women's Year.

As long ago as the early 1880s, Liberal members of the Legislature were fighting for the rights of women in Ontario. One member, John Waters, introduced the first proposal to give women the provincial franchise, warning that he would introduce a woman's suffrage bill in every session until he got it passed for as long as he sat in the House. Between 1885 and 1893, he sponsored nine measures to extend the female franchise and in 1912, five years before women finally got the vote, the Liberal leader of the day, Newton Rowell, was criticizing the Conservative government's

Speech from the Throne for omitting all references to suffrage.

Like its predecessors, the Davis government seems determined to avoid the issues that affect the changing lives of women. They seem unaware that our new concern for the status of women is primarily a consequence of changes that have already taken place in the social and economic nature of their lives, rather than an ominous sign of disruptive changes yet to come.

Women's role in our society and our economy, as workers and as consumers, is just now being recognized. Thus, equal pay for work of equal value, equality of pensions and benefits, and equal opportunities, are among the fundamental issues that demand government action.

There are 1.2 million women in the Ontario labour force. Thirty-nine per cent of these women are the family breadwinners. One of every three workers in Ontario is female. But while women form a higher proportion of the labour force than ever before, the gap between salaries earned by men and women is growing wider.

In 1967, women employees in Ontario earned an average of \$3,538 less than men. By 1973, the difference had increased to \$5,259. On average, women workers in Ontario earn 22 per cent less than men, despite the existence since 1951 of the provincial Female Employees Fair Remuneration Act.

The Davis government has shown no willingness to eliminate these inequities. In spite of strong opposition arguments led by the hon. member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell), recent amendments to the Employment Standards Act still fail to recognize the principle that equal pay laws must hinge on the appraisal of work of equal value. And that employers cannot be allowed to circumvent the law by using different job titles for men and women who perform substantially the same tasks.

Instead, the government acted to penalize women for seeking equality under that Act by freeing employers of the obligation to provide transportation for female employees who work late. Why must equality mean the loss of something?

The Davis government itself is among the employers that discriminates against women. Last November, the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet spoke of the government's "commitment to improve the status of its women employees." Less than two months later, he negotiated and signed

an agreement with 17,000 civil servants that perpetuates the long-standing differences between salaries for men and women.

Barbers get 13 cents more per hour than hairdressers, a difference of more than \$270 annually, even though it doesn't sound like a lot to start with. The highest paid tailor receives 61 cents per hour more than the highest paid seamstress—that's a \$1,264 difference each year.

In hospitals, male laboratory assistants received \$484 monthly in 1972, while female lab assistants were paid \$438 per month. Male cooks received \$560 each month, compared to \$472 for female cooks.

Seventy-six per cent of the Davis government's female employees earn less than \$9,000 annually, but only 28 per cent of the male civil servants earn less than that amount. Eighty-four per cent of the government employees earning less than \$6,000 annually are women.

The Davis government's failure as an employer to ensure equal opportunity for women is nowhere more dramatic than in the Liquor Control Board. That agency reported last June that in its retail stores it employed 2,200 men and only two women. The entire full-time LCBO staff at that time consisted of 184 females and 3,222 males. All 500 store managers and 500 assistant store managers were men. Of the 1,255 LCBO employees earning between \$10,000 and \$15,000 per year, only two were women; and those earning more than \$15,000 included 257 men and only one woman.

Despite pressure and talks since 1972, the Davis government has still not acted to establish a daycare centre for its Queen's Park employees. Again, in January the government's co-ordinator of women's programmes admitted that "this is a crucial and wanting area, and that government action could give an example to the community of what an employer can do." But she gave no indication as to when something will be done.

The Davis government, of course, has failed to meet the child-care needs of parents across the province. At present there are places for about 40,000 in daycare facilities, but Toronto alone needs 73,000 places and it is estimated that Ontario needs as many as 200,000 places.

One in three of Ontario's women workers has children under the age of 16; 11 per cent have children under the age of six. But even if school lunch and after-4 programmes are included, less than two per cent of the children under the age of 14, whose mothers work, have access to child-care services.

Child care for working parents is a major social need in Ontario; it is not a frill. The social and economic opportunities available through quality child care can enable our children—who I believe, are our greatest resource—to realize their potential to an extent never before possible. Yet the Davis government is moving to lower standards to a level that will reduce child care in Ontario to little more than a custodial service, and that would be a tragedy. The government has stuck with this position even though its own advisory council on day care has reported that the promised costs savings are "difficult to substantiate."

The government must also come to grips with the special child care problem that arises when schools close for teachers' professional development days. This is just one area in which the Premier's education system has ignored the role and rights of women.

In 1974 there were 568 male high school principals in Ontario but only 11 female principals. Of the vice-principals, there were 699 men and 29 women.

The proportion of women undergraduates in universities has increased from a Canada-wide average of 17 per cent in 1921 to 38 per cent in 1972, but projections to 1980 show no further increase.

The situation in graduate schools is even worse. The proportion of enrolled women has dropped from 26 per cent in 1920 to 22 per cent in 1973. While women received 31 per cent of the MAs awarded in Ontario in 1931, they got only 24 per cent in 1972, and women's share of PhDs dropped from 25 per cent in 1931 to nine per cent in 1972.

The proportion of women on the full-time teaching staff of universities has not increased significantly in the past 40 years—from 11 per cent in 1931 to 11.6 per cent in 1974. Furthermore, women are concentrated in the lower academic ranks. A task force study at the University of Waterloo in 1972 found that women constituted only five per cent of the total full-time faculty and that two thirds of this small group were at the junior level of assistant professor or below. Only 35 per cent of the male faculty were at these low levels. At Queen's University a similar study found that seven per cent of the full-time faculty were women and 84 per cent of these, compared with 38 per cent of the men, held ranks of assistant professor or lecturer.

The Ontario Committee on Post-Secondary Education reported more than two years ago that women are one of the three most disadvantaged groups in respect of post-secondary education. The report charged that "these

education institutions have done pitifully little to improve the rates of attendance and employment of women."

These injustices in the labour force, in the civil service, in child care and in education, cry out for swift government action.

In the Davis government tradition, Ontario's commitment to International Women's Year has so far consisted of little more than public relations programmes.

Almost three years ago, the Legislature passed amendments to the Human Rights Code to end discrimination in pensions and employment benefits. Proclamation of these amendments has now been delayed indefinitely.

Legislation to reform marital property law, which was inadequate but at least a beginning, was allowed to die on the order paper in the last session, although we expect its return to life.

Apparently the Davis government neither wants to acknowledge that the position of women in our society has changed, nor to institute the legislative and programme changes that are needed to deal with existing problems, let alone the future.

Mr. Speaker, I have suggested that the taxpayers are not getting good value for the almost \$9 billion that this government will tax out of them in the coming 12 months. I have also suggested that by applying rather basic managerial and staff development principles, the productivity of government in Ontario could be substantially increased. This approach would include the creation of a positive climate for women in the civil service.

In addition, there are several areas where a government that is sincere about spending restraint can cut costs. A good place to begin would be in the Premier's office and the cabinet office, where spending increased from \$518,571 in 1970-1971 in John Roberts' last year to \$1.99 million in 1973-1974. That is an increase of 284 per cent in three years and there is every evidence to indicate that the effectiveness of those offices has changed in reverse proportion to the increase in costs.

In the Premier's office alone, salary costs increased from \$515,000 in 1971-1972 to \$796,000 in 1973-1974. That is an increase in salary costs of \$281,000 in two years. The Treasurer tells us in this budget the Premier's staff complement rose from 42 to 45 in that period. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we're not paying each of these three extra employees \$90,000, although with this government, one can never be certain. It is also interesting to

note that the average salary for each of those 45 employees in the Premier's office in 1974 was therefore \$17,688. One wonders how many get more and how many get less than the average.

The policy secretariats, or so-called super-ministries, have been a failure and a waste of money. Yet they cost more than \$1 million annually. The ministers are almost never able to answer questions within their policy areas and there is no evidence of co-ordination between departments that would not be attainable without that expense.

The government should admit that these secretariats were a mistake. They've really served their major purpose anyway. The Premier's leadership rivals have all faded into obscurity except, of course, for the present Treasurer whose eager pursuit of his leader's job may diminish after his party runs a poor second later this year. The Resources Development secretary is in semi-retirement.

Mr. Lewis: A poor second?

Mr. Breithaupt: A poor second.

Mr. Lewis: What assumption is there that they will run even second?

Mr. Breithaupt: Well, we'll see. But, in any event, to return to the fray—

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): I'd be happier if they ran third.

Mr. Breithaupt: I don't mind if they run third. All right, I'll make it third if it would make the member for Scarborough West feel any better.

Mr. Lewis: An abject third sounds better than a poor second.

Mr. J. Lane (Algoma-Manitoulin): Both members are dreaming.

Mr. Breithaupt: An abject third it is. Fine.

The Resources Development secretary is in semi-retirement. The Justice secretary, the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Clement), is also Attorney General and Solicitor General, so he can't be spending very much time as a super-minister.

Then, of course, there is the Social Development secretary. If it's correct, as rumoured, that responsibility for daycare centres will be fully and completely transferred to the operating Ministry of Community and Social Services, then one wonders just what she does for that extra indemnity.

The Treasurer's prattling about restraint in government spending is particularly grating

right now when we are all being subjected to a growing barrage of government advertising as the election draws nearer. This is perhaps the Davis government's most cynical and blatant misuse of public funds for political purposes. Certainly, advertising is a necessary part of the electoral process. Even this government has acknowledged that advertising during a campaign period must be carefully regulated, but the government's extravagant pre-election ad campaigns with public funds make a mockery of the provisions in the new election expenses legislation.

The Peterborough Examiner has noted that, and I quote:

In the post-Watergate era, clear and honest communication would go a long way to restoring lost faith in politicians in governments.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it is on this basis that the government of Ontario would seek to justify annual public relations expenditures of some \$115 million. However, an examination of the advertising programme conducted by Ontario's Ministry of Industry and Tourism provides a case study in the misuse of those public funds.

The government admits that Camp Associates Advertising Ltd. got the tourist promotion account without competition and retains the account without a contract. The Camp agency, whose president was a key Conservative organizer during the last provincial election, received approximately \$2.7 million in Ontario government billings in the subsequent three years. No matter how common it is, this sort of patronage has no place in our democracy. No government advertising account should be awarded without a full and fair competition. Camp Associates which, when we last checked had a staff of 11, lists only 12 accounts. These include two with the Conservative government in New Brunswick; one with the University of New Brunswick; two with the Conservative government of Ontario, including the tourist promotion account, and three with tourist-related clients in the Niagara region.

A large part of the Ontario government's tourist promotion budget is spent inside Canada. According to figures compiled for the Liberal research office by Elliott Research Corp. Ltd., this portion of the budget was 80 per cent higher in 1971, an election year, than in 1972. A breakdown of spending by provinces within Canada is not available but it certainly appears that public funds were used for advertising in Ontario during the election year in order to benefit

the party in power, and this has obviously happened again this year.

Among the Ontario government's other advertising abuses are, first of all, a \$0.5 million campaign in 1969 which assured the people of Ontario that they were covered by the new health insurance plan. The slogan "Relax, you are covered" was of little comfort to the more than 200,000 people who found they had no coverage when the plan began. A \$156,000 campaign in June, 1970, consisted of 1,246 newspaper ads defending the regional government programme which was and still is being criticized in many parts of the province.

Mr. Speaker, there was a \$160,000 campaign about the same time announcing that a low-cost drug programme had been implemented. Then in 1970, in the fall, we had that \$430,000 campaign which blanketed the province with the slogan "Is there anywhere you'd rather be?" The government claimed the campaign was designed to attract trade to Ontario but some of us, perhaps not quite so naive, weren't entirely convinced.

Last year, we had a \$460,000 campaign, which was repeated again this year, advising residents of Ontario to fill out their tax credit forms in order to get their "fair share" by completing both the federal income tax form and the provincial tax credit form.

The current \$665,000 ad campaign to promote responsible use of alcohol is simply the next one along the line. Certainly the problem of alcoholism cannot be denied but there is really no justification for expending this enormous sum on anti-drinking ads while refusing to ban ads by the liquor and beer manufacturers which encourage alcoholic consumption in the first place. The current consumer advertising is also in this class; and the current \$600,000 campaign to promote seatbelt use is for a good cause but there is substantial evidence from other jurisdictions that the money will be spent to no effect.

These are examples of what I believe are an arrogant and irresponsible perversion of public funds, really, for the private benefit of the party in power and not for the enforcement or the education of the people of this province.

Just as the advertising industry must regulate itself to eliminate demand-creating promotions, governments also must adhere to strict guidelines in their own advertising. In general government advertisements should be restricted to messages which either inform residents of the steps they must take to

benefit from some government programme or alert them to some danger. A government's boasts and justifications should be channelled through the news media rather than displayed with public funds.

There are dozens of measures, Mr. Speaker, which the new Liberal government would be undertaking to attempt to bring spending under control and to reduce this government's inflationary deficit. If the election is called soon, we will even be able to straighten out some of the mess in this budget before the next fiscal year. The greatest savings will result from a realignment of priorities within ministries rather than the outright elimination of particular programmes.

In the area of health, for instance, the largest spending department, our government will examine a whole range of cost-cutting measures which have been ignored by this government. While I cannot, of course, speak for whomsoever the new Liberal Minister of Health may be, I'm certain that he or she will examine items such as the following.

First of all, the abolition of OHIP premiums. Certainly no premiums are collected in Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland or Manitoba. As the federal Minister of National Health and Welfare has stated:

The costs of premium collection in some provinces, plus the fact that many millions of Canadians were unaccustomed to paying health insurance premiums, meant that the cost of attempting to collect premiums in some provinces did not justify the effort and within a few years the premium system was abandoned.

Of course, there is the limitation of the number of health specialists. In larger centres like Toronto many specialists give primary care which could be provided by family practitioners at much lower cost. Once again, to quote M. LaLonde, we are tending towards an over-supply of doctors, particularly in some specialties. That's not a very deep or very far-reaching remark, Mr. Speaker. It's an obvious situation, one with which this province should grapple. We have to shift the focus away from care, away from extensive active treatment hospital care to alternative forms of ambulatory care.

One of the main contributing factors to the escalation in health costs has been this government's failure to develop low-cost alternatives to high-cost services. Certainly there must be greater emphasis on preventive measures. The most obvious need is for physical fitness and recreational programmes for all ages. The high cost of automobile

accidents in health care terms also demands tough action, at the very least in the area of driver education.

There has to be a revision of the present funding formula for hospitals, such as that for the per diem rate per bed which is an incentive to keep the bed occupied as the hospital can only collect money for it if it is filled. The per diem rate at North York General Hospital, for example, is \$101.90—an astounding amount.

And, of course, the minister is going to have to look at a more sophisticated information system to provide easy access to information on what is being done in the hospital. At the present time there is very little information available which tells us where the fat is in the hospital budgets. A computer bank for the broad spectrum of management information would make it much easier to determine appropriate cost reductions.

There will likely be greater use of allied health professionals when the use of highly-paid physicians is not required. Nurse practitioners and midwives are only two examples of health professionals who could be used for certain types of care.

Better manpower planning is going to have to be looked at in the health service field as well. Certain specialties are overcrowded and others need more people. There is very little planning done on what the health manpower needs of the province will be and where they will be needed. Many doctors obviously stay in the large centres such as Toronto and generate their own business by having patients coming in for repeat visits, rather than working where they could be much better used to serve the people of this province.

Those are just some of the broad range of cost-cutting measures this government has ignored. Those are some of the alternatives which simply have been avoided and which the government shies away from implementing or even from examining.

There is another area in which cost reduction must concern all of us. The provincial government's programme of imposing regional governments throughout Ontario is another extravagance that has to be stopped. The Premier has talked about getting economies by centralizing municipal decisions, but I believe he has been clearly proven wrong.

Mr. Deacon: He certainly has.

Mr. Breithaupt: His policy was wrong and it backfired. The dramatic increases in regional

government costs are now adding to the inflationary pressures in our economy and are becoming an intolerable burden to taxpayers in these regions.

For example, in Waterloo county the cost of services taken over by the region increased 36 per cent in the first year of regional government. In one township, North Dumfries, costs increased 120 per cent. In the city of Waterloo, costs rose by 82 per cent. The start-up costs in this region were \$1.8 million; one quarter of this was paid by Ontario taxpayers and the remainder had to be raised locally. That balance of \$1.35 million was a new burden on the taxpayers of the region. Ontario Provincial Police coverage was withdrawn, and this required 43 new regional police officers and expenses of more than \$300,000.

Mr. Speaker, I should insert the comment at this point that there might have well been other increases that would have occurred whether or not regional government was put into effect. There might well have been costs—and I have no doubt that there would be costs—that would have naturally resulted if the entire framework had not changed at all. If all the townships, the towns or the villages had remained in the region of Waterloo, for example, then their costs would have gone up. But what we are saying, Mr. Speaker, is that there is an additional burden, even beyond that reasonable increase, that must be laid at the door of regional government.

Waterloo's experience has been felt by others right across this province. In the regional municipality of Muskoka, some residents are faced this year with tax increases of 500 per cent. We are informed by one man in Georgian Bay township who paid municipal taxes of \$106 two years ago that he paid \$496 on the same property last year. And we are informed, of course, that there are still more regions yet to come.

In Niagara the costs of running cities, villages and townships in 1969, the year before regional government was imposed, was \$44 million. In 1970, with regional government, costs increased to \$56 million, a 28 per cent increase. Regional government as well as introduced to Niagara in 1970 and the increase there was even worse. Costs grew from \$21 million to \$32 million in one year—a stunning 51 per cent increase in Niagara. The costs of the regional portion of municipal government have continued to go up since 1970. Costs have been piled upon costs in the four years of regional government in Niagara; just as the annual cost of operating

the regional government has jumped by 85.3 per cent, from \$22 million to \$41 million.

In Ottawa-Carleton, the regional municipality's spending has risen 88 per cent in five years. The soaring expenditures affect all the taxpayers in Ontario, not just those living in the regional municipalities. The provincial treasury, Mr. Speaker, paid 47 per cent of all municipal government costs last year, which was a total of \$2.7 billion. The excessive costs associated with regional government add unnecessarily to provincial government expenditures which are already at an inflationary level.

The Davis programme of implementing regional governments throughout southern Ontario, which despite a temporary hiatus is still scheduled for completion during this decade, should be abandoned. As a result, the rights of locally-elected councils to make independent decisions without Queen's Park direction must be emphasized. The right to establish local planning goals and to implement these goals without the costly delays of Queen's Park supervision must be returned to locally-elected councils. We certainly cannot support the continuation of this government's extravagant efforts to centralize total and direct control of local government here at Queen's Park.

Mr. Speaker, we were treated today to a statement by the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Rhodes) with respect to certain programmes that will result from the Krauss-Maffei system that was to have resolved our particular problems within this province concerning urban transportation. We believe any government that was truly concerned about spending restraints would have abandoned the Krauss-Maffei system months ago. The government's continuing expenditure on this wasteful and expensive technology belies any real commitment to trim the provincial budget.

Questions have been asked in the House today with respect to the total amount this project will have cost us from the date of its inception to today's announcement. I'm looking forward to receiving that information, which was sought by the member for Downsview (Mr. Singer), as it will be a very interesting commentary on the development of these kinds of programmes.

The system has been seriously discredited as a viable solution to Ontario's urban transit problems. Even if it does work, it will be inferior to comparable but less expensive systems already in operation around the world. Urgently needed transit developments across the province are being delayed while the Premier and his Minister of Transporta-

tion and Communications continue to fritter away our tax dollars on their flying trains.

Mr. Speaker, there are a few more remarks I would like to make with respect to this particular subject before I begin what I hope will be some useful comments and criticisms on the detail involved of the budget. I must say before I adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker, that I do appreciate particularly the attendance of the Treasurer throughout my remarks this afternoon.

Mr. Breithaupt moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR:

MATRIMONIAL PROPERTY RIGHTS ACT

Mr. Bounsall moves second reading of Bill 42, An Act to establish Matrimonial Property Rights.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill establishes certain matrimonial property rights for the spouses of a marriage quite simply, the purpose of the bill is to recognize that marriage is an equal partnership and at the time of a marriage breakup, either through a divorce or annulment, the total value of the combined assets acquired by the husband and the wife during marriage should be divided equally between them.

Mr. Speaker, the need for this arose quite clearly and was brought into sharp focus by the Murdoch case in Alberta. I think most people in Canada were shocked to find in that decision by the Supreme Court that not only was marriage not considered an equal partnership in terms of the assets of the spouse of that marriage, but that even where a person—the one spouse in this case, Mrs. Murdoch—had worked shoulder-to-shoulder in the business enterprise of that couple, that is the running of the farm, there was no account taken of the amount of labour which Mrs. Murdoch provided. She simply did not qualify for any of the assets which the two of them had jointly gathered as a result of her direct labours on the farm.

Chief Justice McRuer dissented in a very well-worded dissent, but in this respect, as they were considering the point of her labours on the farm, they had to view—and he had to in his dissent—that very narrow approach. In his dissent he said one should calculate and total up the value of the labour which the wife contributed along with her husband to the farm and some account should be taken of that labour rather than

the somewhat wider view of recognizing that a marriage is a partnership. Even if one spouse's contribution to that marriage and to that joint undertaking is simply running the home, looking after the children, providing the meals, the washing and other services, in spite of that, none of that is to be counted. None of that work, according to the courts, is worth anything.

What they are really saying is that all of that work—in most cases, of course, on the part of the wife—counts for nothing in terms of an asset division in the unfortunate circumstances of a divorce occurring. We are saying, Mr. Speaker, that this is not right.

Women are in a perennially and completely disadvantaged position when, upon a divorce, they find that none of their labours—irrespective of what that labour is over the course of the years—can be taken into account or is worth anything when the marriage breaks up and the assets of that marriage can be counted, can be enumerated on paper and some division made. She gets absolutely nothing. Not only should we look at any work she might do directly toward the business, be it a farm or shop or any other endeavour which the husband has got involved in, which is the case in most cases, but we should be looking at it in terms of dividing all of the assets equally.

The pity of the Murdoch case is that the decision which the Supreme Court made, a retrogressive decision, applies to all of Canada. Any change in the matrimonial property laws, unless a similar case can be brought through and another decision made, now rests in the jurisdiction of the provinces. And that's a pity because most provinces can stay exactly where they are without much being said at all on division of property.

In the western provinces, I guess in Saskatchewan, there is a Homestead Act by which, if it is a homesteading situation, the wife does have a share in the house, the actual homestead. But in most provinces it is not looked after at all. We have the situation of 10 different property laws pertaining to marriage emerging across this country rather than a decision of the Supreme Court which could apply to all 10 provinces and which would clearly indicate some division of assets when a marriage breaks up.

My bill proposes that upon a divorce or annulment one simply totals up the assets of both spouses which have been acquired since marriage and one makes an equal division between the two spouses of all assets acquired since marriage—a very simple proposal. It would require some accounting but leaves very little discretion to the judge involved.

This would, of course, include the matrimonial home. There are various proposals for dealing purely and simply with the matrimonial home quite separately. I am afraid with those proposals one might end up with the law of Ontario dealing simply with the matrimonial home and not with the total assets which both spouses in their own way have acquired since marriage. Dealing only with the matrimonial home in my opinion is not nearly good enough and is not nearly supportive of the efforts which in a marriage women continually make. That's the principle which must be recognized in this bill; that marriage is a partnership and that the woman is an equal partner in that marriage and equally qualified to share in the assets which that partnership has jointly gained.

In speaking to it, I recognize I am phrasing it in terms of the wife being the one who doesn't directly bring income into the family. This increasingly is not the case. The woman is working as much as the man, and in fact in some cases brings in more income than the man does; in many cases women have their own businesses. What we are saying is that when that's the case there should still be an equal division, but in those many cases where the wife does not appear to contribute by working directly on the farm, has not put a downpayment on the farm—such as in the Rathwell case in Saskatchewan—irrespective of that and irrespective of whether she clerks in the store in which her husband works, her contribution to that marriage has to be recognized in an equal way.

In respect of the matrimonial home, I provided a clause in the bill where the matrimonial home cannot be sold without the consent of the other spouse except by a court order in trying to settle up the actual division which is taking place. On the matrimonial home what so often happens, or what could happen, is that the matrimonial home is sold out from under the one spouse who would most likely for some time at least want to inhabit or very much needs to inhabit that matrimonial home. So one cannot sell the matrimonial home without the consent of both spouses, but if one has to finally effect the asset settlement, the court could order that within a given time that matrimonial home be in fact sold to provide the settlement.

In thinking this over I have expanded on a couple of clauses in the bill which make it very clear what does happen. In terms of a gift or an inheritance, what I have proposed is that a gift or inheritance be

not counted as an asset but any income produced or capital appreciation of that gift be taken into the division. This assumes, of course, that there is a separation of assets during marriage.

That's a point over which there could be debate and discussion: When a marriage is formed and it's a partnership, should there not be a completely combined financial situation? That may be a consideration; could we pass a bill that says during marriage all income must be equally shared? I don't know how one polices that in a marriage. Really, in most marriages, certainly in my own, there is no really great excess of assets to share and everything that comes in gets spent on that family unit. If that wasn't the case, one could pass it through legislation but I don't see how one could enforce it.

So the bill presupposes a separation of assets. I don't see how it could be adequately enforced. A gift or inheritance which comes to either is not included in that division of assets, but certainly any capital appreciation on that gift or inheritance is an asset which comes as a result of the marriage and during that marriage, and that should be part of the split.

In looking at the bill, I have also included a phrase in which, except by consent of both spouses in writing, no child shall share in the division of the assets upon a divorce or nullity. I think that is fair, in that upon divorce, what I am saying is that the continued operating support of the children of the marriage should be still, as it is, be the result of a decision. The custody of the children and the decision on the amount of the operating support of that child should stay where it is, a matter of the family court. Nothing should change in that respect. Whoever gets the custody of the children, when the custody is determined then the family court works out exactly what continuing operating expense should accrue to the spouse who doesn't have the direct care and problems of feeding and clothing and bringing up of those children. That remains where it is.

We're talking purely and simply about an equal division of the assets that have accrued during that marriage; the lump sum capital situation, if you like, divided equally. In that case there's no reason for the children to have it. The operating funds for the children are determined in the same way as they always have been, so I see no reason for the children to share. Deliberately, including a non-sharing clause in the bill makes the division of assets at that time much simpler.

I also place a limitation on gifts. Under a bill of this sort on property rights, one could envisage a situation where the one spouse determines that their marriage is to end, and in order to circumvent the division of assets in this bill, decides that he or she will give away large portions of their individual assets. In any event, in most cases these are the combined assets which the two of them are living on. But in order to prevent that, I have a phrase in here which says gifts to another person or persons shall not exceed three per cent of the individual assets of that person in the year prior to the commencement of the action for divorce or nullity, based upon the highest or the greatest asset which that person has in that year.

So if a marriage is breaking up and divorce is going to result, at least in the entire year prior to the commencement of that action, there would be no way in which the one spouse can, in fact, make gifts to a third party, which they might hope to recover after. I have it for a year period, but that could be a longer period. What I really wanted to guard against in that area was one spouse giving away a lot of those assets and not having it for the division when the time comes for the division, and I've put it one year prior to the commencement of the action.

If one wanted to plan very carefully, one could, of course, give a lot of assets away and somehow not have the commencement of the action until more than a year after that point. But I would think that one spouse might be rather suspicious if the other spouse gave away a lot of their assets to a third party in an action with which that spouse didn't agree. It is not likely a whole year would go by before the spouse who didn't agree would bring some sort of action, knowing the details of the bill.

I'm easy on that particular portion. I'm interested to hear what other members have to say around that point on how one prevents this.

I might say that a lot of the ideas I had for the bill came out from the Law Reform Commission report on the division of marriage. They recognized marriage as a partnership and proposed this sort of system of accounting at the time of a marriage breakdown.

One other point certainly interests me, Mr. Speaker, and that is the common law situation. We have in the Employment Standards Act a section dealing with equal benefits. The committee setting out to look at the Human Rights Code, which had a clause, 4 (1)(g), that dealt with benefits not neces-

sarily needing to be equal, have reported on that. They have said virtually every benefit to a woman or man in the workplace must be equal, except for differences that relate directly to the one sex as on an actuarial basis for life insurance and pension plans. They tried to find a definition of common law in the discussion of the Labour estimates and again in that section of the Act. It was brought to their attention that one definition of common law to pertain to all particular benefits may not be the way to arrive at a definition of common law, and for particular benefits they may have to define common law in particular terms.

In the matter of two persons in a common-law relationship seeking to obtain family rates for OHIP, they simply declare that relationship; that's the practice now, and it is accepted. It also has the advantage of indicating a date at which time the common-law situation came into existence. A date of this sort could well be that one used in clause 6 of the bill, where I talk about the same application of everything else I have said applying to a common-law relationship.

I have defined common law, not so much as I would define common law but using a definition that's already in vogue in the Province of Ontario. In the Workmen's Compensation Act, a common-law union is defined as a couple who have declared themselves as man and wife—this can be checked, of course, by the date on which their family OHIP starts—who have lived together for six years without children or for two years where there are children of that marriage. In that instance, if one spouse is killed in the work place, the death benefits that apply to a spouse apply directly in the common-law case on the basis of their definition of a union of six years without children or two years with children. I think those time periods can be shortened.

Perhaps a simple declaration that a man and wife are in fact living common law should be enough for this bill and with respect to the possible division of assets, whether it be a short period or a long period. Over a short period, of course, there wouldn't have been many assets acquired jointly between them during marriage, so there would be very little to divide. If it lasted a long time, then there would be somewhat more.

I feel we cannot rule out common-law unions. We can find a date for them to start if they hold themselves out as living together. At least we should have in the bill the phrase in the Workmen's Compensation Act respecting payments to the spouse

of a person who has been killed in the work place. That at least should be the definition for common-law unions for all the other divisions of property for an actual married person as under the Act.

In the common-law situation, Mr. Speaker, I can envisage a case of one individual having perhaps three common-law relationships that went on for some time over the period of his or her life, and those three relationships breaking down at some point. Then, at the time of each breakdown, there would simply be a division of the joint assets they had acquired during that common-law relationship, the same as if that person had been married three times in the course of a lifetime and the division of assets occurring. Of course, the remarriage of one spouse will not affect the payment they are to receive under this division of assets.

The bill also allows for the payment to be made over a period of time; it is the one area of discretion which I do give to the judge in this case. There might be a case where one could argue that where a business enterprise is involved, a farm or a business of any sort, and division of the capital appreciation of the business since marriage would cause a real hardship to the farm or the business enterprise, that they could be paid over a period of time. The period of time I have suggested is reasonably short, but one over which the business or the farm could continue to operate. I have suggested that the payment be not less than yearly and that there be periodic payments to be made not less than yearly and over a period not to exceed three years from the date of the final decree.

In summation, Mr. Speaker, the women in this province, particularly, and in our country have been disadvantaged over their property rights. They've tended to be in a situation where, unless a couple worked things out very carefully between them, there's no way in which the woman can have a share of the assets which they worked together to achieve in that partnership. We need some very immediate redress of this situation and it's now fallen to the provinces to provide that redress and that protection to both spouses in the marriage.

I would hope that other members of this House would feel that way and see the justice of the case which basically says that irrespective of whether one spouse does not directly contribute to the farm or the business enterprise of the other spouse—even if they contribute to the marriage only by sustaining the other spouse in the many ways

they do—when a divorce occurs, that unfortunate situation, the assets they've acquired between them during the marriage should be divided equally between them.

Mr. Speaker: The member for St. George.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I first want to commend the member for Windsor West for bringing forward this bill and for establishing in his preamble, as proposed, a statement which is welcomed by people across this province. There has to be an acceptance that marriage is a socio-economic partnership of equals and since that preamble sets the tone, I have to say with some great regret that I cannot follow all of the provisions within this Act because it does seem to me that there is some real problem with parts of it.

First of all, I have come to the conclusion that we must, somehow, cause a vesting in each of the partners at the time of the marriage. This may cause problems; I recognize that, too. There are a great many women who have been fighting for this kind of reform for a long time who believe that this type of legislation is coming forward now because more and more women are supporting the family. Therefore, again, it is in essence to their disadvantage not to have a little time when they may have their money to themselves. However, that is not my point.

One looks at this and, again, we have the problem that it all takes effect only on the breakdown of the marriage. It has been pointed out that we look in this bill to the common-law relationship. One of the things I don't think has been taken into consideration is that we have a marriage, we'll say, and there is a desertion by one of the partners and a common-law relationship established while the marriage is, to all intents and purposes, an ongoing relationship.

This has been one of the real problems, Mr. Speaker, in the family court with judges trying to come up with an award for the wife and children and still recognizing the needs of the common-law family. This does not really overcome that kind of a problem. It simply says that somebody is going to have to sort this darn thing out as to who is the wife, within the meaning of this bill, having in mind the provision for the two types of relationship. That is one of the reasons I say it seems to me that if we're going to make this work, there has to be a vesting at the time of marriage. I just point that out, recognizing fully the problems which evolve from it.

As I stand here and speak to this bill, concerned as I am with real problems and looking at the way this government approaches these difficulties, it all seems so futile. This government has practised the elimination of protection without granting equality of opportunity. It is interesting that one of the newest amendments that we've had, which is under the child welfare legislation, is that this government has moved to make it abundantly clear that both spouses may have orders made against them for the protection of the child. But let us preserve in the concrete that piece of Dickens, the fact that the child's religion must follow that of the father!

One of the things that isn't taken into consideration fully, it seems to me, is the family concept of property law, because what you can get from this is that each of the spouses will have an equal division. One of them is going to be more equal than the other. One of them is going to end up looking after children probably out of their share, because that doesn't seem to be provided for anywhere in this kind of division.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we could have an acceptance of the philosophy of the equality of the partnership in marriage, that we could at the same time regard this kind of reform as a family reform and that we could get away from that awful business of trying to make it out as a reform for women, although the need at this point in time is for the protection of women.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I do want to say that as far as I am concerned we must accept this principle, but we must work to a common vesting at the time of marriage and there must still be some provision for the protection of children within this kind of legislation as I see it. I am sorry that I can't be quite as wholeheartedly in support as I would like to be able to be, but I trust that the person introducing this bill will recognize that my concerns are very real and that I'm not raising points simply to be disruptive about it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Renfrew South.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in this private member's bill, Bill 42, An Act to establish Matrimonial Property Rights.

The member for Windsor West who introduced the bill did mention that many of the ideas used in putting together this bill came from recommendations of the Law Reform Commission. It would appear that almost all of them did. I don't find any fault with that.

I think the bill is a beginning; it's a start. I think this type of legislation is perhaps long past due. As a matter of fact, I believe the government is presently preparing legislation similar to this, and probably legislation that will go much further. At any rate, things and times have changed. The day we had few or no working mothers certainly differs from the Sixties and especially the Seventies, when the female partner is today probably contributing in some instances as much, and in other instances perhaps more than the male partner of the union.

So there is a great need for such legislation. Some things bother me about this bill. I think the government can use it as a basis for legislation that I understand is under consideration, but there do not seem to be enough safeguards in it, especially when it comes to disposition of the matrimonial home. I see where the Law Reform Commission recommended an exception, and it read as follows:

If at the time the legislation is passed the wife is the registered owner, the husband will only become co-owner if there is evidence sufficient to satisfy the court that the parties have agreed that the husband should share in the ownership of the home.

We don't have that kind of safeguard, but I don't think that safeguard is even enough, because let's look at a hypothetical situation. Let's say we have a widow who is being courted, she has a fine home worth many thousands of dollars, and during the courtship or immediately after the marriage she does agree with her husband that the home should be equally shared or, if sold, the money equally shared when the home is disposed of. But that is really no safeguard for such a widow, in my opinion.

I think the member for Windsor West used some good reasoning when he looked at the common-law situation where, it is recommended, in section 6:

Where a man and woman hold themselves out as being man and wife and have lived together continuously for a period of at least six years without children, or continuously for a period of two years where there are children, the provisions of this Act shall apply to the man and the woman as if they were husband and wife.

There is some kind of safeguard there. I would hope that when the Act is put together and presented to the Legislature there would be a similar safeguard for all marriage situations and not only the com-

mon-law situation. I think that clause should apply to all. I know that one can pick up a paper almost any day and read of unusual situations with regard to matrimonial disputes and the disposition of the assets, and that is why I think we have to have a time clause inserted there and certain other safeguards to ensure that neither husband nor wife is done out in any way whatsoever.

I think the rest of the bill has much merit, but as I said at the outset, it's a start. It's a beginning. It's possibly too simple. I think all of us in today's society are looking for the simple solutions to everything. I think the member for Windsor West possibly had that in mind when he worked on putting this piece of legislation together. It seems to be a simple solution. It doesn't go deep enough. It doesn't cover all the areas that need covering. It lacks certain safeguards, and for that reason I could only halfheartedly support him in this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join briefly in the debate in support of the principle of the bill introduced by my colleague, the member for Windsor West.

I had occasion early in this session to write to the Attorney General (Mr. Clement) to ask what his intentions were with respect to the former Bill 117, which was introduced into the assembly by his predecessor. I understood in the reply which the present Attorney General gave to me, that a similar bill would be introduced in this session.

I think, however, I must make it clear to the House—and the distinction is quite clear that the question of the interest of husband and wife in marital property is not dealt with in Bill 117; and presumably will not be dealt with by the government when it introduces its new bill.

I listened with interest to what the member for Renfrew South had to say about the intentions of the government—that it may be that the bill will include provisions dealing with marital property when the new bill is introduced. Well, so be it. We will welcome it, if that is the case.

I think if I can perhaps generalize for a moment, it was rather trite law, but needed to be said when we were engaged in this kind of legal study at law school—which is now many, many years ago—that while you could have an agreement to marry, nevertheless, once the ceremony of marriage took place, you created a status in each of the

persons to that marriage which was not subject to contract in many and most of its incidences. It might be possible, by a suitable agreement, to vary certain incidences of that status relationship, but then only with respect to property and then only in very limited ways.

It's very strange, of course, but the feudal system was based on the conception of status of people. And the movement away from the feudal society to the kind of society in which we presently live—if in these words it could be referred to as a latter-day version of some form of liberal democracy—has not altered in any significant way the status created by which, in substance, the wife is considered to be inferior to the husband and dependent upon the husband.

Now, my colleague, the member for Windsor West, has modelled his bill to fill the defect which was inherent in Bill 117. I would suggest that perhaps we can go beyond the provisions of the bill, which my colleague had introduced and which, of course, I support. I support it because it reflects in substance the family law study, the report of the Ontario Law Reform Commission. But I want to say that I am not at all certain—as my friend, the member for St. George, has said—that it is possible within strict legal rules to establish criteria with respect to mutual relationships of man and woman in a married context, when they are living in the kind of society in which we are living.

I am concerned that if we try to codify the rules of that relationship in a statute, we may very well be reinforcing the remnant of a status concept of the marriage relationship, rather than moving to a relationship of agreement. I don't want to quote it at any great length, but in the Law Reform Commission report, they opened their foreword by saying: "More and more, marriage is being recognized as an economic partnership in which both husband and wife have an equal stake." But they do not carry that thought through in relation to the subsistence of the marriage, but purport only to deal with what takes place upon the dissolution of the marriage and what has been termed by those lawyers who have studied this particular problem some form of deferred community of property interest. It is deferred until the dissolution of the marriage either by nullity, by divorce or by death. Then certain consequences follow with respect to the property rights of the parties to that marriage.

That doesn't in any way provide any support for the proposition, which I believe to be of importance, that the marriage relationship at least in one of its aspects is an economic relationship. I think it is fair to say that the Law Reform Commission attempted to say that, because, having dealt with other aspects of the marriage relationship—the personal/private relationships, the relationship of love and affection and support—it goes on to say on page 15 of the report:

On a secular basis marriage can be characterized as an economic arrangement that assumes the dependency of the wife upon the husband within a legal framework that is designed to provide a remedy for the wife if the husband's obligation to maintain her is not properly discharged.

It is that relationship which I think has to be dealt with by agreement during the subsistence of the marriage, by agreement entered into prior to the marriage. That doesn't mean that we can legislate what that agreement is. I think it is possible to devise an agreement which would reflect the reciprocal relations of the parties to that marriage in such a way that would encompass not only the property interest but other interests as well.

Strangely enough, I had occasion to be in England last fall and I picked up the Penguin Special, "Women's Rights: Practical Guide" by Anne Coote and Tess Gill. In the appendix to that particular volume I found a draft of a proposed marriage contract, having nothing to do with the end of the marriage but having to do with the beginning and the inception of the marriage. I'd like very briefly, because it is of interest, to quote that agreement. It is not to say that the agreement can't be varied—there may be different feelings about different paragraphs in it—but it says a number of things which I think have to be said. This suggested draft agreement, which I believe would be legally enforceable—it would be very interesting to see whether it could be—is as follows:

This agreement is made on the 1st day of January, so-and-so between Gloria Smith of Manchester, England (hereinafter called the Woman) and Sam Bloggs of London, England (hereinafter called the Man).

Whereas:

1. The Woman and Man intend to marry.
2. The Woman and Man wish to enter into an agreement which they intend to

be legally binding upon them, as to their own respective rights within marriage, obligations towards any children of the marriage and interest in any property owned jointly and separately by them.

3. The Woman and Man wish to establish the principle that they both have equal rights in all matters concerning their life together and their respective development as individuals and that all such matters should be settled between them in mutual agreement.

4. The said principle shall be the guiding principle even when it conflicts with financial considerations.

Now in consideration of the above agreement and of the intended marriage it is hereby agreed:

1. The Woman and Man agree that each shall be entitled to retain for all purposes after the marriage their own respective names before the marriage. They agree that when they have children they will adopt a joint family name, there being no prior assumption that this should be the name of the Man.

2. The Woman and Man shall each be entitled to work and to engage in vocational and social activities as each chooses. Should either of them who has not previously been working outside the home decide to take up an occupation or should either of them decide to continue her or his education, they agree to support each other in attaining their objectives.

3. The Woman and Man agree to plan their lives in such a way that the Woman may combine her work and any vocational and social activities with motherhood and that the upbringing of any children of the marriage shall not disrupt or restrict the work and vocational and social activities of one party more than of the other.

Mr. Speaker. Order, please. May I point out that the member's time has expired?

Mr. Renwick: May I just complete this? I only have—

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): We are ahead of time because the member for Renfrew South was very brief.

Mr. Speaker: Are we short of speakers?

Mr. Renwick: If I may, I think it would be interesting to have it on the record. It continues:

4. The Woman and Man agree that the responsibility for the upbringing of any children of the marriage and for the

domestic work of the home shall be shared equally between them.

5. The Woman and Man agree that they shall decide jointly where the family home shall be with equal consideration as to the needs of each other. The fact that one of them may earn more than the other as a result of employment in a certain place shall not allow that one to decide where they shall live.

6. The Woman and Man agree that they shall have equal interests in any premises occupied by them as the family home, so that if the legal title to such premises is vested in one party such title shall be held in trust for both parties in equal shares.

7. The Woman and Man agree that all property owned separately by them before the marriage shall remain their separate property unless such property shall be occupied as the family home, in which case the above clause applies. Any property owned jointly by them before the marriage shall remain their joint property, and on sale the proceeds shall belong to them in equal shares.

8. The Woman and Man agree that all property acquired after the marriage for their joint use shall be jointly owned. All property acquired after the marriage for the sole use of either party shall remain separate property of that party.

9 (a) The Woman and Man agree that while they both maintain separate bank accounts the moneys in each bank account shall belong to the party whose name it is in.

(b) Should they decide at any time to open a joint bank account, the moneys in that account shall belong to both in equal shares.

(c) If at any time one of them is not in full-time paid employment because of childbirth or responsibilities of caring for the children of the marriage, they both shall transfer all moneys into a joint bank account but, failing this, half the moneys earned during such a period by the one who is employed shall belong to the other.

10. The Woman and Man shall, as far as it is reasonable to do so, share equally in the management and control of any jointly held income and property.

11. The Woman and Man agree that they shall be equally liable to meet the common expenses of the family home, including all necessary outgoings such as rent and mortgage payments, rates, elec-

tricity and the expenses of maintaining the children, in proportion to their respective incomes.

In witness whereof the parties have hereunto set their hands and seals the day and year first above written.

Mr. Speaker, in very briefly closing, it seems to me that that kind of conception of marriage is consistent with what the Law Reform Commission report stated in its foreword and which was the theme. It seems to me to be a much more reasonable approach to the problem than to provide for some Draconian solution only upon the dissolution of the marriage by death, divorce or nullity. It seems to me that that approach to the marriage relationship might well be one which could find favour in an assembly such as this and would reflect in a very real way, with whatever mutual changes the parties may wish to make to such an agreement, what the marriage relationship is all about so that it will cease to be futile, so that the agreement will subsist throughout the marriage and will apply not only throughout the marriage but will also deal with matters at the time of dissolution.

Needless to say, I support my colleague's bill. I just wanted to put on the record this rather more different aspect of the same problem.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to just add a few comments. I found the last speaker's description of the model marriage contract a very interesting approach and maybe it is the way that we should be dealing with the whole basic problem that the member is endeavouring to fulfil in this bill that he has brought before us.

I think he is to be congratulated in putting the matter before us. I think we have waited so long for the Conservatives to do something about it that it's no wonder that he has decided that something has to be done to clear up the cause of very many serious hardships, not only in the breakup of marriage but in the existing marriages.

That's what makes me lean so much toward the approach that has just been suggested of having a contract which is entered into by either party that can be amended before the marriage. But it's clearly understood that the law provides for that type of recognition unless the two sides, before they entered into the marriage, decide to change it otherwise. Many couples may decide they'd rather work in a different way. Many believe a marriage would be stronger if each party had their very definite properties and rights

and individual positions, and that the marriage would be stronger because they are kept separate. And of course that agreement does provide for that to some extent.

The one thing that I have noted in discussing this matter with others in the community is the problem that exists in existing marriages where there is a feudal relationship on the part of the wage earner with the spouse who's at home looking after the family—a failure to give that person the individual freedom of choice. The strength of that position is very important, in my mind, to a happy marriage. After looking at the bill, I see many little individual problems that are brought in by a bill of this sort, and I would like to mention a few of them.

For example, the question of the gifts during the previous year. Sometimes marriages have broken down very quickly, and during the previous year there's been a substantial gift given here or there. How is that going to be accounted for in this? Why do we have to have it provided for this way? I think it's maybe better to recognize that three per cent or 10 per cent, or something like that, may be a decision that was taken by an individual, that he or she felt they had the right to make a gift and it should be possible to make that gift.

We certainly know of the classic case of a gift by a spouse in the Windsor case of Mr. Cohen, where he made a gift and he had an unexpected result.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Everybody knows him.

Mr. Deacon: Everyone knows him. But that's a situation where people should recognize that unless they have mutual trust there's not much of a marriage to begin with, and Mr. Cohen is certainly paying the price himself for what happened.

One of the clauses that concerns me is this matter of payments in a period not to exceed three years from the date of the final decree. That could be very tight, because even the succession duty department recognizes five years and will stretch that to 10 years if it sees that that would be the basis of destroying the source of the income or the business that was the major asset here. I think there should be provision for some flexibility there.

Another clause I'm concerned about is the one dealing with the common-law relationship. What if couples don't hold themselves out to be man and wife? Many don't; but the terminology says "they hold themselves out to be man and wife or have lived together for a period of six years." It seems to me that if they've lived together then this should apply. That's something to think about, because a lot of people don't hold themselves out as husband and wife, and the standard contract that we are thinking about here in the new legislation, which some of us feel would be appropriate, should apply if they have lived together for six years, or if they've lived together for two years and have children.

These are just some of the points through which, as an amateur in this matter of the law but as a pro in a matter of trying to work out a happy marriage relationship, I hope I've been able to contribute a little bit to the debate.

Mr. Speaker: That concludes the private members' hour.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the House, I would like to announce the business for tomorrow and Thursday. Because there is some urgency in regard to the tax bills, we will proceed immediately with them tomorrow. If members will write down the numbers they'll know precisely the order they will be called in. It will be 8, 9, 19 and 20, to be followed by 10 through 15.

If perchance, following that, there is time on Thursday, I would then call order No. 16. I would give notice now that the House will sit on Thursday evening.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): The bills are for tomorrow, are they?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, right through that period. Then we will return, following the conclusion of these bills, to the debate before the House.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 14, 1975

Portrayal of violence by communications industry, statement by Mr. Davis	777
Federal-provincial conference on energy, statement by Mr. Davis	779
Intermediate capacity transit system, statement by Mr. Rhodes	780
Portrayal of violence by communications industry, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer, Mr. Good	782
Intermediate capacity transit system, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Singer, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Givens, Mr. Germa	784
Maple Mountain project, question of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Breithaupt	786
Emergency Measures Organization, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Breithaupt	786
Portrayal of violence by communications industry, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Reid	787
Oil and gas prices, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis	788
Hazards in Kitchener area plants, questions of Mr. Miller and Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Lewis	788
Sales tax exemptions, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis	789
Grand River flood inquiry, question of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Breithaupt	789
Facilities on the Trent-Severn system, question of Mr. Grossman: Mr. R. G. Hodgson	789
Port Colborne tunnel, question of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Haggerty	790
Home buyer grant, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Deans	790
Ontario truckers, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Yakabuski	790
Intermediate capacity transit system, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Singer, Mr. Givens	791
Mopeds, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Shulman, Mr. Good	792
Ottawa teachers' dispute, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Morrow	792
Northwestern Ontario road project, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Reid	793
Laurentian Hospital management, question of Mr. Miller: Mr. Germa	793
Hydro job applications, question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Germa	793
ODC lending policy, question of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Riddell	793
Venue for Canadian Open, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Bounsall	794
Official gemstone for province, question of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Jessiman	794
Windsor hospital facilities, questions of Mr. Miller: Mr. B. Newman	794
Expropriations Amendment Act, Mr. Clement, first reading	795
Town of Kapuskasing Act, Mr. Havrot, first reading	795

City of Sarnia Act, Mr. Bullbrook, first reading	795
Town of Cobourg Act, Mr. Carruthers, first reading	795
Township of Bruce Act, Mr. Gaunt, first reading	795
City of Toronto Act, Mr. Wardle, first reading	795
City of Toronto Act, Mr. Wardle, first reading	795
City of Windsor Act, Mr. B. Newman, first reading	796
City of London Act, Mr. Walker, first reading	796
Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Breithaupt	796
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Breithaupt, agreed to	814
Private members' hour	814
Matrimonial Property Rights Act, on second reading, Mr. Bounsall, Mrs. Campbell, Mr. Yakabuski, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Deacon	814
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	822



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, April 15, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 1975

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

LIQUOR LEGISLATION

Prayers.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Legislature, 30 grade 12 students from the Barrie District Central Collegiate Institute and give them a very hearty welcome.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take the time to introduce a class of students from a little place in northern Ontario called MacDuff. There is a pulp operation up there and a hamlet with about 150 people living there. I have students from there today, grades 7 and 8, with their chaperones, their two teachers, Mr. and Mrs. Pierre Lacombe, and Mrs. Morin. I'd like the House to welcome them at this time.

Mr. Speaker: I recognize the member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I'd like the House to welcome a group of students from the G. B. Warren Junior High School in Yorkview with their teachers who are here today. They have been here since 10 o'clock this morning and are enjoying their visit to the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker: I'm sure the hon. members will also join me in welcoming to the Speaker's gallery this afternoon the hon. Gerard Amerongen, QC, MLA, the Speaker of the legislative assembly of the Province of Alberta, and Mrs. Amerongen.

Speaker Amerongen was in Ottawa, along with other Speakers from across Canada, to attend the annual Speakers' conference last weekend. I am delighted that he and Mrs. Amerongen were able to spend some time visiting Toronto and our Legislature this afternoon. Thank you.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): We'll give them a good show.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): In the west gallery I would like the hon. members to welcome six Rotarians from the Philipines who are being hosted by the Rotary Club of Burlington.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Hon. S. B. Handleman (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, later today I will be introducing for first reading two important pieces of legislation—a new Liquor Control Act and a new Liquor Licence Act. Both will replace existing legislation.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): An announcement a day.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Further, within a few days we will begin distribution of a suggested code of administrative procedures under the Liquor Licence Act of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, the review of liquor laws in Ontario was carried out over a two-year period and involved consultation with many groups and individuals. Their concerns ranged from the economics of running a licensed establishment to the impact of alcohol consumption on provincial health and social programmes.

In our review, it became clear to us that the issues are much broader than most people anticipated. As part of our deliberations, we have had to look at the quality of life the people of Ontario want and how the use and abuse of alcohol can have an impact on it. Most people recognize that moderate consumption of alcohol is socially acceptable. But alcohol abuse results in significant economic and social cost.

The provincial government is responsible for coping with the excesses and the problems associated with alcohol abuse. These problems increase as alcohol consumption rises, a relationship which appears to be applicable world-wide.

Mr. Lewis: We could have a royal commission to investigate it.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): We could appoint the member for St. Catharines (Mr. Johnston) as the chairman.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I won't send over that picture of the leader of the NDP and his orgy in Ottawa, but he'll be seeing it—

Mr. Lewis: I had an orgy in Ottawa? I want the picture.

Mr. Roy: That was a good advertisement for Labatt's.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I will send the picture over to the member.

Those who abuse alcohol constitute a small minority, but that minority increases with the accessibility of alcohol. The costs of abuse are borne by all of us, for in our society we are responsible for each other. It is no use pretending all of us are free to do as we please—when everyone else pays the bill.

Therefore, we decided that much is right with the way liquor is sold in this province. We have rejected foreign drinking standards. There is nothing particularly desirable, for instance, about drinking customs which fill one in every two French hospital beds with alcohol-related disease.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Is that a slur on the Frenchmen?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I would like to review for the House some of the major decisions reflected in the two Acts.

First, the distribution of alcohol will remain the sole responsibility of the Ontario government. The Liquor Control Board of Ontario may take justifiable pride in its efficiency and the selection of products it provides. More than 530 stores now offer 1,975 different products, and its quality control and testing standards are second to none.

Distribution and sales will continue to be managed by the Liquor Control Board of Ontario. All other regulatory activities will be transferred to the Liquor Licence Board operating under the new Liquor Licence Act.

There will be an appeal procedure from all decisions of the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario to a newly created appeal tribunal, with a further appeal to the Supreme Court of Ontario on matters of law. This policy follows the McRuer report and provides protection against arbitrary or inconsistent decisions.

The liquor licence policies will be codified under the Liquor Licence Act. This will ensure that licensees and applicants are fully aware of their responsibilities to conform to this written code. Failure to do so will imperil their privilege of obtaining or holding a licence to dispense liquor.

There will also be a number of recommendations involving special-occasion permits in the suggested code. The fact that special-

occasion permits are now being issued at an annual rate of 170,000 suggests further clarification of the guidelines.

Two permanent advisory committees to the minister will be established to help monitor continuing changes in social attitudes and ensure that we remain responsive to all viewpoints on alcohol consumption.

Mr. Lewis: They are running amuck with committees.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: One committee will deal with special-occasion permits and—

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Providing jobs for the back-benches.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: —the other with concerns on overall liquor policy.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Is the government trying to create an Ontario senate?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I will be looking for detailed study and comments from the public, the industry and members of this House, before this legislation is finalized.

Mr. Cassidy: Will the member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea) be the chairman?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Changes in the organizational structure and administrative procedures of the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario, many of which have already been implemented, will improve the manner in which applications, inquiries, and recommendations are handled. In addition, we plan to decentralize the function of approving and issuing special-occasion permits.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Your friendly local liquor office.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Another proposed change will mean one public hearing for new licence applicants. Under the new Acts, the community can become more directly involved. Citizens will be able to express their views at these hearings in much the same way as they are now involved in determining questions of community growth. Responsibility for advertising new applications will be assumed by the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, one area of change which I am sure will be of interest to all members is clarification of the duties of inspectors. In addition to a clearly defined inspection role, they will assume as one of their primary functions the role of advising and counselling licensees and new applicants. We are also working with municipal jurisdictions and

other ministries to eliminate duplication of inspection.

Another area I should also mention is communication. Efforts are already under way to improve the way the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario communicates with licensees and the public. Future changes in legislation, regulation or procedure will be communicated to licensees in writing. Work has also begun on a number of brochures to help new applicants and to inform licensees as to how they can maintain the high standards the Ontario government demands.

Mr. Lewis: The Ontario government's summer employment programme.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I have talked about change, and indeed many changes are taking place. Improvements have already been initiated. I now look forward to receiving the advice and counsel of all members of this House on the proposed legislation. In addition, I welcome submissions from the public and the industry as we continue our studies.

Before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank those people who participated over the past two years with my predecessor, the Attorney General (Mr. Clement), in the preparation of the new legislation and the suggested code. Some of them are in the gallery today and I know that they look on this as a culmination of long, hard, but most rewarding work.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.
The leader of the Opposition.

FIRE SAFETY ON LICENSED PREMISES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the minister who just spoke if he took into consideration in forming the bill, the recommendations of the inquest into the fire in Paris, Ont., which resulted in the death of, I believe, five men in a hotel there. Is he changing the requirements for fire inspections so it is clear that the responsibility in no way lies with the Liquor Licence Board or the Liquor Control Board or any of its emanations, but is a municipal responsibility under the jurisdiction of the fire marshal?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, at the present time, there is a policy of the Liquor Licence Board that all licensed premises must conform to the fire marshal's requirements and in order to enforce that, it has been the responsibility of the liquor licence inspectors

under the authority of the fire marshal to establish whether or not those standards have in fact been met.

In the new suggested code, which will be distributed within a couple of days, we are leaving the code silent on the issue because we do feel, and I think most members of the House will agree, that fire prevention and fire protection should be under the sole jurisdiction of the Solicitor General and the fire marshal's department.

There will be a problem, of course, because at the present time the fire marshal simply does not have the resources either in manpower or funds to carry out a complete fire prevention function. There will be a transitional period during which there will probably be more than just the liquor licence inspector involved in this very very important work.

ENTERTAINMENT IN LICENSED PREMISES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if I may, can the minister tell the House what decision was made about the chairman of the liquor commission's control over the suitability or otherwise of entertainment in licensed premises?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, again in the suggested code for administrative procedure, it will be silent on the issue.

Mr. Deans: Will he be silent on the issue? That is the question.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I would hope that members of the public and the industry will make suggestions—

Mr. Lewis: It is a pretty imaginative code.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: —because we are concerned about the possibility of entertainment standards being very low in licensed premises and particularly that minors may be exposed to certain standards of entertainment without knowing what they are going to be exposed to.

Mr. Foulds: Sort of like violence on television.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I would like to see licensed premises at least announce to people exactly the kind of entertainment they are about to show—

Mr. Roy: I think we should have a royal commission on that.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: —so that people can be forewarned before they enter licensed premises and therefore can avoid anything which may be distasteful to them personally, because now they have no way of knowing.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We should leave that to the police.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park, a supplementary.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Yes. I am afraid I don't understand. When the minister says the code is silent, does that mean it is for the present time, inasmuch as he will instruct Mr. Mackey to keep out of that field?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, at the present time there is no regulation which would require Mr. Mackey not to use his judgement or that of the members of the board in determining whether or not a licence should continue to be in force.

Mr. Shulman: Silent only where it's important.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary, the member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Deans: The code can't be silent if it will help him make those decisions.

Mr. Roy: A supplementary of the minister about his statement today about the code. Will there be anything in the code dealing with the discrimination by the Liquor Control Board of Ontario against women, who can work only part-time in self-serve stores and cannot work at all in other stores? How are they expected to earn a living?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, the code, of course, is designed to govern the manufacture, distribution, sale and consumption of alcohol beverages and therefore it, too, will be silent on the issue my hon. friend raises.

Mr. Shulman: A very silent code.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Silent indeed.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Surely the minister recognizes that if the code is silent on the board's right to dictate what is or what is not an appropriate level of entertainment, he has granted the board that right and since Mr. Mackey has abused

that right in the past, why does the minister invite him to abuse it in the future?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I don't quite follow the member. One doesn't give power by being silent on an issue.

Mr. Lewis: One doesn't remove it by being silent.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is exactly how the minister did it before.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The code, when it is finally passed—which it hasn't been and we are waiting for a feedback from the public—will not at the present time, as it is being distributed, say whether or not the board will have any jurisdiction over entertainment standards.

Mr. Lewis: So they will continue to exercise it.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: No, they won't. They cannot exercise a right which has not been given to them.

Mr. Shulman: It is not in the code now but they exercise it.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: They will continue under the present regulations until they are replaced by the new Act and the new regulations.

Mr. Shulman: Why doesn't the minister do that now if it's not in the present law?

Mr. Lewis: The minister said he would leave it to his good judgement.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Leader of the Opposition have any further questions?

Order, please.

The Leader of the Opposition.

CONDITIONS AT DON JAIL

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask the Attorney General if he has read the report of the grand jury which brings to public attention the fact that conditions in the Don Jail are such that they recommend it be evacuated until it be cleaned up? I ask the minister in the absence of his colleagues, has he read it and is the government considering a course of action?

Hon. J. T. Clement (Provincial Secretary for Justice): No, Mr. Speaker, I have not read that particular document.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, surely the Attorney General should not have to read yet another complaint about the Don Jail to recognize that it is old, tired and useless and should be replaced. Can the minister tell us when the Don Jail is going to be replaced so that we won't continue to be embarrassed by reports of grand juries such as this one?

Mr. Roy: It's even in better shape than the member for Scarborough Centre.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, I share the concern of the members as to the age and the physical condition of the Don Jail. There is a matter of physical implications to be considered; I personally would support a replacement of the Don Jail. I haven't had the opportunity to visit it since I was a law student and it seemed rather ancient at that time which, as members know, wouldn't be many years ago.

Mr. Singer: Yes, even as far back as that time.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): It has aged even more rapidly.

Hon. Mr. Clement: I would support it, but again the overall matter of physical priority is being dealt with by the Ministry of Correctional Services. I can't give any estimate at this time as to when it may be replaced. Perhaps when my colleague, the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Potter) is in the House, he might have some better views on it.

Mr. Singer: The Provincial Secretary for Justice is supposed to know all about the operations of these things.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

TEACHER-SCHOOL BOARD BARGAINING LEGISLATION

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask the Provincial Secretary for—

Mr. Breithaupt: The social secretary.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Thank you very much; the social secretary? Can the minister inform the House when we might expect the long-promised legislation dealing with teacher-board negotiations now that the situation in Ottawa has apparently been settled? Is it now appropriate that the government move by way of introduction of this legislation, and

can she tell us, as a matter of policy, if we can expect it at this session?

Hon. M. Birch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge it still is a matter under consideration by the policy field.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Can the minister tell us if there has been a commitment on the part of the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) for herself as policy secretary that the bill will not be introduced until there has been consultation with the trustees and the teachers' organizations concerned?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the member direct that question to the Minister of Education. I have made no such commitment.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: However, the minister would, I take it, be prepared to concede that the bill in its present draft form, ready for submission to the Legislature, gives to the teaching profession the right to strike? That is no longer a quietly-held confidence; she can now admit that?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That information will be revealed in due course. Any further questions?

Mr. Lewis: It was about to be revealed at this point. You pre-empted a revelation.

EMERGENCY QUARTERS FOR CABINET

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If I have a moment, I would like to ask the Attorney General, the Provincial Secretary for Justice, if he can assure us that the famous bunker up at Camp Borden, which is prepared to receive the minister and his colleagues in the event of atomic war, is going to be dispensed with? Is that closed down? We saw a picture of it in the paper the other day. Is there really a fuhrer bunker up there ready to receive the powers of government in the event that it's necessary?

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): I think they are all up there today.

Hon. Mr. Clement: I haven't seen the bunker, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Clement: If the Leader of the Opposition insists, I would be glad to go up and have a look at it. I am glad he is concerned about my physical safety; I really didn't think he cared.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I do, I do.

Mr. Breithaupt: We just want to know where to drop them, that's all.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Don't worry. The members have dropped a few in the past and they didn't do much good.

Mr. Lewis: In the event of attack, the leaders of the opposition parties would also be invited, would they?

Hon. Mr. Clement: I have not personally been up to that particular piece of construction but if the members would like me to, I would undertake to go up there and come back and report to the House as to what I see.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: As a supplementary, I wonder if the minister can explain, since he is not sure whether or not it is going to be kept open, are there arrangements made so that a selected group of Conservative backbenchers can be saved so that the future of the universe can be assured?

Mr. Breithaupt: We don't want to endanger the species.

Mr. Roy: For posterity purposes.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Is the member advising, perhaps, a task force on procreation of Tories, is that it? In which case, I will take the question as notice.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? The member for Scarborough West with his questions.

MINISTER'S STATEMENT ABOUT EQUAL PAY

Mr. Lewis: If I can direct a question to the Minister of Labour, who is expecting it, I am sure, Mr. Speaker: What caused him to lose possession of his faculties last night and say on a public platform that society is not sold, the public is not ready to accept the concept of equal pay for equal work and therefore he wasn't prepared to embody it to the full extent in legislation?

Hon. J. P. MacBeth (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I am not exactly surprised at the question. I do have trouble when it

gets to dealing with the women, I am afraid, sir.

Mr. Cassidy: He sure does.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: I did get into some trouble yesterday and I think maybe it's time I turned to the Bible.

Mr. Lewis: I know the minister has prepared his answer.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is that going to save him?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: I think I have to find something to say. I am thinking of the New Testament, sir, where—

Mr. Lewis: Is that the Old Testament or the New?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: —there is the parable about the workers going into the field and you will recall that they went in at different hours.

An hon. member: It was a vineyard.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: That's right, it was the vineyard. I am not as familiar with the Bible as I should be. They received different rates of wages, as you know, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Foulds: The same rates of pay.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: That may be a pretty old parable—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order, order.

An hon. member: They have more clergymen over there. The minister can't win.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, it may be somewhat of an outdated philosophy but at the same time it's the point I am trying to make in regard to what many of the outspoken women of this province would like us to enact in legislation—that is, the words "equal pay for work of equal value." I have tried to explain, perhaps not very successfully, the difficulty of enacting those words.

Our legislation, as embodied in section 33 of the Employment Standards Act, and I won't take the House's time to read it, is as advanced as any that one will find in any of the western jurisdictions. It is good legislation and it does make a comparison as far as women being assured of the same pay as men in a particular spot.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Not even in the government.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: The trouble is that if we put into legislation equal pay for work of equal value, then what are we going to compare it with? I use the phrase that there is no legislation here that assures two men, working under similar circumstances under the same employment, will get equal pay for work of equal value.

Mr. Lewis: Even the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet (Mr. Winkler) did it for the civil servants.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Well, we should have it.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Maybe there should be, but I'm not so sure that we all want to be put in that box. Who, for instance, is going to determine what equal value is?

Mr. Lewis: Some independent assessment.

Mr. Breithaupt: Look around.

Mr. Lewis: I can see the minister is embarrassed by last night, but he's overdoing it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, it's nonsense. One can determine value. The minister is becoming more discriminatory as he goes along.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: I said, who would be the one to determine my value to the Province of Ontario?

Mr. Bullbrook: And what did your wife say?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: She looked at me with a rather jaundiced eye, sir, and indicated that my value wasn't too high to the province. That's the sort of thing I say one is into if he is going to—

Mr. Bullbrook: Who asked this question?

Mr. Lewis: I'm sorry, I did.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: —enact equal pay for work of equal value. One has to categorize all of these jobs and somebody has to determine the value of the work produced.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is just digging it deeper and deeper and deeper.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: That is the kind of thing that I say would be impossible to administer, and that's what I meant when I said the province isn't ready for it at this time.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Doesn't the minister understand that when

he say the legislation now in effect does as much as society is prepared to accept, and when he provides that kind of answer in this House, what he is saying is that he will doom women in Ontario to unequal pay for equal work as a matter of government policy?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: That's what he is doing.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, that's not what I'm saying at all. I say there's good legislation there and we are anxious to have it put to the test. We feel it is adequate to do the job that we want it to do, sir.

Mr. Lewis: Put to the test!

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary: Does the minister not realize, though, that it is not that society is not ready to accept it, but that he is unwilling to administer it?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: That, of course, sir, is not the case.

Mr. Foulds: That's exactly what the minister has just said.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary from the member for St. George.

Mrs. Campbell: In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that this ministry does, in fact, classify many jobs across this province, why is it so difficult for him to conduct a job evaluation in other areas? Why is it that he and his own government consistently have women serving in virtually the same, if you like, classifications with different titles at different rates of pay?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, as far as the government is concerned, that is under active review at the present time—

Mrs. Campbell: Oh, come on!

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: —and that will be adjusted, if adjustments are warranted. In industry there's no great problem. Through union agreements, these things are done all the time. But if one looks at the many non-unionized sectors across this province, and I refer to any general office, it would just be a nightmarish job with the bureaucracy that would be required. I say it's a good theory, but one would need so many people to administer this—

Mrs. Campbell: Try it now.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: —to go across the province and determine the value of one job as against another job in private industry and private offices.

Mr. Martel: It's unbelievable.

Mr. Lewis: Do it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Bounsall: Get them used to the idea.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

PROTECTION FOR PUBLIC SERVANTS

Mr. Lewis: I have another question of the Minister of Labour. What prompted his earlier spasm of irrationality, when he said publicly that civil servants don't need the same collective bargaining rights as others in the province because they can turn to individual members of the Legislature who are, as it were, their employers to defend them? Does the minister really believe that?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I think the member is going back quite a way when he brings that statement up.

Mr. Lewis: Not at all. It is part of this statement, the same kind of stuff.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: I suggested, I think sometime last summer, that people who work in the public sector had certain protections—just the very fact that they were working for the public—that people in the private sector did not have, and that if there were injustices they could be brought up, as my friend has indicated he is bringing up one now, and some have suggested today that they are bringing up injustices. They have this sort of recourse.

Mr. Speaker: I think there are many employment positions across this province that don't necessarily carry with them the right to withhold their services, and we have indicated some in the police services, in the fire services, in the hospital services, and that, I think, is a reasonable thing. There are ways that those people have their rights to fairness protected, and I think one of those ways is through this House, because these people work for this House and the people in the province.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Who protects them from members like the member for Timiskaming (Mr. Havrot)?

Mr. Speaker: Does the member have further questions? No? I think we should get on with new questions.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Is it on the original question? We have been veering off and wasting too much time on supplementary questions.

Mr. Roy: Well I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the time is wasted over there.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Lewis: The questions weren't long.

Mr. Speaker: There has been too much time on questions which weren't really supplementary to a question. I will allow the member this final supplementary.

Mr. Roy: My question of the minister subsequent to his statement is this, Mr. Speaker: Is he prepared, as Minister of Labour, to issue a directive to all departments that they not dissuade any public servant from complaining to his member of the Legislature, where, in fact, in the liquor board area some public servants are told by their superiors not to complain to their members of the Legislature—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That supplementary question is far away from the minister's statement which he reportedly made last night about women's employment. The hon. minister? The member may ask that as a new question later.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

Mr. Lewis: I don't understand your ruling.

Mr. Speaker: I will explain my ruling. The original question had to do with the minister's statement about employment or equal wages for women—I am shortening that—and this is entirely different.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Lewis: I asked a separate question on the matter of civil servants. It was a quite separate question.

Mr. Speaker: Does the minister have an answer for it?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I gather it was whether somebody working for the civil service had the right to go to his member. To my mind, yes. The members of this House are open to anybody to go to from time to time and I think a lot of them do.

Mr. Roy: Without being fired?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Nobody stops them.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Scarborough West have other questions?

HEALTH AND SAFETY HAZARDS AT ELLIOT LAKE

Mr. Lewis: May I ask of the Minister of Health, is he aware that in Elliot Lake, by virtue of overtime work permits, a large number of men have now worked underground equivalent to 3.5 working-level months' exposure to radiation in the first three months of this year, so that they are almost at the maximum, and yet continue to work underground under terribly hazardous circumstances, much more hazardous than dust? Since Natural Resources has cut off the overtime, will the minister have them removed from underground?

Hon. F. S. Miller (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I don't normally enter into the order to remove a given person. In fact, I just spent some time today with a delegation from Elliot Lake discussing some of those very principles with them. I was surprised to find that even the wives of the workers at Elliot Lake who visited us today did not want compulsory removal of men from the working place, but rather advice given to them on their state of health and what the risks were.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, the minister would, of course, appreciate that they don't want compulsory removal because there is no job to go to and therefore no income. So, when men are exposed to radiation above the level set down in the law, can the minister not see to it that they are removed from danger?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to look into that.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Energy has answers to questions asked previously.

ONTARIO HYDRO POLICY

Hon. D. R. Timbrell (Minister of Energy): Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Riddell) posed the following supplementary question:

Why is Ontario Hydro being permitted to do away with the marketing division sales section, a group whose job has been to provide heat loss calculations for buildings and to specify insulation requirements, and what is going on in connection with phasing out the programme of Ontario Hydro?

Mr. Speaker, the answer is that Ontario Hydro has not done away with this programme. However, the insulation inspections are being done at a reduced rate. Hydro is attempting to transfer this activity to municipal hydro representatives and to other segments of the building industry such as contractors, local building inspectors, and so on, where it properly belongs.

Although Hydro is now charging \$20 for a heat loss calculation, their actual cost is about \$45. They have trained people to do these calculations and the \$20 charge is an incentive to have other people take on the responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, one of the main reasons for the reduction in the marketing programme is to avoid any public image of Hydro promoting the use of electrical energy.

ONTARIO HYDRO POLICY ON AGRICULTURAL SUPERVISORS

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, on the same day, I believe, the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Spence) posed this question:

What is the policy of Ontario Hydro in regard to the agriculture supervisors across the Province of Ontario? I am told that last year there were 13 and now there are six. Is it the policy of Ontario Hydro to do away with these agriculture supervisors? This is a great concern.

Mr. Speaker, Ontario Hydro's marketing policy and objectives have changed in recent years, and it has replaced its former sales activities with a significant conservation effort. This is in accord with the wishes of this government, my ministry and the many conservation and environmental groups and, we think, with the wishes of the public as a whole. Obviously this has meant that staff in many locations, who were hired originally for direct sales activities are surplus now to Hydro's needs and are being redeployed to carry out work in other functions.

This does not mean that Hydro has stopped assisting the farmer, who will continue to have at his disposal the assistance of an electrical safety inspector, an electrical applications specialist or other customer service staff through Hydro's local area offices.

When the question was originally raised on March 18, the concern expressed was that Hydro had reduced its "agriculture supervisors" from 13 to six. Currently there are seven applications specialists in Ontario Hydro who are assigned directly to meeting the requirements of the agricultural industry, a reduction from the 11 who were originally assigned to this work.

Mr. Martel: This is a ministerial statement. It is not an answer.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: At the same time, however, I should state that the agricultural community has available, through Hydro local area offices, the assistance of electrical inspectors and other customer service staff whose numbers have in no way been reduced and who will continue to provide the essential services required by the individual customer.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River.

LAWYERS' TRUST FUNDS

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General. Can the Attorney General indicate what interest rate is paid on the trust funds held by lawyers, the money that goes into the legal aid plan?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the rate being paid at the present time is three per cent on the minimum monthly balance.

Mr. Reid: Can the Attorney General indicate why it is not the same rate as a bank would ordinarily pay to a depositor? Why is it only three per cent?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, the banks compute the interest on the minimum monthly balance at three per cent and remit quarterly to the law foundation. That is a net sum. The banks, I am advised, had to set up a specialized system for this because their ordinary current accounts, which they maintain each and every month, are based on the half-yearly minimum balance.

The rate paid here is the same rate that is paid, I think, in Manitoba. I have some figures here, which I would be pleased to show to the hon. member, but I believe it's the same rate that's paid in Manitoba. In Saskatchewan the rate varies between 2½ per cent and three per cent. In British Columbia, each law firm negotiates its own rate of interest.

If the banks paid the five per cent or six per cent rate that is paid on a current account, if I may use the phrase, then there would be deducted the administrative charges of the bank for each cheque written on that account. Presumably the more cheques, the greater the charge, and in fact the trust account of a particular firm could end up earning nothing if it happened to be a particularly busy trust account. Therefore, the Law Society, in negotiating the rate on behalf of the law foundation, agreed with the

banks to a flat charge of three per cent, as I indicated, with no charge on the number of cheques written being levied against either the firm writing cheques on that account or against the interest accrued on it.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Reid: One final supplementary, if I may.

Mr. Speaker: One supplementary.

Mr. Reid: Is the minister satisfied, when we consider the size of Ontario and the number of law firms, that the law firms are contributing their share to the legal aid plan, and that the banks particularly are not ripping off the public in this respect on something like \$14 million, I believe?

Hon. Mr. Clement: I certainly cannot suggest that the banks are ripping off the public. I should indicate to the House that the trust accounts of firms fluctuate tremendously, even in a small law firm operated by one or two practitioners. It may vary from a relatively few thousand dollars per month and on a particular transaction could have any amount on deposit—\$100,000, \$200,000 or \$300,000.

But I can assure the member, having had a trust account in my practice, that those large amounts are not left lying around by a client in a lawyer's trust account, for the simple reason that the client will keep it in his own account to earn interest until it is required for the completion of the proposed transaction. It will be merely an in-and-out-again type of thing. It may be in there, in many instances, for only a few minutes. Accordingly the Law Society while negotiating these rates left it open, as I understand it, to review them annually to see if the amount is in fact correct.

I have the report here with me. If the hon. member would like to peruse it at his leisure I'll send it over with a page and he can see the amounts that were in fact generated between April 1 last year and Dec. 31, 1974.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur.

HURON COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Education, if I can get his attention: Has the minister yet met with the delegation from Huron County Board of Education with regard to the total rejection

by his ministry of its capital expense programme?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Is that Huron or Bruce county?

Mr. Foulds: Huron.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Huron? I've had conversations with the chairman of the Huron County Board of Education.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: What led the ministry to the total rejection of their budget for renovations? Surely this is contrary to the minister's stated policy of equalization of educational opportunities throughout Ontario when he is discriminating against the rural board here.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, there is no attempt in our capital programme to discriminate. I'd have to find out. Indeed, I believe that in last year's programme there were things for the Huron county board.

As I told my friend the other day, this year there was about \$293 million worth of requests—obviously more than we've ever had in the great days of the 1960s when enrolment was increasing. We just don't have that kind of money available within our budget. We have a much, much more limited amount, away down near the \$100 million mark, so obviously everything that's been requested couldn't be accommodated.

On a priority basis we've tried to first accommodate requests where new pupil spaces had to be built and then as many renovations and additions of general purpose rooms and resource centres as could be accommodated. If I look at Huron I may find that they got some last year and some other board is getting some this year.

I have had an informal meeting with the chairman of the Huron County Board of Education three or four weeks ago; I haven't met in any formal way with the board. But as I said with Bruce, we are always willing to take a look and listen to what the board has to say about the rejection of their programme. The plain and simple fact is there just isn't enough money to accommodate all the needs—all the requests, I should say.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Renfrew South.

RENT CONTROLS

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Housing.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): What again? Two days in a row?

Mr. Yakabuski: In view of the fact that the leader of the New Democratic Party has advocated rent controls during his Throne Speech address and at other times, I'm wondering if the minister is aware of the disastrous effects rent control has had in socialist Britain, as per the editorial in this morning's Globe and Mail?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Speech.

Mr. Martel: Did the member send it to the minister?

Hon. D. R. Irvine (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, I'm well aware of the editorial that the hon. member is referring to. I've also said in this House many times that this party does not support rent controls and will not support rent controls at this time or in the future, because we believe supply is the answer.

An hon. member: That's why this government is going out of power.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister said he might be forced into it. He warned the industry more than once.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I think the editorial very clearly substantiates what I've been saying for months in this House.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth has a supplementary?

Mr. Deans: Supplementary question: Doesn't the minister recognize that in his recently announced apartment building programme in Toronto he has in fact imposed rent controls on those apartments? How does he pretend to deal with the spiralling rent increases when there are very few apartments being built in the private sector and none by the government in most sectors of the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Wentworth has again misinterpreted the facts. We have not imposed rent controls on our limited dividend programme.

Mr. Deans: The government certainly has.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: It does not have a rent control—

Mr. Deans: It does. The minister doesn't even understand his own measure.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —per se, because the rent control that we have is a rent stabilization in the limited dividend programme—

Mr. Deans: What does the minister call that?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —and I have said this to the member time after time.

Mr. Deans: What does the minister call rent stabilization?

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Examine the programme and understand what it does. It allows a rent escalation according to the inflation factor, which may come from year to year.

Mr. Deans: Is that not rent control?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Now, the private sector is the one that will provide enough rental accommodation. It's not up to the government to provide all the housing accommodation throughout Ontario.

Mr. Deans: The government hardly provides any of it.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Nor in my opinion should the government in any part of Canada provide all of the housing accommodation. The socialist party may think that, but we don't.

Mr. Deans: Well we will.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Did the member for Etobicoke have a supplementary to this question?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Etobicoke with a supplementary.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister, if he is not in favour of rent controls, would he at this time come out in favour of rent review boards for places such as Toronto and large centres?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't hear all of the question. Can I ask the hon. member—

Mr. Braithwaite: Is the minister in favour of rent review boards?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: No.

Mr. Braithwaite: Why isn't he?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I have stated why many times before, and if the hon. member was here he would know.

Mr. Lewis: Not even rental review?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Lewis: The Housing minister is a dinosaur that predates the testament.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Ottawa East with his question.

PORTRAYAL OF VIOLENCE BY COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General, if I can get his attention. It pertains to the Premier's (Mr. Davis) statement yesterday about a royal commission into violence in films and on television. Would the minister, who is a lawyer, advise why the government would grandstand in the area of television where it has no jurisdiction and not do anything about an area where it does have jurisdiction. For instance, there are comic books, magazines, pocket books advocating violence, and kids read them every day? Why would the minister limit his inquiry simply to television and films when he has jurisdiction in the publishing field?

Mr. Cassidy: The Premier grandstands and now the member is grandstanding.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, I don't agree with the member's remarks that the Premier was grandstanding. I think the Premier made it very apparent in his statement yesterday that he was not being exhaustive in the context of his remarks. He did not want to be restrictive, and in fact my understanding is that the guidelines of the royal commission—

Mr. Roy: That is not what the statement said.

Hon. Mr. Clement: —the objectives of it will be as broad as are required to allow the commissioner, in the conduct of her inquiry, to look into all matters pertaining to the question of violence.

Mr. Roy: Would that include types of publications where the government does have jurisdiction?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, I think that would have to be a matter determined by the commissioner, whether she felt it per-

tinient. I cannot answer for her, but if she felt it to be pertinent and relevant to the issue, I would feel somewhat confident that she would insist on the objectives of her royal inquiry being broad enough to encompass that type of material.

Mr. Reid: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister indicate how many charges have been laid against violence on the hockey rinks in Ontario, either professional sport or amateur?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Professional or amateur?

Mr. Reid: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Clement: I'll take the question as notice. I cannot give the members the exact number, but there are some investigations going on right now. I believe there have been some charges laid. But I will take his question as notice and get back to the member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

HAMILTON AREA HOME PROGRAMMES STANDARDS

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Housing. Given that I have provided the Ministry of Housing during the course of the last two years with at least 100, and perhaps more, cases where the HOME programme houses were either not completed to standard or required repairs after the owner moved in, and which were not completed expeditiously; and given that last week an inspection showed structural defects in at least one, perhaps in other homes, built by Valport; and given that there have been a great many problems with Settlement Corp., will the Minister of Housing order a re-examination of all of the homes built in the Hamilton area in the last two years? And particularly will he inquire with regard to structural matters within the houses to ensure that people are not going to be faced with major repair costs in the very near future?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member brought this matter to my attention I said—if I remember correctly—that if there were defects such as he mentioned, they would be corrected by OHC. Since then I have received additional information. I will have to refer to it, since there are quite a few details I can't remember offhand.

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would take this down, on March 27, OHC made a pre-occupancy inspection which at that time

indicated to us that the unit was not ready for the new owner and it was assessed accordingly. A further inspection was held on April 3. Some of these deficiencies have been corrected but not all, and it is still not ready. Another inspection was held on April 9. There was a meeting on April 11 which was held between OHC and the builder. The builder agreed that the house should not have been offered until it was ready and that it would be brought up to HOME standards before it would be occupied by the new owner.

This builder, Mr. Speaker, I think I should bring to the attention of the hon. member, has built many homes for the Ontario government, for OHC, and for the last several years his building has been all right. In this case, it's definitely not up to standard and he was told so. It will not happen again, I can assure the member.

Mr. Deans: I have a supplementary question. This is only one house. Quite obviously, if the builder can build one house like this, he can build many houses like this. I want to ask the minister whether he will put a sufficient number of inspectors, in the first place, in the area to conduct an inspection in a proper way and, secondly, whether he will reinspect all of the properties built by this builder to determine whether this is one isolated incident or whether it's a practice of his not to comply with regulations.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I have already told my staff to make sure that this particular builder is very closely watched in the future. I would be happy to give further inspections if any other deficiencies are brought to my attention, but they have not been to this particular time. If the member knows of any, I would appreciate receiving them. I don't believe there are further deficiencies now existing.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

HALTON REGIONAL COUNCIL OHAP LOAN

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Housing. Can the Minister of Housing explain the difficulty that occurred in the Halton regional council in connection with an \$8.8 million OHAP loan? Why was it necessary to rush it through so that many members of council weren't aware of the details? What was the urgency and why wasn't it done within the fiscal year?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the difficulty was as far as the council was concerned. Certainly they have been after assistance in regard to improving their sewage plant capacity. It has been under capacity, as I have stated in the House. I think the member's leader brought the question to my attention and I said at that time we wanted to improve the facility. We gave housing grants for the very definite reason that we want to build more homes in that particular area. We have proposals before us right now which will allow us to do so, once we have improved this sewage capacity for the entire area. As to the council's confusion, if there was any, there shouldn't have been.

Mr. Singer: Can the minister explain why he got caught in the jam of having to spend his money so quickly that he didn't have time to explain to council what the agreement involved?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, we're never really anxious to spend money too quickly but I think every member of this House knows that members have been after me from all sides to try to get housing built. I do my best to ensure that we do. If I have the money, which to me it is quite sensible to spend in regard to a sewage facility capacity, I should do so as quickly as possible and at the request of the council.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury East.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Was it too fast for the member for Downsview?

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Environment has just left his chair. If I could get his attention, I have a question.

Mr. Speaker: He may be back. We'll give you an opportunity in a few minutes.

Mr. Martel: He is on his way now.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): He was getting into the Premier's chair. He liked that pretty well.

Mr. Cassidy: He will never make it.

EFFLUENT AT INCO PLANT

Mr. Martel: Can the Minister of the Environment indicate whether the studies conducted by his staff in the Copper Cliff area indicate that Inco is in any way responsible for the fog conditions which resulted in so many accidents in the past couple of years?

Mr. Laughren: He should answer his letters too.

Hon. W. Newman (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I have reason to believe that there is some reaction from the effluent being dumped into the stream. We are working on this, as I think I have indicated to the member before. We hope to have the matter corrected by this fall at the latest.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Minister of Industry and Tourism have the answer to a question?

ODC LENDING POLICY

Hon. C. Bennett (Minister of Industry and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the member for Huron asked why J. F. Farm Machinery Ltd. of Exeter was turned down by the Ontario Development Corp. for a loan for a capital project. The facts are as follows:

During 1969, the company inquired respecting a forgivable loan but was informed that it was not eligible. In 1970, the terms of reference relating to forgivable loans were changed and the company then made an application, which was approved, for \$90,000 on Jan. 10, 1973.

It has, sir, from that date been given a forgiveness of \$9,000 on Nov. 5, 1973, and again on Dec. 1, 1974. At that time the employment was 95 and it had predicted that it would reach a maximum of 41.

On Sept. 12, 1973, the company was granted an export support loan in the amount of \$250,000 with an interest rate of 6.5 per cent.

On Oct. 25, 1974, the company requested that the export support loan be increased to \$400,000 from the \$250,000. The company was advised that the request would be subject to our current rate of interest—8.5 per cent interest. The company did not pursue the application with us and on March 21 the company repaid in full its export support loan that was outstanding at that time, from the receipts it had received from the orders.

Mr. Speaker, Ontario Development Corp. has served its role well in assisting this company when it was unable to obtain financing from other sources. Later, it was able to withdraw when the company was strong enough to obtain financing from the private sector. I am completely mystified as to why the member for Huron would not check his facts out before he brought this question to the House. However, my colleague, the Min-

ister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), informs me that this is par for the course.

Mr. J. Riddell (Huron): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Huron.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I don't read comic books like the Liberal Party.

Mr. Riddell: Is the minister aware that the ODC extended assistance to Kongskilde in Exeter, whereby they built two buildings for Kongskilde and they leased the buildings and J. F. Farm Machinery Ltd. asked for the same assistance and the minister's official, Mr. Bruton, told the president of J. F. Farm Machinery Ltd. that they would not extend that assistance to J. F. Farm Machinery because they didn't want to encourage competition in a field where they had already extended assistance.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I really didn't get the significance of the question, but let me make it very clear to the member—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Make it perfectly clear.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Yes, to the Liberal leader likely everything is very clear in a very mystified sort of a way.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Running scared.

Mr. Roy: We have heard that.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Okay, we are not reading comic books on this side. There are no jokes.

Mr. Speaker: We are wasting valuable time. Does the minister have a short answer?

Mr. Cassidy: The minister is very rattled, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I am not as rattled as the member for Ottawa Centre was with the settlement of the Ottawa school teachers yesterday, that's for sure.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Huron very clearly indicated that there was a verbal inquiry made on a very general basis. There was not, as he indicated yesterday, an application related to the specific case that he is quoting at the moment. When the application is made, then it will be reviewed by the board at ODC and a decision made. The question was generally an inquiry of our office.

Mr. Riddell: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. No. The time has really expired, but the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville was on his feet before.

Mr. Riddell: Why would he make an application when the minister's official told him there was no sense in it?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I'll allow the member for Windsor-Walkerville to pose his question.

Mr. Roy: Tell us about the industrial park in eastern Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the provincial Treasurer.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. members give their colleague an opportunity to ask his question?

The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Now the hon. member.

OMERS PENSION BENEFITS

Mr. B. Newman: A question of the provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker. Is he looking into or will he look into amendments to the OMERS legislation that will permit municipal employees to buy back in pension benefits for war service, just in the same fashion as is given to provincial employees today?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The members will buy back in.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): That, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, is a matter which is in front of the government as a whole in terms of a number of pension plans. I don't believe any final decision has been made by the government. The decision to do such a thing, of course, would be made by the board of OMERS and recommended to the government for legislation. It would not be initiated by us.

Mr. Roy: How come they didn't keep the minister in Ottawa?

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired, but the minister—

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Let me tell the member for Ottawa East, they would not—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Minister of Labour indicated he had given some wrong information in an answer yesterday and he would like the opportunity to correct it, so I think we should allow him that opportunity.

An hon. member: We'll be here all day.

Interjections by hon. members.

HAZARDS IN KITCHENER AREA PLANTS

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I ask the House's indulgence and I apologize to the members. I indicated there were 195 safety complaints from labour unions in the Kitchener area. I have given ourselves too much credit for overwork. That figure referred to the whole province and not just the Kitchener area.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

LIQUOR CONTROL ACT

Hon. Mr. Handleman moves first reading of bill intituled, the Liquor Control Act, 1975.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, the bill continues the Liquor Control Board to perform the present functions of the Liquor Control Board concerned with the marketing of liquor by manufacturers and the operation of government stores.

LIQUOR LICENCE ACT

Hon. Mr. Handleman moves first reading of bill intituled, the Liquor Licence Act, 1975.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, this bill re-establishes the Liquor Licensing Board to perform all the licensing functions, including those now performed by the Liquor Control Board. The principal changes are: (1) provision is made for licensing procedures and for hearings, review and appeals; and (2) the offences are revised and simplified.

Mr. Shulman: The minister should be embarrassed.

MENTAL HEALTH AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Roy moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Mental Health Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced in the last session. The purpose of the legislation, of course, is to protect individuals who are arrested or confined under the Mental Health Act and to permit these individuals, within a period of 24 or 48 hours the right to have a hearing and to be examined by a psychiatrist. This would prevent individuals who are picked up under the present Mental Health Act from going for a period of time—sometimes nine weeks at a time—without getting an adequate hearing.

PUBLIC HOSPITALS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Roy moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Public Hospitals Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, this bill was presented in the last session as well. It would amend the Public Hospitals Act to prevent incessant appeals by hospital boards which are making appeals at public expense, for instance in the case of Dr. Schiller. This legislation would provide that they would be limited to an appeal to the court of appeal and that pending the court of appeal decision the decision of the appeal board would remain in force so that an individual like Dr. Schiller could continue to practice in that hospital pending the appeal.

I have another piece of legislation here, Mr. Speaker, that I consider the cornerstone of Liberal policy.

Mr. Foulds: Their leader is away. Are they sure it's policy?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ruston: That woke them up over there.

Mr. Roy: Look at the member for Ottawa South (Mr. Bennett). We should send him back to Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Let's get on with the bill.

Interjections by hon. members.

ONTARIO BILL OF RIGHTS ACT

Mr. Roy moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish the Ontario Bill of Rights.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Lewis: The Ontario Bill of Rights from the Liberal Party?

Mr. Roy: That's right.

Mr. Lewis: It begins with the incarceration of the Japanese Canadians and ends with the War Measures Act.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, this legislation was presented in the last session and it's very unfortunate that the government did not see fit to adopt this legislation.

Mr. Foulds: It would prevent Ontario from coming under the War Measures Act.

Mr. Roy: As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Bill of Rights is limited only to federal legislation and has no application whatsoever to provincial legislation.

Mr. Bullbrook: I sometimes wonder if it has any application to federal legislation.

Mr. Roy: It has been limited. In any event, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation would be to create what is called an Ontario Bill of Rights under which the fundamental rights and freedom of individuals in this province would be protected from any legislation passed by this Legislature. Of course, many other provinces have this type of legislation and we would encourage the government to adopt this type of legislation.

LANDLORD AND TENANT AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Braithwaite moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Lewis: It's an act to provide that all tenants vote Liberal.

Mr. Braithwaite: They will anyway.

Mr. Lewis: Under the bill of rights, previously passed.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, the amendment provides for mandatory landlord and tenant review boards in municipalities with populations over 150,000 persons. These boards would have the power to determine

the amount of rents and to order tenants removed from premises for non-payment of rent and for wilful damage to the premises.

Also, Mr. Speaker, this bill is introduced to bring once more to the attention of the government the sad plight that most renters in Metropolitan Toronto are facing in view of the unconscionable rent raises they're having to pay.

PUBLIC HEALTH AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Braithwaite moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Public Health Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to provide for the marking of dates on perishable food packages which will, without the use of a code or guide, clearly indicate the date the food was packaged, together with the expiry date.

ATHLETICS CONTROL AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Braithwaite moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Athletics Control Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to prohibit the practice whereby senior house leagues require individual leagues to submit personal information on members.

The bill would also prohibit the selling of the names of league members to companies who wish to compile mailing lists.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is introduced to draw to the attention of this House the fact that the Metropolitan Toronto house league, and a hockey league in my particular riding, known as St. Benedicts, are having difficulties with reference to the furnishing of names and the sale or the possible rental of these names to commercial outlets.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Braithwaite moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act, 1971.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to provide for noise control regulations on a province-wide basis rather than by by-laws passed by individual municipalities. This bill is introduced to draw to the attention of the House the problem that municipalities such as Etobicoke and Mississauga have with reference to noise emanating from sources outside of the municipalities—in this particular case, Malton Airport.

ONTARIO WASTE DISPOSAL AND RECLAMATION COMMISSION ACT

Mr. B. Newman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish the Ontario Waste Disposal and Reclamation Commission.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, this bill has been introduced before. It proposes to establish a utility similar to the former Hydro commission to provide solid waste disposal and reclamation services, including incineration and landfill throughout the province.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

ONTARIO HOME BUYERS GRANT ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves second reading of Bill 28, An Act to provide for the Payment of Grants to First Time Home Buyers.

Mr. Speaker: The member for St. George.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Mr. Speaker, in view of the problems of housing in this province at this time, we are in a position on this side to support almost any measure that might ease some of the burdens. We do resent, however, and I believe the people of Ontario will resent the fact that such needed help is introduced temporarily, in effect to cover an election period, in view of the fact that the house must have been purchased or built prior to Dec. 31, 1975.

For practical purposes, it is difficult to ascertain how much help this really will be, but if there is one person benefited I suppose we are in the position that we can do none other than to support the principle.

We are aware of one case in particular where up to one month ago one builder had 1,000 units unsold on the market. We believe similar situations exist in other areas because of high prices and high carrying charges. At the moment, therefore, we do have some housing in some areas and we certainly have

people who wish to buy. We hope that this grant, picayune in a sense as it is, may assist to fit them together.

We are interested in knowing why the Treasurer of this province (Mr. McKeough) should seem to give preference to those who are from out of the province, because if one reads the principles of this bill—

Mr. P. Taylor (Carleton East): The Treasurer had better listen to this.

Mrs. Campbell: —it seems clear that one could have owned a home outside of Ontario and still qualify under this programme if that person moved into Ontario. We would like the Treasurer to explain that apparent preference for those who are not now citizens of Ontario, since this government has laid to the door of those coming into this province a great deal of the responsibility for the lack of housing. That, of course, is only one area in which they have tried to lay responsibility for failure.

We are concerned, Mr. Speaker, as to what will happen at the end of this year. We are interested to know why, in the light of all of the prognostications, this particular programme should effectively end as of the end of this year as to the period of purchase. Surely this programme ought to be tested and evaluated before being terminated unless, of course, the government really believes that someone will wave a magic wand—and it won't be the Minister of Housing (Mr. Irvine)—and, miraculously we will have no housing problem after the end of December. We suggest that no time limit should be set, and certainly not before the programme is even implemented and any assessment possible.

We have another serious reservation about the programme. We are concerned lest this encourage conversion to condominium ownership, especially in the Metro area, which will impose an additional hardship on tenants already beset by unconscionably high rents.

I suppose that could be rather academic in view of the time-frame; nevertheless we express this concern. We are curious as to whether the government has equated the provision of this grant with the refunding of the sales tax on building materials. I would be interested to know if there is any relationship between the amount of the grant and the sales tax collected on a moderate-cost home?

We are pleased that some relief is forthcoming to home buyers. We are distressed that it will be terminated on Dec. 31. We certainly urge the monitoring of the situation in condominiums and we most precisely want to know, in conclusion, why the citizens of On-

tario should be prejudiced as against those citizens who may have owned homes in other parts of Canada or other parts of the world, but who may qualify on moving into this province, as we read the legislation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, the Tories are going to try and simplify the debate on the hustings about this particular measure by saying, "Okay, who voted for the \$1,000 and who voted against the \$1,000?" That's the kind of way in which the Conservatives have handled housing policy. They've dealt with a very severe crisis in this province over the last few years in a simplistic fashion. I wish that we could have a better level of discussion of this bill and of the housing policy of the government in general.

We consider the grant that's proposed in this bill to be an exceedingly modest contribution to the housing problem. I have to say that we are going to support it. We do so limply and without any particular great enthusiasm. We do it, however, because we don't feel that we can expect anything better from the government. We will get a string of announcements as long as one's arm from the Minister of Housing. If this were a sunny, warm climate without any precipitation it might be that the paper on which those announcements were printed could be used for shelter. However, our climate is not that way and at least this is a concrete policy.

However, it has many, many defects and I wish that the minister would acknowledge that it's simply a piece of election candy which does not provide any real substance in solving housing problems, whether for the particular target group or for the population of the province as a whole.

The first defect in the scheme is, very simply, that one needs to be rich or almost rich in order to afford to benefit from this particular scheme. Since housing prices are averaging around \$46,000 in the province as a whole, and since they average something over \$55,000 to \$58,000 in Metro Toronto right now, since the monthly cost of purchasing housing is running around \$400 per month or more at current interest rates and with modest downpayments, it is clear that the vast bulk of Ontario families are simply shut out from this particular scheme entirely.

The member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick), who may have some hankering to go there himself, points out that this is going to bene-

fit certain scions of the rich who will buy their first home, having just emerged from finishing school or from their world tour or from a couple of years working the way up in dad's firm. Then they will pay \$80,000 or \$100,000 for a pleasant house up in Willowdale or on the fringes of Rockcliffe or some other part of the province. They will benefit. They'll take the \$1,000 and go down to Nassau for a couple of weeks for an end-of-season vacation, and by God if they won't get \$250 for air fare for the next two winters running in order that they can repeat that particular kind of experience.

The minister's policies are selective and discriminatory in favour of just that kind of person. Working class people need not apply. Many middle class people need not apply either. Right now I remind the minister in the House that the average industrial wage in Ontario in January this year was \$10,149. It had risen from \$7,673 in 1971. Back in 1971, somebody on the average industrial wage couldn't quite buy a house but at least they might have some hopes. Now it is completely out of reach.

The basic home—if we can call it that—the basic \$40,000 house in Metro, if we can find one, is going to cost \$376 per month including taxes and it is going to require an income of \$18,000 per annum if we assume that a person can save \$5,000 and if we have them paying 25 per cent of their income for the house. That is not a working income. The median family income of the province right now is \$5,000 less than one needs in order to afford a house. It's running at about \$13,000 per annum. People who earn \$18,000 or \$20,000 or \$25,000 per annum basically own homes as well; 80 per cent of them approximately, have their own homes. What have we got then? We have a kind of quixotic policy which may benefit a few but which escapes the needs of most of the people for whom it is designed to appeal.

It will, perhaps, help developers unload their unsold houses. It may help some appliance dealers because people will wind up buying a house they had intended to buy anyway and will then find themselves with \$1,000 cheque from the minister, conveniently delivered a few days before the election. They may go out and spend it on a fancy dishwasher or a \$700 refrigerator or something like that. It cannot effectively increase the supply of homes between now and the time the programme runs out. The programme is going to run for all of about—is it eight or nine months?

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Eight and a half.

Mr. Cassidy: Eight and a half months. During that period of time, the major constraints on the supply of housing are going to be mortgage rates which are so high that most people can't buy homes; the supply of serviced land; the time it takes to build new housing. Very few units, if any, will be begun, as a result of this particular scheme.

In certain cases, it will be impossible to put up new houses and to let people have title to them by the end of the year. I think, for example, of highrise condominiums for which the time between inception and completion is generally longer than the 8½ months. If a developer had said on April 9, that is, last week, "I will build in order to allow the purchasers of this condominium to take advantage of this grant," the chances that he could have actually had units ready for people to move into by the end of the year are very slight indeed.

If somebody moves into a condominium which was commenced in March or February or January, there is possibly a chance that those units will be completed by the end of the year. It cannot be argued that the minister's programmes will have gone to create one single new unit in that particular condominium since the planning for it was already well under way at the time the bill and the programme came in.

The bill does nothing for tenants. The budget does nothing for tenants, nothing at all. The Minister of Housing clearly is completely insensitive, doesn't understand the problems and is unwilling to do anything at all. He is wrapped in his own 19th century ideology and is not aware of the suffering that is taking place out there. I challenge the minister when he comes to reply in this particular debate to tell me what his bill is going to do for a lady who called my home yesterday.

This is the mother of a former babysitter of ours who happened to call. She lives in a highrise apartment and is facing a \$44 rent increase for her two-bedroom apartment in June or the beginning of July. That is an increase of about 20 per cent. It will bring her rent to about \$220 a month for a modest two-bedroom apartment.

Over the course of the last couple of years her daughter, our former babysitter, was killed in a car accident. Her husband has died of illness. The woman herself is now suffering from multiple sclerosis and she has a 13-year-old daughter who is still living with her. She is attempting to live on the pension her husband was able to leave her. She is damned and determined that she

won't move into rent-gear-to-income housing because she says she has not got to that pass yet, and now she is facing a \$44 rent increase.

There is no money in that family to pay \$400 a month in order to afford a new house or even a used house. That is probably as much as this woman's total income from her pension. There is no way in which that particular family can benefit from this programme or any of the programmes that are being proposed by the government. This is not an isolated case. It is a case which could be repeated hundreds and thousands of times across the province.

The next thing is that the proposal that the minister has brought in is quite likely to have an absolutely perverse effect where it could even lead to the point where these purchasers are worse off than if the programme had not been introduced at all. Certain ones might be a bit better off because the \$1,000 could help them to meet their downpayment. Mr. Speaker, if you bring 55,000 people in with an extra \$1,000 jingling around in their jeans and if you take the current supply situation in the housing market, then you have added demand without providing extra supply and, as the minister knows, there is a very strong tendency that that will lead to higher prices.

The government has presided, without acting effectively at all, over a doubling of housing prices in the province over the last four years, that is, since the last election. In 1971, the price of a house in Toronto was averaging around \$31,000.

In 1974, it was averaging about \$50,000, \$53,000 or \$54,000. Just in the three months from the time that this minister took over and began to consider what kind of candy he would offer in his budget, the price of a house in Metro has gone up by far more than the total amount of these particular grants. The average in Metro was \$52,800 in 1974. In January, 1975, it was up by \$2,000 to \$54,806. In February, it was up by another \$1,700 to \$56,500. In March, it was up by another \$1,700 to \$58,200. In April, the selling season has just begun.

The prices are increasing every month by an amount which is greater than the value of the grant which the minister is proposing to provide. Not only that, but if one looks in the minister's budget itself and looks at the statistics—I think I can find them here—on the housing sector, back in page A21, they show graphically that the housing crisis that was reflected in starts last year will be re-

flected both in starts and in completions this year.

Last year, oddly enough, despite the drastic drop in starts, completions were up in urban Ontario from 83,000 to 88,000 units. That meant that the supply situation last year was not appreciably worsened. However, starts last year in urban Ontario were down from 93,000 to 72,000—down by 21,000 starts. That will be reflected in completions this year.

Nothing that the minister has proposed is going to have any effect on that at all. In fact, an even more drastic decline in housing starts in Ontario over the first three months of this year will mean that those completions are not going to recover until some time, at the earliest, in the spring of 1976.

There is no way with the programmes that the government is proposing now that it's going to come around. Therefore we're going to have more dollars chasing a sharply reduced supply of housing, with the inevitable results. I ask the minister to tell us how the grants are going to cure that particular kind of situation.

I said at the beginning that we're going to support this particular bill. I said it at the beginning at the urging of my colleagues, because they pointed out that if I didn't, I might well convince us that we would vote against it by the end of this speech.

It is a cynical election move which will have no long-term benefit because of the fact that this particular measure is only provided for a period of eight months. If there is any real commitment by the government to the plight of people buying a home for the first time, then clearly this should be a measure which should be in place on a permanent basis. We find it doubly cynical that in the same budget, where sales tax reductions and homeowner grants are provided for only eight months, the candy that is provided to big business should extend until some time well until the end of 1977. We intend to propose that the home buyers be treated at least as generously as industry. We would make the grant permanent. For now, we will propose that it go on until the end of 1977.

I think that this measure is cynical as well, Mr. Speaker, because the people from Detroit who advised the government have told them: "Look, go heavy on violence, go heavy on small business and go out to those home buyers who are getting frustrated; they're always potential Tories [more homeowners are Tory than tenants for a number of reasons]. Pander to what people want."

And I'm afraid to say that is precisely what the government is doing.

The minister estimates that 55,000 first-time home buyers will benefit during the course of this particular year. If you go back to 1973 and 1974, to any typical year, Mr. Speaker, you will find that the number of first-time home buyers in an average year is probably considerably higher than the 55,000 that are estimated for the coming year.

After all, if our housing starts are running at a rate of 100,000 per year—and the people who buy a home who had already owned one don't count because they leave a house that has to be sold—then one has to assume that something like 100,000 people per annum are first-time home buyers. This year it is estimated there will be only 55,000.

Then one has to ask: "How many of those 55,000 people would have already bought?" The answer again is obvious. The number of people is limited to those who could afford \$400 to \$600 per month in carrying charges on a home or have a father who is a vice-president of the Robert Simpson Co., a minister in the Conservative government, or someone else who can afford to lay some money down for them to buy a first home. Most of those 55,000 buyers would have bought already.

In terms of social policy, in other words, this is not a particularly effective use of \$55 million. We support it only because we can't see anything better coming from the government. But it's quite possible that no more than 5,000 first-time home buyers in fact will become buyers because of that extra \$1,000, and even many of those will simply be accelerating their purchases from the spring of 1976 until just before Christmas, 1975.

What really breaks my heart is that out there, Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds and hundreds of thousands of couples, people with one or two kids, families who have been saving up for 10 or 15 years to try to get a home of their own but they're always just a bit too short. Or perhaps they now regret the fact that at a time when they might have been able to afford it, their priorities were elsewhere and they thought they would put it off for a year or two, with the result that they lost the one chance in a lifetime when they might have found a home of their own.

For every family that benefits from this programme there will probably be 10 or 20 families across the province who would like to be home buyers, who sympathize with this programme but won't understand why it's not benefiting them.

The member for Sandwich-Riverside (Mr. Burr) was pointing out to us today that many of those people are already getting cynical because of what they see. They see that rich people benefit; they don't benefit. A few people who are now paying 35 per cent or 40 per cent of their income for homes they bought in March or April see that if your timing is politically adept for the Conservative government's re-election, then you benefit; and if you happen to be busting your wallet in order to get a home of your own, then you don't benefit either.

Mr. Speaker, because of the way it's drafted the bill is going to create some fairly severe problems, firstly for people who have just bought, and for apartment dwellers who are shut out because they are into a one- or two-year lease and can't break it. I would like to know what the minister is going to do about those problems.

There's also the cynical treatment of co-operatives because co-operatives are said to be encouraged by this particular measure. This comes after a year in which the provincial secretary responsible for housing has been one of the leading proponents of the anti-co-operative housing movement in the province, in that she has been actively working against co-operative and non-profit housing in her particular riding with the full support of the government of which she is a member. Nevertheless, the government says that co-operatives will be encouraged by this particular measure.

If it takes more than a year to get a condominium under way, Mr. Speaker, it obviously takes even longer to get a group of people together in order to form a co-operative, find land, thread through the red tape that has been erected by the various levels of government and eventually get a project on the ground. No new co-operative which is born or conceived after April 8, 1975, will benefit in any way from this particular measure.

There are problems with condominiums that are proposed by this measure, Mr. Speaker. On the one hand, I have had calls from people who maybe want to evade the purpose of the Act—I am not sure—but who are occupying a condominium unit under an option agreement which in certain cases is a binding agreement of purchase and in certain other cases is not. Where the option is not binding but there is a clear intention to purchase and they have been in for several months, I am not sure personally whether the minister intends that these people benefit from the homeowner grant or not, and I think that he should make that clear.

Even more serious though, there will be some condominium purchasers between now and the end of the year who were duped by clever sales tactics into assuming that they will benefit to the tune of \$1,500, who will move in before the end of the year, but who will be in a condominium where title is not registered until 1976 and the way in which the bill is drafted right now, they will not benefit. I see that the officials may have already considered that—

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): There is an amendment.

Mr. Cassidy: There is an amendment on that particular measure, okay. I am glad to see that that one has been tackled.

I believe that the matter of fraternity houses with revolving purchasers can also be handled, and I am sure that the minister will have a statement or an amendment on that particular thing as well.

Mr. Speaker, this is the centrepiece of the government's housing policy in this particular budget; the centrepiece—\$55 million in home purchasers' grants. I can see the ads now. I would like to know what the allocations to the Ministry of Housing are just to advertise this particular programme. I would like to know what the advertising schedule of that programme is and how it has been integrated with the other government advertising programmes leading up to the 1975 election, because clearly it is going to be used for that particular purpose. The Tories are coat-tailing themselves on the public purse in trying to get themselves re-elected.

When you look through the budget in general, Mr. Speaker, you find that there is no indication of any measures to stop the runaway rent increases that we are experiencing right now. There are no proposals to stop rent speculators. The money that is being put in for land acquisition is away down. There are no proposals to lower interest rates.

We find that last year the government's target of 30,000 assisted housing starts was missed by about 50 per cent. The government only got half of what it said its target was going to be. We find that last year when they talked about 100,000 housing starts, only 85,000 were achieved, that during the last fiscal year—that is 1974-1975—the total of housing starts was even less. The record is getting worse and worse, quarter by quarter.

We find the government lashing out at the federal government for its inaction and yet refusing to come in and use the very ample credit of the Province of Ontario in order to

fill the gap that it charges the federal government with creating. We find the government equally bitterly and viciously lashing out at the municipalities and always trying to pass the buck from its own responsibilities, despite the fact that the Province of Ontario, the provincial government, holds the keys to housing policy and successful fulfilment of a housing programme in the Province of Ontario.

We are confronted with yet another series of announcements in the budget—10,000 public housing units, other programmes and so on—which are just as incredible as the programmes that have been announced in the past. We are just as sceptical about them because the record, Mr. Speaker, has led us to believe conclusively that you have to cut back any announcements that the government makes about housing. They never fulfil what they promise to deliver. They never even spend the money that they budget for housing. They are down by 100 million bucks over the last three years on funds which have been allocated for housing, and if that's the case, then what on earth do we have the right to expect of the programmes that are announced in this particular budget?

That particular double dealing was added to in the budget itself where mortgage money for the OMC, which will go to \$208 million in 1975-1976, will in fact be \$35 million less money than had been promised for this current fiscal year by the government during the series of announcements made by the Minister of Housing during the latter months of 1974. Merely to repeat last year's allocation and to provide the additional funding that was promised but not spent last October would require a budget of \$233 million for 1975-1976. But the budget figure does not even provide enough funding to honour last year's commitments.

Mr. Speaker, that's about it. The house purchase benefit will benefit those who can afford to buy and to close in the next nine months. It's absolutely useless for the majority of low and middle income earners who have been priced right out of the market. And the Treasurer isn't doing anything to get them back in.

By the time these grants start to flow, the value of houses or the prices charged for houses will have gone up right across the province by more than the \$1,000 value of the grant or even by more than the \$1,500 value of the grant over three years. There is nothing to accommodate the problem that most families earning less than \$15,000 a year cannot afford \$400 or \$500 per month in order to have housing.

We will propose, during the course of the committee stage of this bill, Mr. Speaker, that the time limit which was put in to make this a piece of election bait be extended to be comparable with the concessions made to industry. We may even make that indefinite.

We also want to propose, in order to prevent people using this on \$80,000 mansions and other such types of property that there be limits set on the value of the homes which can be bought with this particular grant. We've considered the alternatives—whether it should be the limits set for the federal \$500 grant or the limits set for the assisted homeownership purchase programme. We believe that if there is going to be this amount of money going in, it should encourage and permit first-hand home buyers to buy modest priced homes and there should be a substantial incentive to the development industry to price homes closer to what those admittedly middle-income families can afford.

We would, therefore, propose that the regulations which would be set by the minister would limit that to the figures set under OHAP; that is, ranging from about \$42,000 maximum in most of the province to a ceiling of about \$48,000 here in Toronto. I find those figures are ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. I can't find better ones because of the insane kind of situation in the housing market which has been created by the Tories.

Ineffectual as it may be, cynical as it may be, we will rather grudgingly support this particular programme on the part of the government but we will move in committee stage to try to make it an effective, if marginal, contribution to the housing market. We will continue to press for a comprehensive housing policy which ensures that every Ontario resident, regardless of income, achieves the right to decent housing at an affordable cost. God bring the day when that will be the policy of the government of Ontario rather than the cynical kind of election baiting which is all we're getting from them right now.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is no doubt the government has a very great bent for bringing forth policies with great sex appeal politically, and passing them forward not knowing what their real implications and their real worth actually will be in the long run. There's no way anyone in their right mind could oppose the idea of putting money into

the hands of home-buyers. It's something needed and overdue.

I did a little research, Mr. Speaker, since this was introduced in the budget and I have found some startling things which just don't add up to the picture the minister has painted regarding this particular programme.

When the Treasurer was on TV following the budget, he admitted there was a great glut of homes on the market at the present time and that this particular measure would take these homes off the market. Then he was questioned, "What have you done for apartment owners?" After a little humming and hawing and thinking it suddenly dawned on him that that's going to move people out of apartments to pick up this supposed glut of homes that is now on the market; there will be vacancies in apartments for tenants, so that should keep rents at a particular level.

Mr. Speaker, surely he must know that that is a lot of nonsense. There isn't the glut of homes that people are able to purchase, or can afford to purchase, on the market in the Province of Ontario. I checked in my own riding and I find that the only homes for sale that have been on the market for any length of time are overpriced rowhousing, townhousing and condominiums. The low-priced single-family units are snapped up as quickly as they can be bought.

I asked for a few examples of what type of housing really is there as a backlog. So I was handed one slip from the Multiple Listing Service and it is a townhousing type of unit selling for \$44,900. This is one of the better deals in that it has a \$6,500 second mortgage which is interest free for the first three years. They really must be pushing to try to unload these overpriced houses if they are offering a second mortgage of \$6,500 interest free for the first three years. So after a downpayment of \$4,500, with an interest-free second mortgage of \$6,500, one would still be faced with a first mortgage of \$34,000.

Mr. Speaker, a mortgage of \$34,000 at 11 per cent requires monthly payments of principal and interest of about \$330. When one adds on taxes we are talking payments in the neighbourhood of \$400 a month. The problem is not that people can't manage the downpayment on a house—they can save the few thousand dollars that are required for the downpayment—that is only part of the problem. The major problem is who can afford the carrying charges of mortgages at their present rates and the size of mortgage that is required?

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Right on.

Mr. Good: So figuring it out, taking about somewhere between 25 and 30 per cent of income—and this varies depending on who one gets his or her mortgage from—but taking say 27 per cent, there is no way that a person can afford a house unless he or she is making somewhere around \$18,000 a year. The people who need housing are in earning ranges which are considerably less than that. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that anyone who really wants a house and is making \$18,000 a year in today's market could have a house. If it was his or her top priority in life to own a house I see no reason why he or she couldn't have a house.

The \$1,000 grant from the government is going to do one of two things for anyone who is trying to get into one of these overpriced units: It can reduce his downpayment by \$1,000 or it can reduce his monthly payments by \$10. The two realtors I spoke to said: "If you have a prospective buyer and he can't afford the \$400-a-month payment, there is no way he can afford \$390 a month," and that is all the \$1,000 is going to do.

So I don't think we are going to move the type of home which is today the backlog that the Treasurer has spoken of. These are houses in the middle and upper price range and a \$10 reduction in monthly payments, or the \$1,000 reduction in downpayment, isn't going to take those homes off the market. If those developers have seen fit to build, on speculation, homes in the medium and upper price range, I would say let the normal process of buyer and seller take its normal course and if they get stuck with them for a while let them be stuck with them. What we need is a programme that is going to put housing in the hands of the people on lower incomes and I agree that the \$55 million could have been used in another manner which would have been more equitable and fair.

I think we will see abuses come into the system, as we did with the simplistic approach that the government first developed in its farm tax reduction scheme.

The first time they introduced it they said everybody living on the farm or in the rural area with over 10 acres would get 25 per cent of their property tax reduced. So the fellow who built a \$100,000 home in the rural area on 15 or 20 acres of land got 25 per cent of his municipal taxes refunded. This thing was abused for two or three years, Mr. Speaker, simply because all this government looks at is a headline-grabbing, eye-

appealing approach to policy; policy by headline. They've been doing it for as long as I've been down here.

Granted, Mr. Speaker, this programme does have great political sex appeal. We don't doubt that. But in my own riding it doesn't seem to have gone over so big, judging by the calls I've had. I must confess I've had only about a half a dozen calls and letters on it and of that half dozen—I received one letter today, a copy of which went to the Premier (Mr. Davis)—these people are simply disgusted. They say: "I strongly object to the \$15,000 being given to first-time home buyers."

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): It's \$1,500.

Mr. Good: Fifteen hundred, I'm sorry; \$1,500 being sent to home buyers.

They go on to explain their objections. They had to skimp and save to get their downpayment, and now they're going to have to pay for other people. Well, maybe or maybe not that is a valid objection. In two other phone calls I had, the people were quite incensed because they had purchased just a week or two before the April 8 deadline on which the policy was announced. They feel it should be retroactive to this fiscal year. Well the government fiscal year starts April 1, so at least it should go back to April 1, if that would be any advantage; maybe it wouldn't.

I don't think it's going to create one new housing unit in my area. I don't know about the Toronto area. I understand there are quite a few houses on the market. I also understand they're in the price range where a person on average wages just can't afford to buy them.

With a little more forethought and a little more detailed analysis, perhaps that \$55 million could have been used in a manner which would have been more beneficial to those people who are really in the bind. There's no possible way they can ever get into a house.

I'm all for home ownership. I'm all for people owning their own property. I think it's the only hedge you can have against inflation. I come from a community where not many years ago, 87 per cent of the people lived in houses that they were buying. That has been distorted greatly in the last 10 or 15 years because of the advent of the high-rise apartment. I believe that home ownership gives a family a great deal of stability and I'm all for it. But I don't think this particular programme has had that much thought go into it, other than its political implications. Along with the

whole budget, people are wrapping this up into one bundle and saying it's nothing more than electioneering with public money.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I have a few points on the legislation. The scarifying of the same has been done adequately by my colleague, the member for Ottawa Centre. There are several points which I want to peruse or muse about, or go over with the minister. Why 55,000 homes—is that the idea? Where does that figure come from? How is it arrived at?

I would point out to the minister that the gift tax is being monumentally increased from \$2,000 to \$5,000. A rich man gives a \$5,000 gift, and so forth, and the government adds \$1,000 to it. Not many people have rich fathers who are in a position to give \$5,000. It's another element in the overall picture of not benefiting. On the contrary, it is giving positive and extra emphasis or weight to certain elements in the population who really don't need all the government's beneficence and handouts. The failure in the legislation is that it is not restricted to those who might very well use it and could.

We would abjure, or request that the minister be clear on the dates that are effective here. A good number of the public, from telephone calls received—and I'm sure the minister has got them in abundance in his office, too—haven't been thoroughly informed about the transaction. Even if entered into prior to April 8, if it closes, if there's a transfer of title or possession subsequent to that date and up until midnight of Dec. 31 of this year, they qualify. I don't think it's clear enough yet. Certain lawyers have asked me about it. They think that if a transaction was entered into prior to that date then the matter is out the window. The transaction has to be entered into, in other words, subsequent to April 8, which is not the point and intent of this bill. In handling it that way, there is equity, and there is a sense of fairness written into the thing. It falls within a certain period; there is not that arbitrary deadline, that is true.

Well I don't think the man whose deal actually closed on April 7 should wring his hands. I mean that was set up. It would have been nice, but I don't think one will get that sense of chagrin or bitterness in the way that this is set up. But please give it a little publicity so that the thing will be made clear.

I'm also a little bemused to wonder what's going to happen to real estate transactions, say around Dec. 20. I can imagine quite well somebody buying a house on Dec. 31, insist-

ing that it close the next day. I suspect there will be ballooning and pressure mounting towards the end of the year as this legislation comes to a close.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Law offices are mainly closed after Christmas to New Year's.

Mr. Lawlor: We are going to send it into committee anyhow and I can get that answer without my hearing aid. We want to point out to the minister too, that when the government passes legislation of this kind for industry, conferring benefits upon them by way of subsidy or largess, it doesn't quite handle it the same way as it does for ordinary people. The production machinery stuff that we've been handling here in the past few days, for instance, goes on until 1977. It's constantly extended, and it's anticipated that it will be extended. It has been extended from 1968 right clean through.

The flexibilities involved there and the open-handedness in that regard are quite diametrically opposed to the toughness of these measures, although I suspect that possibly as part of the government's campaign tactics Dec. 31 may not become all that arbitrary. Doesn't the Treasurer agree? Isn't that in the back of the government's mind as an extra move?

I have certainly some misgivings about this. I was speaking last night as I came home, to a real estate salesman on the street. I said: "What impact has the \$1,500 or \$1,000 in the first-year situation going to have?" He said: "Oh, Lawlor, we've already picked that up into the price." Unless the Treasurer is prepared to bring in some kind of controls, some way in which to place a lid over that, he can't open Pandora's box over here. He defeats his own purposes, cuts into the revenues of the province by \$55 million and doesn't achieve what he seeks to achieve at all. It's all siphoned off and the gravy is slurped up by those whom even the Treasurer didn't intend would be the beneficiaries of these particular measures.

The Treasurer does it constantly because he is so purblind about setting up some kind of alternative fixed figures. He has the whole apparatus under the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Meen) to inspect, allocate, set prices for property, determine tax for land transfer tax and land speculation tax measures. There is a whole new department operating in these areas which he could very well, as Treasurer, utilize in this particular regard to set a price which will not be exceeded and which will ensure that all the benefits are not incorporated into different hands than what was the original intention of this legislation.

It's pussyfooting. But even if it is pussyfooting, miniature and a slight thread that can hardly be seen even in the brightest sunlight, we feel it's a move in the right direction and we are kind of forced, more or less against the grain, to support it.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other hon. member who wishes to take part in the debate? The hon. member for Welland South.

Mr. Haggerty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few comments on Bill 28, An Act to provide for the Payment of Grants to First Time Home Buyers. I do support the bill in principle but with some reservations. No doubt a grant of some \$1,500 will induce many individuals of family status to purchase a home for the first time. Not realizing that this purchase will be one of the most important financial investments the purchaser will be faced with in the period of his lifetime, I'm afraid many of them will not really know the cost involved and whether or not they can afford it. Other members have mentioned that the announcement is nothing but a vote-getting programme. I can agree with them on that principle, that is what it is for—just something to go to the public with sometime this year, within the nine-month period, with the hope this will gain additional support for the Conservative government.

My main concern, Mr. Speaker, is the cost involved to induce these individuals to go out and buy homes. I was interested in a brief presented to our caucus last week—it was a submission to the Ontario government—on the employment and housing crisis and it was presented by the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America. It was a very well documented brief and well put together. I was interested in page seven of the brief and perhaps I should read it into the record.

By 1973 the average Metro home had gone up to \$40,000; so assuming a \$30,000 mortgage and with the new interest rate of 10 per cent, a 25-year mortgage would require a monthly payment of \$268. That is a whopping increase of 320 per cent over 1961.

I don't believe wages have increased that much.

By March, 1975, with Multiple Listing Services' average home prices at \$58,000, a \$50,000 mortgage would be typical; with an interest of 12 per cent, a 25-year mortgage would require monthly payments of \$515.95. In other words, if one is to keep to the recommended maximum of 25 per cent of income for shelter an annual income of \$25,000 would be required to buy

the average home listed by MLS in Metro Toronto. With residential and second mortgage interest rates running from 14 to 16 per cent the whole issue of financing housing has gone beyond reason.

Put simply, since 1961 an increase in interest rates of 85 per cent has raised interest charges by 1,000 per cent over the life of a 25-year mortgage.

I am concerned when we deal with the Ontario Housing Corp., particularly with a proposed development in the town of Fort Erie. I raised the matter last Dec. 18 with the Minister of Housing over the involvement of Ontario Housing.

They moved into the town of Fort Erie to establish Ontario Housing. They set a price on lots of some \$10,000. Of course when you mention \$10,000 to the Legislature here perhaps in some areas that's peanuts compared to what they have to pay for a lot in Toronto. In particular it's mentioned here that the average income in Ontario today is around \$10,000. That may apply in some municipalities. It doesn't apply in all municipalities throughout Ontario and \$10,000 a lot, particularly in the town of Fort Erie, is out of the reach of the average wage earner in that municipality.

When I mentioned about the programme I had figured it out at 4½ or five homes built on an acre of land. The developer would be making a profit of almost \$25,000—that's clear—after all the services have been put in. In the overall picture, looking at 200 homes, there was \$1 million in profit which would go to the developer, at the expense of the taxpayers of the Province of Ontario, through the Ontario Housing Corp. Again, I say if the involvement of the government is to get into building houses, it must put them on the market at a price the average wage earner in Ontario can afford.

I was concerned particularly about the interest that would be involved in the purchase of a home in that area. I suppose we are looking at \$30,000 or \$35,000 at 10 per cent to 12 per cent. I suppose we are talking about, in the first year, \$3,500 on it and it would run roughly at about \$285 to \$300 a month to purchase a home in that area. No individual in that area without an income of \$25,000 is going to come in under that scheme.

In various election campaigns, we have laughed at one of the political parties, Social Credit, and in particular at one of their main planks, which is to lower the interest rate to about six per cent. When it is mentioned,

it raises a few eyebrows and produces a heckle from the crowd or the other candidates on the platform. But I think it makes sense when they say that the interest rate should be around the level of six per cent or seven per cent.

I think we must take a look at the usurious rate of interest in the Province of Ontario and perhaps throughout Canada. I was interested in the comments of the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett) when he mentioned in the House this afternoon, that certain companies got loans through ODC at 6½ per cent, while the highest is about eight per cent. I believe that's reasonable.

An hon. member: There are some at zero.

Mr. Haggerty: But for some reason the Ontario Ministry of Housing can't come through with an interest rate of six per cent or eight per cent. One must conclude that the ministry is in bed with the developers.

Looking at the interest, when one has to go out and buy a home through Ontario Housing, on a 40- or 50-year term that interest will bury him for sure. He'll take it with him to his grave. There are many municipalities today where there are a number of new homes waiting for buyers, but the buyers cannot afford the interest. Certainly the programme is good for nine months, but all the Treasurer has actually done is to remove the sales tax for that period of nine months.

The Liberal policy in the past, and it probably will be this time, is that the sales tax should be removed on home building. I see the minister has got a little smile on his face, but it is true.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am just delighted that we've come that close to hearing the Liberal policy.

Mr. Haggerty: The federal government has moved in that direction and reduced it from 12 per cent to five per cent—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That represents a step forward. It has made the whole day worthwhile.

Mr. Haggerty: —but not for a period of nine months. If one looks at the resolution presented by the Liberal Party following the last provincial budget, one would see that it was suggested there that the sales tax should be removed from home construction in the Province of Ontario.

If the government is serious about what it wants to do to provide housing in Ontario for the average wage earner, then it should remove the sales tax and, above all, it should lower the interest rate. If they can do it through the ODC loans to businessmen, surely they can find some accommodation for the home buyer in Ontario to bring the interest rate within his means and capabilities in providing a home for his family.

The bill itself, you might say is just a headline hunter. The government obviously hopes it's going to pick up a few votes from those persons who are going to be able to qualify under the programme—and how many will be able to qualify, I don't know. I suppose that when they read the information that is on the application form, they're going to have second thoughts. They'll probably soon realize they've got to invest \$40,000 to pick up \$1,000 this year, \$250 the next year and \$250 the following year. I don't know if the government is going to be able to fool them or not. If the government is serious enough and wants to provide homes for the people of the Province of Ontario, then it should lower the interest rate. The government can do it; it has done it in other provincial programmes to assist industry and the like. Surely if the government can find money for that, it can find it for the home builders in Ontario. And, after all, if a person goes out and buys a home in Ontario, he's going to be buying furniture, appliances and so on; this is what is going to keep industry going, and they're going to get some benefit out of it.

I think the government's whole housing programme is going to fail because people today just don't have the money to be able to go out and buy a home. They're fortunate enough to even have the downpayment, without having a mortgage for 40 or 50 years; and as mentioned in the brief that was presented to the cabinet, they mention 25 years. I think that 25-year club has gone. I think the present condition is 50 years under the Ontario Housing Corp. I think if the government wants to do something it should lower the interest rate.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, Bill 28 is, of course, part of the government party's election gimmickry. It is allegedly designed to stimulate house building, but because the first-time owner may buy an existing house there is no assurance that any new housing is going to result.

It is almost impossible for a young couple to initiate the construction of a new house in the time period allowed. The young couple would have to find a lot, go through the legalities required to secure title, then find a contractor who could guarantee to have the house finished by Dec. 31. That is a rather tall order, involving some possibility that the deadline might arrive before title is obtained or possession taken.

In subdivisions in which new houses are being finished there may be a stimulation of sales, although not necessarily; or sales to people who were not already planning to buy. There is no assurance, of course, that the first-time buyer will not have to pay \$1,500 more than would have been the case if no grant had been announced. Any real estate agent will learn in a few minutes whether a prospective buyer is a first-time buyer or not. The likelihood is that the seller will also be affected by this knowledge and will bargain more harshly accordingly.

When the government eventually issues a report on the effect of this scheme in a year's time, Mr. Speaker, it would be interesting to know how many of these first-time buyers actually based their decision on this grant offer. If 55,000 buy under this plan, there may be only 2,000 or 3,000 who would not otherwise have done so.

Another feature of Bill 28 that I dislike is the fact that a buyer who has plenty of money will get this election gift although he may have no need for this inducement whatsoever. The poorer citizens who have recently become first-time buyers, before April 8, are looking askance at this whole plan, realizing as they do full well that they are subsidizing many well-to-do persons who had no need of financial help.

With the experience that many people have had with such transactions and the snail's pace at which some lawyers work, then I predict that in December of this year many MPPs will spend a considerable amount of time trying to expedite legal arrangements to enable the first-time buyer to receive his \$1,000 Christmas gift.

I feel this grant should not be given to those who can well afford to buy their first house. There may not be many such people in Ontario, but these people should be excluded from the provisions of this bill. Because I disapprove of the means-test procedure when it can possibly be avoided, I feel that the grant should be restricted to those purchasing houses with less than a certain designated value. That the means test should be placed on the house—the value of

the house—not on the financial capacity of the buyers.

If I may pick a figure out of the air at random, let me use the round figure of \$35,000. If houses with price tags of \$36,000 or \$37,000 were not eligible for this grant, the effect on the seller or the developer might be to bring the price down to \$34,995 so that the first-time buyers would be attracted under this grant plan.

But as it is, I fear that a \$36,000 house is more likely to have a \$37,000 price sticker, on top of the previous label, so to speak.

Most of the people who are delighted with this Bill 28 are those who have already decided or even started to buy a house for the first time. There are many better ways of stimulating the provision of new housing in this province, which our party would use. For an example, the Ministry of Housing could provide mortgages on a sliding interest scale, depending on a family's income—as is done with houses that have their rentals geared to income.

Bill 28 is a hastily conceived, ill-considered election device that I cannot applaud. My instinct is to oppose the bill, but it is just possible that this grant will make enough difference to enable a few hundred low income couples to buy some low priced homes being vacated by senior citizens moving into other accommodation or dying. I certainly would not like to deny such people a chance that may never come again to enable them to enjoy home ownership with all that usually means in enhancing family life and family solidarity. And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I shall not oppose the bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Speaker, I was tempted not to speak to the bill because, unlike my colleagues, I wouldn't suggest for a moment that the Treasurer brought in this particular piece of legislation with any political motivation behind it, such as the election. But interestingly enough I had about 15 calls on the weekend. There was great interest shown. The people in the Sudbury area are pretty astute and they all realized that this was gimmickry. I had five or six calls who asked me this: "Do you think I should make the application?" And I said: "Are you buying the house?" And they said: "Yes." And I said: "By all means, but I am delighted that you focused my attention on the fact that this was political chicanery." But they saw through it.

I want to tell you at the same time, Mr. Speaker, that in speaking to that 15-odd couples on the weekend, there were at least four who had missed the deadline by about a day or two. And I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that has rankled them to no end. Of course, the other five or six who I told or advised they should make application for the grant, they drew to my attention that this was political chicanery. So I, in turn, drew it to the attention of the four other couples who had missed the deadline. I didn't want to do it. I don't have a suspicious nature, Mr. Speaker, but it is more than one can endure, really. What in God's name is the government doing?

We are talking about 1,000 bucks to people who are in the process of buying. Some of those who called last week had the money in order to buy. Therefore, they were in the process of buying. You have got other people who are hamstrung for time, Mr. Speaker, with that nine months bit. If they have got an apartment lease and they are going to be there for the next 12 months, there is no way they can get out of the apartment and finalize the total transaction and qualify to move into a house. In fact, Mr. Speaker, you are alienating a lot of people and there is cynicism out there over that and the two per cent on sales tax like you wouldn't believe.

I addressed a nominating convention in North Bay on Saturday night and the press was absolutely cynical. The only press that isn't cynical, of course, is the Sudbury Star, run by the minister's friend, J. R. Meeks. It's a Thomson newspaper and they saw that as the greatest budget in the world.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): He is not only running it; he is running it into the ground.

Mr. Martel: In fact, Don Collins said it was the best budget in the last 20 years.

Mr. Laughren: Who is he?

Mr. Martel: Well, I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that it does nothing for anyone.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Of course, he is a two income family.

Mr. Martel: Of course, he is a two income family. He works for J. P. Robarts; or I guess it's his wife who works for J. P. Robarts now on the study.

Mr. Deans: How much does she earn?

Mr. Burr: Is he going to buy a first-time house?

Mr. Deans: How much does he get? Is he an average wage earner?

Mr. Martel: Donald Collins? About \$50,000, I guess now.

I listened intently one day when the Minister of Housing was talking about the carrying charges on Ontario Housing Corp. units in Ottawa, I believe he said \$426 a month. Who in God's name in this province, except I suppose \$20,000 or \$25,000-a-year income earners, can afford \$426 a month? Where is the assistance for people to get them into a home? Of course, the Minister of Housing denied it last week. I happen to believe that the young people who are going to use this plan will not be buying new homes. As the time is very short for them to get into a home, I suspect they will resort to older homes to fall within the nine-month period.

I can see the first thing the real estate agent will say: "Are you a first-time home buyer?" They say yes, and his pencil comes out and he adds another \$1,000 on the deal, because he knows the government is going to give them \$1,000. They're going to be buying old houses. They're not going to be buying the type of house they need with a young family over the long haul. That's one reason that group will move into that type of housing.

If they're caught with leases and so on and can't get out of the lease until the end of October, they've got two months to finalize the transaction. That group too will move into old houses, when what they need are houses for the long term if they're going to raise families; and I suspect most of the first-time home buyers will be young couples. They will be jumping into old houses which ultimately will have to be renovated at tremendous cost to them. Consequently, we're going to see the opposite to what the Minister of Housing said. That class of houses will go up over the next couple of months rather than, as he tried to convince this Legislature, going down. I couldn't understand the logic of the Minister of Housing the other day when he said this programme would drive housing prices down. Maybe the Treasurer could explain to me very slowly how that's going to occur. If this programme is going to drive the price of housing down, I'd like to get it from him.

Finally, I have two other points. I heard pension funds mentioned. I recall engaging the minister some years ago in some discussions with respect to teachers' funds. Instead of borrowing \$210 million to support that giveaway budget, which we'll ultimately pay for after the next election anyway, the Treasurer might have gone to the superannuation com-

mission of my own teachers' fund and said: "Look, give us \$210 million." As he talks to Jim Causley, and I'm sure the Treasurer has done that in the past, he could say: "Now look Jim, lend us \$250 million more for long-term loans for low mortgage rates for housing."

If the Treasurer was really interested in a housing programme that's where one starts. Instead of going to the Canada Pension Plan fund and just throwing that money into the consolidated revenue fund, he might take some of that pension money from CPP and put it into housing.

Direct, very deliberately the teachers' pension fund and the funds from the CPP into housing. In fact, he might even try the railroad. I'm told that they have a pension fund that's valued at over \$2 billion. I believe they're getting 3.5 per cent for it now.

Mr. Haggerty: They put money into the Workmen's Compensation Board building.

Mr. Martel: They put \$33 million into Fidinam from the railroad pension fund. We might have got that type of low interest rate money and deliberately put it into mortgage money. I'm sure that teachers—I am a little familiar with them—would have been delighted, particularly with the interest rate that this government has been providing teachers over the last number of years.

The final point I want to make, and this is a direct question to the minister, is that I want to know what happens if someone is involved in an option-to-buy situation and they've been paying rent for, let's say, two or three years, and in the final analysis they decide they are going to purchase the house and the rental then becomes the down payment. Do these people qualify for this \$1,000? I think that is important because Falconbridge is selling houses in the Sudbury basin in that manner and I have had a couple of calls which I simply couldn't answer, based on the content of the bill. I would like a direct response.

I tell the minister if it was up to me this party would vote against the bill because I think it is just cheap chicanery in the final analysis, which isn't going to do anyone any good. I want to tell him it isn't buying the Tories any votes; it really isn't.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to take part in the debate? The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I originally had no intention of getting into the debate but as no one has covered a topic

in the legislation that I thought should be covered and brought to the attention of this House, I thought I would partake and hope to make some type of contribution.

Practically everyone has mentioned the political implications of the introduction of this bill. There is no need to go into that area of discussion any further; it was quite emphatically made by practically every member, prior to me, who has made some type of suggestion or some remark.

Mr. Speaker, one of the problems that puzzles me—I shouldn't say puzzles me but concerns me—is that the price of homes is now getting into a range where practically the only people who can purchase one are those in a two-income family. There are two incomes in the family and as a result they are able to make a sufficiently high down payment to be able to purchase the home. The \$1,500 which will be provided by the government is an assist but it is only an assist to those who really could afford to buy a home without this \$1,500 assistance. No one is going to turn a gift horse away when the government sort of insists on the individual taking the \$1,500.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of the bill do not prevent someone coming from another jurisdiction and purchasing the home. Naturally it says it must be the principal residence but I can foresee some of our friends to the north or to the south, whichever way one wants to look at it, our American friends, coming into Ontario and taking advantage of this. There would be some favourable aspects to that in that there would be home construction and as a result it could stimulate the economy.

The individual does not have to be a citizen. It has to be his principal residence so he can make his residence in the Province of Ontario for the prescribed period of time, or have someone live in that home and then, at the end of that one year, either pay for the home or use it as a summer cottage. I would think he would prefer to buy that type of accommodation in the vacation resort area so that it could serve a dual purpose, both as a summer cottage and as a year-round residence, especially in Essex county where he would be within commuting distance of his employment. He would be just as close to his place of employment in the State of Michigan in many places or in the city of Detroit as he would be if he lived in the suburbs of Detroit. I can foresee that Americans could take advantage of the provisions of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, one area which disturbs me a bit is that this is going only to a first-time buyer. I can accept it for a first-time newlywed or younger couple but I think there should be included in that bill "for the first time in the last 25 years," since 1950. An individual may have owned a home 25 years ago, in the 1940s, and may have left the area, gone to another area and simply rented accommodation. He has returned to the community and has now tried apartment living, isn't satisfied with that and would like to purchase a home. This could be an incentive for that individual if one of the requirements was not that he must be a first-time buyer. If it was the first time since, say, 1950—that would be going back 25 years; a generation—it would enable individuals in their later years of life an opportunity once again to purchase a home of their own.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder why there wouldn't be provision in the legislation to enable an individual to build a home himself and qualify for the grant. He could have the outside done and it be a sort of shell type of home which that individual could complete in his spare time, with his own expertise. In that fashion he could own a home that would have the market value of today's style of home, as a result of his own physical capabilities or with assistance from friends. In this way he would be able to complete this type of home and still qualify for the \$1,500 first-owner grant. I would hope that there would be provision for that type of approach by individuals.

Likewise, maybe on a co-op basis, we would have a group of school teachers or members of any other profession get together and, through a co-operative effort, build a series of homes at a substantially reduced financial outlay to themselves.

Mr. Speaker, the government set up an advisory task force on housing policy. I wonder why, after setting up a task force to look into the housing situation, it wouldn't accept some of the recommendations presented by the task force. I'm going to refer to residential mortgage assistance, on page 70 of the task force report. The following recommendations are made there, and I would suggest to the minister that these should have been considered:

An Ontario Housing Finance Corp. should be established as a successor to the Housing Corp. Ltd., with the following duties and responsibilities:

a) To provide grants and interest subsidies for mortgages for low-income families; second mortgages for moderate-

income families; and to enable purchasers of older homes to undertake needed renovations.

b) To lend directly to individuals when and where the private market does not operate, and to owner-builders.

c) To provide mortgages below market rate to non-profit organizations and co-operatives for the construction and rehabilitation of low-income housing.

I certainly think that the recommendation of subsidized mortgage payments—

An hon. member. Subsidized interest.

Mr. B. Newman:—subsidized interest payments, would be a substantial assist. I've noticed that some of the American jurisdictions do have a sort of geared-to-income mortgage payment scheme where the lower the income the lower the mortgage interest on the payments the individual must make.

As conditions are today, and because the average wage is a little over \$10,000, the one-earner family—unless he, she or both are able to save their funds and live very, very conservatively and put everything they possibly can away for that day when they can buy their dream home—is going to be relegated to mobile housing, because mobile housing is practically the only housing that is within the financial means of most people today. I understand that probably 80 per cent of homes under the \$15,000 price range are mobile homes.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to see that the minister has included mobile homes in here, but what he is really saying is that practically everyone in our economy can purchase homes, but that those with a limited income or a very small income must buy mobile homes. The minister is relegating the senior citizen or the older individual and also the newly married into mobile housing.

There is nothing wrong with putting them into mobile housing and there is nothing wrong with providing a first-owner grant for those who are going into mobile housing. But, Mr. Speaker, no provisions have been made concerning the development of mobile-home parks. No provisions are made concerning the quality of the homes. I know the minister has a clause in here that states that mobile homes must meet certain Canadian Standards Association requirements. Those I understand, Mr. Speaker, are not as satisfactory as they could be.

Likewise there is the problem of taxation when it comes to mobile homes; that needs to be cleared up. There is also the problem

of a mobile-home owner's bill of rights. I can recall back in 1966 recommending to government that they should look into the mobile-home field as one of the answers to our housing problem—as an assist in our housing problem. I'm pleased that mobile homes have been included in here, but the problems of mobile homes haven't been completely resolved.

Mobile homes are good homes. They are substantial homes in many cases. They provide to the individual decent housing at two periods in the individual's life: when they first get married and then later on in their years when they are going to retire and don't want to go into apartment living and prefer that mobile-home style of living. Many of us know relatives and friends who now live in some of the sunnier states of the union and they generally live in mobile homes because they can't afford the condominiums in those sunnier climes.

So mobile housing is good housing. It has a part to play in the overall housing picture. I would certainly suggest to the minister that amendments may be made to legislation so that those who live in mobile homes don't have the problems that they are confronted with today concerning the sale of their mobile homes—the master-slave relationship that exists between the mobile-home-park owner and the mobile-home owner.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the minister takes into consideration some of the comments I have made and if necessary makes amendments so that those who purchase homes for the first time since, say, 1950, would likewise qualify for this \$1,500 first-owner grant. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peel South.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Martel: He is opposing the bill, you know, Mr. Speaker. That fellow is opposing the bill.

Mr. Cassidy: No, the heavyweights have to defend it.

Mr. Kennedy: No, Mr. Speaker. I'm not opposing the bill.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Kennedy: I'm here to enthusiastically endorse it, as I'm sure those fellows opposite really feel in their hearts—

Mr. Cassidy: We can tell that enthusiasm from his speeches.

Mr. Kennedy: —should be their stance. They are just not prepared to admit it, that's the trouble with them.

Mr. Martel: Some of us have a heart.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Never been used, though.

Mr. Kennedy: Mr. Speaker, as one who has had considerable experience in past years with first-home owners, I want to commend the minister for bringing in this measure in his budget.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): How many times has the member been a first-home owner?

Mr. Kennedy: There are those who poo-hoo the idea of \$1,500 as being insignificant. To me \$1,500 is a lot of money. It always was and still is.

Mr. Deans: Why doesn't the member get appointed to a select committee?

Mr. Kennedy: This, along with the federal \$500, gives a real lift, I would say, to a first-home owner.

Mr. Cassidy: It puts you ahead by at least a month in Metro—maybe two.

Mr. Kennedy: I'm pleased, too, at the wide range of accommodation that's being provided for in this bill. The member for Windsor-Walkerville who just spoke touched on mobile homes, which was something I was going to make reference to as well.

Mr. Martel: My son wants a tent, does the member think he can apply? His first tent—he is 10 years old.

Mr. Kennedy: Really, just to endorse what he has said, that is a very, very acceptable type of accommodation now. There is resistance by municipalities and this, somehow or other, needs to be broken down. The stigma that still seems to surround occupancy of mobile homes is totally unwarranted and has to be further dissipated. People in that type of accommodation are just as comfortable and happy—if not happier. They usually don't have the burden of debt over their heads. I can't speak too highly for the merits of this type of accommodation.

Mr. Lawlor: They wiped all the parks out of his riding.

Mr. Kennedy: Pardon?

Mr. Lawlor: They wiped all the mobile homes out of the member's riding. He wasn't out there crusading.

Mr. Kennedy: If the municipalities in my riding are opposed to it, I have no more sympathy for them than for the councils of any other municipalities. I say there is accommodation that can result in as a happy and as contented and as suitable living conditions as any other type.

Mr. Lawlor: I agree with the member. They all got kicked out.

Mr. Kennedy: No, some were moved; this is true. I know the park the member is speaking of. The owner said he wanted them out. He sold the property for highrise apartments. They are now under construction.

Mr. Lawlor: I understood the council forced it.

Mr. Martel: They are all moving to Chat-ham anyway.

Mr. Kennedy: Well, however it was done, that is what happened.

Mr. Speaker and Mr. Minister, as it refers to providing housing units for young people who find it such a struggle, I am sure that this financial assistance, along with a breakthrough in the mobile home field, would give a real lift to those people who wished to have their own separate units of accommodation.

The other thing I wanted to refer to was the land transfer tax, which isn't referred to particularly in this bill, but I know we can speak broadly about it.

Mr. Deans: It certainly isn't. It isn't in the bill at all.

Mr. Martel: The member is out of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Kennedy: The Treasurer isn't without interest—

Mr. Deans: On a point of order, he has to speak to the principle of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Would the hon. member direct his comments to the principle of this bill?

Mr. Kennedy: The Treasurer isn't without interest in financial affairs.

Mr. Deans: Stick to the principle of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Would the hon. member speak to the principle of this bill?

Mr. Kennedy: Yes, I will. My principles are even higher than that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Martel: It wouldn't be hard to be higher than the principles of this bill.

Mr. Kennedy: A transfer of property, \$35,000 or less, attracts a tax of three-tenths of one per cent. Over \$35,000, it's six-tenths. If one gets a \$50,000 home, the six-tenths is some \$300. Well, that is still quite a bit of money. I would like to see that land transfer tax reduced to a tenth, as I think it used to be. Or, alternatively, the break point between three-tenths and six-tenths should be raised to something like \$50,000 or \$60,000—something that is more realistic in today's escalating housing market.

Mr. Lawlor: The Treasurer should have consulted with the member when he made the budget.

Mr. Martel: He might have followed the select committee's report on land.

Mr. Kennedy: So with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I know that this bill has been enthusiastically received in the entire Legislature this afternoon, and quite properly so.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Thank you. I wouldn't want to disillusion the member, but if he thinks this is an enthusiastic reception for a bill, he has got an awful surprise coming to him.

Mr. Kennedy: Actually I could, Mr. Speaker, mentioning a few examples—

Mr. Deans: Is he back up again?

Mr. Kennedy: —I could have mentioned a few examples.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member for Wentworth continue please?

Mr. Deans: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Don't be quite so provocative.

Mr. Deans: I wondered a bit about this bill over the weekend. I did something on this weekend I have never done in 7½ years in the Legislature. It just happened on Saturday that I had the annual meeting of my riding association.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Deans: Is the member for Durham back again?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member will continue.

Mr. Deans: I took the opportunity to put some of the budgetary matters before them to get their views. I explained to them, as I am going to explain to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Treasurer, that my own personal view of this was that it wasn't worthy of support. My personal view of this particular piece of legislation was that there were so few people who would benefit from it, who were in need, that the bill itself really didn't justify discussion in the Legislature. In fact, it ought not to have been brought forward.

I asked the question—and I ask it of you, Mr. Speaker — how many people earning \$10,000 or less in the Province of Ontario will qualify for the \$1,500? How many people in the Province of Ontario will be able to qualify for the \$1,500? How many people in the Province of Ontario who earn \$10,000 or less will be able to purchase a first house in this province? There may be people who have already owned houses who will sell them and, with some of the money they get from that house, will have a sufficient down payment to be able to buy another house—

Mr. B. Newman: They're merely upgrading themselves.

Mr. Deans: —who will be upgrading themselves and who will fall into the category of earning \$10,000 or less.

I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the average wage earner in the Province of Ontario doesn't earn over \$10,000. The average classification in the Steel Co. of Canada, which is considered by many people to be a fairly high wage payer in the Province of Ontario, is job class 6. Job class 6 doesn't provide a person with \$10,000 a year, which means that probably 50 per cent or more of the people who live in the city of Hamilton earn less than \$10,000 on a single-income basis.

The average family income in the Province of Ontario is something around \$13,400. There will be very few people earning \$13,400 who will qualify to buy a first home in the Province of Ontario in the next nine months, given the value of the houses.

The fact of the matter is that this measure, brought in by the government, will not satisfy the needs of very many people in this province earning the average wage or less.

There may be two or three isolated instances where people will benefit from it, but the majority of people working every day in the average job in the Province of Ontario, who are attempting to purchase a home for the first time, will have great difficulty in qualifying for this \$1,000 this year and \$250 in each of the next two years.

One must understand the reason for saying this. The average home in the city of Hamilton, by CMHC standards, costs over \$50,000. The average young couple, in order to buy that home, would have to be able to save \$10,000 in order to have a \$40,000 mortgage. That \$40,000 mortgage would require them to pay \$360 to \$380 a month.

Mr. B. Newman: Plus taxes.

Mr. Deans: On the average wage, they can't afford that; they can't buy those homes.

When you take a realistic look at it, this kind of measure doesn't even begin to deal with any of the major problem areas. Certainly there will be some people who will buy a home in Ontario who will get the \$1,500 and who will use that money. It will be considered by most of them to be of some consequence; they will be happy to get it. I'm going to be the last guy to deny them that, but I say that this government's record in the housing field is so bad that when it brings in a measure like this, without bringing in any other legislation that will provide rent stabilization or enable a sufficient number of houses to be built in the Province of Ontario for people earning average and below-average wages, then we've got to look at this measure as being a little bit of politicking. There won't be enough people who will benefit to justify calling it a lot of politicking.

Mr. Germa: Shame.

Mr. Deans: Over the course of the last few years—well, let me go back a bit further, because I think it's worth putting on the record. Ten years ago, it was possible for the average wage earner in the average family to buy a new home in the Province of Ontario. Ten years ago, the average man or woman in the average job, with a single-income family, could go out into the marketplace and buy a new home. They can't do that any more in this province. There's no way that the average person can do that in this province. This has happened under this Treasurer and this Premier (Mr. Davis) and his predecessor. We have got to the point where the average hard-working person

in this province can't raise enough money to provide a home for himself and his family under this government's programmes. It builds houses, as I have said to the Minister of Housing on numerous occasions, and provides subsidies for people who are earning more than \$20,000 a year. It provides subsidies and housing—not a lot of it—in a limited quantity for people earning between \$12,000 and \$20,000 a year. But bear in mind that the average wage earner earns \$10,000 or less and this government doesn't provide a blessed thing in this province for 60 per cent of the wage earners.

The minister comes forward and asks us to endorse enthusiastically the \$1,000 grant over nine months to a selected few people who would have been going into the housing market in any event and to somehow view that as a stimulus toward housing. There won't be one new house built in the Province of Ontario as a result of this \$1,500 grant. The housing stock of the Province of Ontario will not have increased by one as a result of this measure.

I heard it said by one of the cabinet ministers that this wasn't really intended to stimulate housing. What was really intended was that this first-time home buyer could purchase a fridge and a stove and a washing machine perhaps, some of the appliances they will need for their new home.

I put to the members this question: How does the government go to those people in the province who are saddled with \$35,000, \$40,000 and \$45,000 mortgages, who have been saddled with these as a result of this government's inactivity over 10 years, and say it is going to tax them a little more so that a selected few people who happen to be able to purchase during the nine-month period—April to December, 1975—can buy a fridge and a stove and a washing machine? How does it tell these people it is going to raise their taxes in January, 1976, as it is, so it can pay back to the coffers of the Province of Ontario the money it has paid out under this programme in order to allow people to buy washing machines, fridges and stoves for nine months?

In heaven's name, what kind of fiscal policy is that? What kind of Robin Hood complex is it that says the government is going to take from the already hard-pressed who are having extreme difficulty in meeting their obligations now—which they had to undertake in order to provide accommodation for themselves and their families as a result of this government's inactivity—it is going to go back to them and tax them even more in

order to provide a few people with \$1,000 or \$1,500? I don't know how it is going to explain that to them. I don't even know how it dreamt this up.

Mr. Laughren: That is the really intriguing point.

Mr. Deans: I don't even understand the rationale behind the budget any more because as I read it over again on the weekend I tried to see, somewhere in the budget, some sort of common thread which would tie it all together and set it up as a reasonable fiscal document which would be used somehow or other by the Province of Ontario to guide the economy of the province. When I looked at it, I have got to be quite honest with the members, all I saw were some—not many, a few—items obviously conjured up by some desperate politicians trying to woo votes.

I said to the members when I started that I have wondered a lot about the appropriateness of this. On Friday I could, I think, have brought myself to vote against it because I don't agree with it. The minister knows I don't agree with it. But I said to my riding association, "What do you think of this?" I put to them what I put to the minister. I said: "What do you think of this?" I mean, recognizing that the average wage earner will be in no better position to buy after this bill goes through than he or she was before, recognizing that there will be no additional houses in the marketplace as a result of this legislation, recognizing that housing prices are likely to be inflated to take up the additional moneys that are going to be made available, recognizing that rents have risen by 30, 40, 50, 60, up to 80 per cent over the last year without any action from this government, recognizing that what it is really doing is taxing already overburdened taxpayers to pay to a select few who were going to buy a house anyway, a few dollars to make the government appear good in their eyes, recognizing those things on Friday last I would have voted against it.

They said to me: "Ian, you are right. You know, you are right." There is only one problem. I am not sure that the public would be given sufficient time for them to understand what the government is saying. I am really not sure that it's possible to get to every door and to explain to them adequately just how bad the government's fiscal policies really are, or just exactly what this taxing measure means—because that's what it is. It's a tax. They are imposing a tax on the one hand to hand out on the other hand and without any consideration for ability to pay.

A man who is earning \$500,000 a year could get this \$1,500, whereas a man who is earning \$10,000 a year isn't likely to qualify because he can't afford to buy a house. I know it's a ridiculous extreme, but let's put it in a more sensible way: A man earning \$40,000 a year who can qualify to buy a house today and who may, in fact, be in the market for a house today, qualifies for \$1,500, some of which will be raised by way of taxation from people earning \$10,000 and less and who can't qualify to buy a house. What in heaven's name kind of policy is that?

Mr. Laughren: It's perverse.

Mr. Deans: What kind of policy is that? Well, I am going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, in keeping with my promise not to make it more difficult for them, I won't vote on it. I don't support the measure. I don't support it. I can't support it. It's wrong. It's wrong to tax a man who can't afford a house in order to give to somebody who can, and that's what they are doing. That's exactly what they are doing and if they can't see that, then there is something terribly wrong with their mentality. There is something wrong with their fiscal policy. There is something wrong with their understanding of basic economics.

Mr. Laughren: It could be all those things.

Mr. Deans: When I look at all these people living in apartments, young couples working every day, who are struggling like hell to try and buy a house and can't get into the marketplace because the government has allowed house prices to become inflated to such an extent that they can't even undertake the mortgage, when I see those young couples and I think of this—and they are going to have to pay higher rents, because the Conservatives won't take any measure against the rent increases, and higher taxes so that they can hand out \$1,500 and look like nice guys in the market—I have got to wonder seriously about their integrity. This is a very, very bad measure.

Mr. Laughren: What puts the price up?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Trade unions and ripoffs.

Mr. Deans: In fact, it borders on one of the worst types of political chicanery—I used the term the other day—that I have ever seen. The whole budget smacks of it from beginning to end; from beginning to end. The member for Renfrew South should think about it. I will tell him something—I say this to him as a friend—

Mr. Yakabuski: There are better-versed people than the member who say it's tremendous—

Mr. Deans: Well, I don't doubt—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Yakabuski: —and the response that we as members are getting is absolutely unbelievable.

Mr. Laughren: They are telling the member what they want him to hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Wentworth will continue.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I don't doubt that there are people who think it's a great budget. There must be some, because the government obviously brought it in. But I am saying that that kind of measure has no place in a modern society.

Mr. Yakabuski: Don't twist it.

Mr. Deans: The government doesn't have the right to tax the poor to pay for the rich, and that's what that measure does.

Mr. Laughren: They do it every day of the week.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Laughren: Would you believe Nickel Belt?

Mr. Speaker: I'm sorry. The member for Nickel Belt.

An hon. member: Stand up.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, like my colleague, the member for Wentworth, I have some interest in monetary and fiscal policy. I too looked through the budget for some indication of the direction the government was hoping to move and some overall fiscal plan, and I couldn't find it either.

Certainly I couldn't find it in this bill, Mr. Speaker, because the budget stated that there were certain premises on which it was based. It made certain assumptions that the economy was going to upturn this year and so on, and the petroleum prices would be stable. Then to bring in these interim measures or halfway measures to attempt to keep the economy stimulated for the balance of the year, really doesn't hold together as logical fiscal policy.

If one looks at the principle of this bill, of course it implies that first-time home buyers need help. That's the implication of the bill.

It also implies that there are houses available for these people, otherwise, of course, there would be no sense in introducing the grants.

Given the fact that in 1974 the province fell 25,000 houses short of its 110,000 goal, I wonder why the Treasurer didn't concentrate in his budget on increasing the supply of houses available to people of moderate incomes. I think that most of us are very tired of RIP and RAP and CRP and NOAH, and now this. It would have been so much nicer to have had a housing programme. It would have been so much nicer to have had in the budget some meaningful kind of land assembly programme for the municipalities. But none of that. Instead of that we once again get an interim housing programme that does very little, and does very little for only nine months.

Why not, for example, concentrate on policies that would increase the supply of housing? Why not concentrate on a policy that would make houses affordable for people in the Province of Ontario? Certainly that's not so now. How could one even suggest that this programme is going to increase the supply of houses in Ontario? How could you even suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it's going to have any thing to do with the prices of homes in Ontario? It does nothing at all.

Surely, even first-time home buyers who are looking at a \$50,000 or \$60,000 home in the large urban centres in this province, must look with a little bit of chagrin at this kind of subsidy they're getting. And it certainly does very little for them.

Not only that, but I was struck by the arbitrary dates set in the budget, particularly those applying to this bill. I was struck, not just by the fact that it's nine months, not just by the fact that it establishes April 8 as the date, but by what those arbitrary dates are going to mean to a lot of people. I can imagine that, come next Jan. 2, 3, 4 or 5, that there's going to be all sorts of people whose solicitors didn't get the deed cleared at the proper time when they thought they would. And I can imagine the way that those people are going to feel.

I've already had—and I'm sure other members have had too—phone calls from people who purchased their house on Feb. 8 or March 30, and now are faced with seeing themselves eliminated from being eligible for this grant, just by the fact that there was such an arbitrary date set.

Also, the whole question of first-time ownership is something that should be debated, I think. I've had calls coming from an area where there have been company

towns, where people 20 years ago had an opportunity to move into a company house at very reasonable rent and sold their house and did so.

Now, 20 years later, International Nickel in Falconbridge are selling all their houses. They're divesting themselves of all of their residential real estate holdings. And here are these people now being thrown on to the housing market for the first time in 20 years, and yet they're ineligible because 20 years ago they owned a home. Certainly, the conditions under which people enter the housing market now are entirely different than what they were 20 years ago.

I would have preferred that rather than have this kind of interim bill, which isn't going to stimulate supply or do anything about prices, there should have been a programme that would have done something very specific. It perhaps would not have applied to the entire province. There could have been a programme that would have equalized prices in different parts of the province; there could have been a programme to build more public housing; there could have been a programme to stimulate the building of houses in northern Ontario and allow more equalization of building costs in northern Ontario.

Mr. Cassidy: Excellent idea, first rate.

Mr. Laughren: Right now from the last figures I saw it cost something in the neighbourhood of—I shouldn't quote figures, as I don't remember, but it cost significantly more to build a house in northern Ontario than it does in southern Ontario. There is nothing in the bill or in any of the budget to do anything about that. When I saw the statement that grants to northern municipalities were going to be increased 42 per cent, I thought that sounded like a big figure. The special grants to northern communities go from \$7 million to \$12 million. If you look at that, Mr. Speaker, if there are 750,000 people in northern Ontario, you are talking about giving the northern resident \$7 more per person because of the increased cost of living in the north. I can tell you it costs my family more than that just in the increased cost of milk, not to mention fuel and all sorts of other goods.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, that the government has introduced an inadequate bill. We shall not oppose the bill in the Legislature, although I can tell you there are those of us who are sorely tempted to do just that for the same reason that we could not support the reduction in the retail sales

tax because of the obvious cynicism of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Act to provide for the payment of Grants to First Time Home Buyers is a very inadequate response to the problem of people trying to buy their first home or trying to buy housing in this present market. It benefits, as far as I can see, simply the upper-middle income earners or those people who, in fact, have two full-time earners in the family. This is to whom the \$1,000 will go and it will not be able to go any way toward the purchase of a house. It is coming after everything is settled toward the purchase of a house.

Let's make no mistake. It is not a grant that helps them to purchase that house; it is a grant which allows them perhaps to furnish that house after they have got it. But the problem in Ontario is that most people cannot get housing; they cannot afford to buy housing.

They usually have furniture. Furnishing is not a problem, but the ability to purchase a house is a problem. This does not help in any way, shape or form toward that because it comes only after the house has been purchased. What the government is giving is a \$1,000 handout in the first instance—and if they live in that unit an extra \$250 for each of two years—to those people who have the funds and the ability to purchase new housing now in the Province of Ontario. This bill helps in no way at all as I can see it—or only very, very minimally—those persons who have really given up the idea of purchasing a house. This bill and the amount of funds in this bill do not help those people to ever getting into housing, no matter how they might initially react to the bill.

My secretary indicates to me that our calls on this bill are breaking down into two categories: Those who oppose it, saying that this is a misuse of funds and should not be given out in this way, and those who can afford to buy housing and simply want to make sure that they get in on the grant. That vast majority of people, who were unhoused heretofore and who before the presentation of this bill could not look forward to ever being able to purchase a house, are not at all helped by this bill. There are no safeguards at all in this bill that this \$1,000 simply won't end up added on somehow to the cost of that housing and

in the pockets of the present owners or the developers of estates and so on.

The short-term application of this bill bothers me. There's a section in here that deals with housing units being built and says that people will occupy them. With the time constraints in this bill, people won't occupy those units before the end of December. There won't be a person who will be able to fit into that category unless the basement is being dug at the moment. It will not encourage people. There is simply not enough time for a couple to go out and decide that, as a means of cutting down costs, they will put some of their own labour into a house. They will not have it completed by Dec. 31. Therefore, this bill doesn't help in that area where one would hope it would help.

There are two other sections of this Act that I have questions about. There is a section that deals with a grant not being given to a person where the spouse of such person has owned a house in the past. I assume that if one has a decree absolute in a divorce and was not a co-owner of a house in that previous marriage, then that divorced person is eligible. In a sense, that's fine, but even if the spouse was a co-owner and now is in a divorced situation, I'm not so sure that they shouldn't be eligible for this handout as well. After all, they really have much changed living conditions than they had while they were married; and if one is going to give a handout, I don't see why this particular group of persons should be disadvantaged.

The other matter is the mobile home situation. For the purposes of a handout in this bill, I can see that it's nice to include a person who is buying a mobile home. But what about those persons—and I know of one such situation—who owned a mobile home for a short period about 10 years ago because there was such a shortage of housing in the locality in which he lived? Their only means of getting housing was to buy a mobile home, which they got rid of as soon as they could to get into more decent rental accommodation. That was back when a mobile home was in no way defined as a house and they suffered many disadvantages by being in a mobile home, because they could take no other home in a particular community. Yet, by having owned a mobile home at some time in the past, which in no way was considered adequate or good housing, or even in the category of housing years ago, I understand—unless I'm corrected—that those persons are not able to get this first-home buyers'

grant if they are now thinking of purchasing a first home.

I can see nothing in this bill, Mr. Speaker, that is going to add to the stock of homes available. Couples are going to go out and get into the competition for the purchasing of homes because of this \$1,000. There have been no great plans to add to stocks of housing in this province, where the planned programme is still well behind the target need. What's going to happen is that it will increase the competition by those people who can already afford to buy a home for the small amount of housing that exists already. I can't see that doing anything else but driving up the prices of the homes that are available. This \$1,000 handout will encourage people to go out and buy housing, but at the same time the price of that housing is going up because there's a limited supply.

In a bill relating to grants to homeowners, I would have been much happier to see something that did something to de-escalate the price of housing. There should be someone in the government really concerned about housing who would be introducing legislation dealing with land speculation and to take the cost of land out of the price of housing. There should be someone in the government really concerned about getting people into housing and at reasonable prices, who would be interested in seeing housing provided upon land that was not bought and sold at vastly escalated prices in the marketplace; rather, the price of that land simply should be the original price years ago plus reasonable holding costs, and not a tremendous speculative price on the land, which is really the major component which has put housing out of sight for most people, that and the continuing shortage and inability of this government to really catch up with their housing programmes.

This does give \$1,000 to people who can afford to actually purchase a house. I've nothing particularly against this group of people, therefore I can't work myself up into a great lather about voting against the bill.

All I'm saying, and will repeat again, is that I'm very disappointed in legislation which does not come to grips at all and cope with the situation of housing the people in this province. I would have hoped the government would have taken legislation of this type seriously and really had a programme to meet or to start to cope to meet with the needs of the people of Ontario; and this bill doesn't. Mr. Speaker, I simply won't bother to vote against it.

Mr. Speaker: Any other hon. member wish to speak to this bill? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I suppose I might make a general comment, other than dealing with the member for Sudbury East, who made a point of drawing attention to a certain fact—and I think the last speaker as well. I must say that I'm impressed, overwhelmed; flabbergasted, at the infatuation of members opposite with their concern about elections, election dates, vote getting, and about advertising. Some members even felt constrained to make some sort of partisan remarks, which I thought was out of keeping.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister never does.

Mr. Yakubuski: Never has.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: But I have never seen such a display of concern about the politics of a certain piece of legislation. I will just say in response to all of those remarks—

Mr. Lawlor: The minister is above all that.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): What was the budget all about?

Mr. Lawlor: The member doesn't have to compound the cynicism.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would just say in response to all those remarks, which must have accounted for at least half of the time of the debate this afternoon, that as a country boy from Kent, I'm really not concerned with being political.

Mr. Roy: What was the budget?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Those of us on this side of the House are just trying to do a job. We are not concerned about an election. We'll just go on doing our job the way we've always done it.

Mr. H. C. Parrott (Oxford): Even after the election we will keep doing that.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: And the people will take our performance into account at that point in time.

Interjection by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It seems to me that there were two or three questions which were asked.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): He should smile when he says that.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I might deal with them now, although they may come up in committee.

Mr. Roy: He should be on television.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: First of all, someone asked about condominiums. There will be an amending regulation. There are two points of closing a deal, as I understand it; either possession or the actual registering.

I think it was the member for Lakeshore who was concerned about when, in fact, the possession might take place in a condominium. They might move in tomorrow, but the registration might not take place for a couple of years. They are in fact in possession, and I think the regulation will make that clear. That's a point.

The member for Lakeshore and others asked why \$55 million? The member for Ottawa was a little bit confused, I think. He was relating figures which were really apples and oranges. Last year there were about 220,000 residential transactions in Ontario, as opposed to the normal 80,000 or 100,000 starts. The 100,000 starts obviously included rental accommodation. In fact, the ratio is about 50-50.

Our estimate is that about 25 per cent of the residential transactions are, in fact, first-time home buyers. And then you translate that into a nine-month programme, as opposed to a full year's programme and you come up with what we would hope to see happen, rather than what might happen if the whole industry is not spurred in this particular way.

Mr. Cassidy: That then means no increase because of this programme.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Several people mentioned ceilings and the variations in prices which may occur. We have had something like 5,000 phone calls, over 5,000, in the three ministries on this to date. About 35 of those phone calls concerned themselves and were, in fact, complaints about sellers who appeared to have raised their prices by \$1,000. Half of those were from one area of the province, the others, I think, were scattered enough probably not to be of concern. Half of them were from one area of the province and once that word is out I think his sales are not going to benefit from the programme. The market, in my view, has a very effective way of dealing with those sort of fluctuations in the marketplace.

Mr. Cassidy: Just like the rental market deals with tenants?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If the member knew something about the metal market, he'd see what has happened to the price of copper

without any controls in the last two or three months. He would talk to his friends from the north instead of being the great expert on nothing from the south and he'd find out what a great concern there is in the metal markets today and what it is doing—

Mr. Cassidy: The rental markets.

An hon. member: He said rental markets.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —to unemployment in various parts of the province.

Mr. Cassidy: I'm talking about tenants, not copper.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: He would concern himself with listening, instead of yapping for a change, as I listened to him—and learned nothing.

Mr. Yakabuski: He never learns, he won't listen.

Mr. Cassidy: Now tell us about the tenants that the Treasurer met—

Mr. Yakabuski: He just won't listen, that member.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): He never stops. His tongue is in perpetual motion.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member for Lakeshore also wanted to know—perhaps I could lead into this just a little bit—if the programme was related to the sales tax. The seven per cent sales tax on construction materials, totally, is about \$200 million. It would have been something less than that in terms of the cut from seven to five. The horrible problem with the sales tax on construction materials is to distinguish what is residential, what's industrial, what's commercial. That's one of the problems.

There is also the problem of ensuring that it is passed through. There is a very considerable lag between the time the sales tax is paid on the construction materials and the ultimate disposition of the finished product, be it a house or an apartment building. That was certainly one of the things we looked at.

I think, in looking at the total housing situation in the province in the spring of 1975, we see a number of things which are improvements from last year. Mortgage rates are down. Our indications are that there is mortgage money available.

Interestingly enough, although we talk about the lack of serviced land—it is a problem and it is more of a problem in some municipalities than others—the Min-

ister of Housing will indicate to members at some point, I am sure, if they asked him, that the number of serviced lots awaiting final registration has risen rather dramatically in the province.

The final approval of a plan of subdivision used to be very much of a formality once the draft plan had been approved, subject to certain conditions being met, then, usually reasonably quickly, the plan was finally registered and the lots registered in the registry office. What has happened in the last five or six months is that there has been an upswing of something over 100,00 lots—I'm not aware of the final figures—which have had draft approval in various parts of the province and which are not moving forward to final registration.

It is true in my own community, and one can drive around and take a look, that there is an inventory of unsold houses. Some of that inventory has carried through the winter. Some of it is too highly priced, no question about it; but the fact is that because there is that inventory of unsold houses and because of a variety of other reasons; in the rental area because of the continuing concern or threat, if I can put it that way, of rent controls—

Mr. Cassidy: Where is that threat coming from?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and because the return is not high enough in the view of many builders, and the worry about mortgage rates and, as a matter of fact, I think the general feeling that mortgage rates are coming down further and therefore the builders are holding off—all these things, in my view, and the view of a number of people, combine to create a lack of confidence both in the housing industry and on the part of the normal house-buying public. What our task was in this particular measure was to try to get that market moving, to try to get some stimulus going and to try to get rid of some of the inventory, because until that inventory is gone new starts will not be made. If one talks to any number of builders around the province, big and small, he will find they weren't moving on new lots because they were nervous.

Mr. Cassidy: So this is directed to the developers then. This is a developers' bill, not a purchasers' bill.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Oh, why doesn't the member just shut up? He hasn't said anything this afternoon—let him just pipe

down. He is annoying me and he has annoyed everybody else. Let him just be quiet.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister shouldn't get so offended. He is saying it is a developers' bill, and that is what it is, to help bail them out with their unsold houses.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We have a combination of circumstances coming together which brought about a lack of confidence, in our view, both on the part of the industry and on the part of those who hopefully would be buying houses and should be buying houses, whose disposable incomes because of tax cuts last fall have advanced and have moved ahead. I said this the other day—and the NDP doesn't like to hear it because it likes to ignore inflation—that the fact is that if a house was selling at \$55,000 a year ago, there is some justification for it selling at \$60,000 today, because we've had that kind of rate of inflation and we've had across-the-province increases in wages of 10, 11 and 12 per cent so that actually that house shouldn't have moved up from \$55,000 to \$57,000 or from \$56,000 to \$58,000 as was quoted by the leader. One could make an argument that it should have moved further.

Mr. Cassidy: That is unreal. If it was overvalued a year ago, why should it continue to go up?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: For a whole variety of reasons, I want to make it very clear that the government does not take on its shoulders, as they would in that party, the task of building by ourselves 100,000 houses or units in this province.

Mr. Martel: But the government will have welfare and unemployment insurance and people unemployed.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We happen to think that there is an industry out there, a gainful industry which is capable of doing the job and which, in fact, has produced something like 80,000 or 90,000 of the 110,000 units which have been produced in this province—

Mr. Lawlor: That is big work for the building industry.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —without government assistance. Our job in this bill, and the objective in this bill, is to get that industry back to work. Members over there don't really care about that industry. Their objective is to build the whole 100,000 units themselves.

Mr. Martel: Don't give us a lecture.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I'm here to tell them we're not going to do it. That's their objective and it's not ours, pure and simple.

Mr. Lawlor: Oh, we would not. The Treasurer builds straw men and then he burns down houses.

Mr. Cassidy: He is almost entertaining.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: One of the hon. members—in fact, several—asked what does this bill do for tenants. Then we heard about the mother of the babysitter of the hon. member for Ottawa and the islands. The bill does nothing for her. The bill doesn't do anything for tenants. Those things are in other bills and in other legislation and in the minister's estimates, but they are not part of this bill.

Mr. Cassidy: No, they are not. They are not in the budget. They are not in the minister's policy.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The purpose of this bill is to spur the industry to get starts under way, and most of all to get a housing industry back to work and everything that flows from that. Members over there made light of the durables, but people are going to go out and buy a washing machine or a washer and a dryer. There are people out of work in this province today because those kinds of durables aren't being built in this province because there isn't a market for them. I'm not going to sneer at people who want to buy a washing machine, because behind those people there are people building washing machines who deserve to get back to work in this province. Instead of snivelling over there about something that the programme isn't designed to do—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): What is the Treasurer saying, that behind every washing machine there is a builder?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —wake up and make the economy work; join with us and get people back to work. Members over there are not going to go anywhere. They're dedicated to putting people on a bread line. We're not; we're going to get them back to work, and that's what this piece of legislation is all about.

Mr. Lewis: The Treasurer is talking nonsense. Does he realize what he said? For the first time, he stated the purpose of the bill is to bail out the industry. This is the first time he has admitted that was the rea-

son. It is not to protect consumers but to bail out the industry.

Mr. Martel: He blew his cool.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lewis: Why do you suddenly intrude while we're barracking? That was one continuous barrack.

An hon. member: The NDP are doing it all the time.

Mr. Speaker: The Speaker wishes to complete the transaction here.

Mr. Lewis: Complete the transaction! That's as good as the washing machine analogy we've had this afternoon. Behind every washing machine—well, complete the sentence.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Lewis: That whole party is a laundering operation.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Committee of the whole.

Mr. Speaker: Committee of the whole House.

Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I wish the members would not make it necessary for me to take an extra step at this time.

ONTARIO LOAN ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves second reading of Bill 29, An Act to authorize the Raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Mr. Breithaupt: There are some comments that have to be made with respect to the bill, albeit they may be fairly brief.

It is interesting to see that at this point we are proceeding to attempt to raise some \$1.4 billion on the general credit of the province with the loans that the minister is now going to be able to make.

Just to review briefly what we did last year, in Bill 69 as it then was, it is interesting to see that at that point we were going to require only some \$800 million as a maxi-

mum credit to tide us over from time to time. Certainly an amount which is this substantial, and which is well over the \$1 billion mark, is something that we should seriously consider.

I would appreciate hearing from the minister when he responds to the bill as to the reasoning behind the setting of this particular figure. After all, Mr. Speaker, when we move from one year to the next and are somewhat close to doubling the amount that we are going to expect to require from time to time on a short-term basis, it may well be that there are certain underlying presumptions that we should be the beneficiaries of and have shared with us by the Treasurer.

The bill, of course, is a routine one and ordinarily passes without much particular problem, since the Treasurer from time to time brings this kind of legislation forward to us just after each of the budgets—certainly in my time in the House.

I would appreciate, though, some elucidation on that particular point when the Treasurer does respond to the bill.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I recognize that we have a bill similar to this before the assembly each year to authorize the raising of money, but over the years I still have never quite understood the authorization for it and the way in which the financial statements of the government are introduced. I have never understood the way in which the financial statements of the government for each year then reflect back to the authority granted by this assembly under the Ontario Loan Act for the particular year.

For example, and just for the convenience of the minister and for the convenience of my colleagues, there may very well be a simple answer to a couple of the questions that I want to raise, but I do want to understand the bill for the first time in any of the years that I have been here. I took the liberty of putting in synoptic form, drawn directly from the financial statements of the government, the comparisons with the authorizations which we granted from the year 1970 through to the request this year in 1975.

If the minister would take a moment to look at the synoptic form presentation that I have put in front of him he will note that in the year 1970, by chapter 48 of the statutes of that year, we authorized \$460 million to be raised by way of loan. The proceeds of the loan as shown by the financial statement of the government for that year was \$772

million. I have rounded the figures for convenience, and these are the headings used in the financial statement. The loans matured or retired are \$74 million, leaving a total on net debt transactions of \$698 million. This, of course, is in excess of the \$460 million originally authorized.

Similarly, in 1971, by chapter 38 of the Statutes of Ontario, we authorized borrowings of \$800 million. The proceeds in that year were \$718 million. The loans matured or retired were \$85 million and the total net debt transactions were \$633 million, which was within the limit that particular year.

In 1972, by chapter 79 of the Statutes of Ontario, we authorized loans to the extent of \$800 million. The proceeds of loans in that year were \$1,177,000,000. The loans matured or retired were \$95 million. The total net debt transactions were \$1,082,000,000; again a substantial excess over what was authorized by the assembly.

In 1973, we authorized by chapter 35 of the Statutes of Ontario \$900 million to be borrowed. The proceeds of the loan in that year were \$1,295,000,000. The loans matured or retired were \$113 million. The total net debt transactions were \$1,182,000,000.

In 1974, we authorized \$800 million by chapter 33 of the statutes of that year. The proceeds of the loan were \$1,196,000,000. The loans matured or retired were \$264 million. The total net debt transactions were \$932 million.

Now, in four out of the five years, those figures would indicate that the amount of the net debt transactions of the government during that period of time were in excess of the amount that was authorized.

I then looked at the specific terms of the bill. And, of course, the bill hasn't varied in its terms for any year. It states that the "Lieutenant Governor in Council is authorized to raise from time to time by way of loan in any manner provided in the Financial Administration Act such sum or sums of money as are necessary" and so on, up to the amount of the specific aggregate to which I have referred.

That, of course, drove me to the Financial Administration Act. In part 4 of that Act, under the heading of public debt in section 29, we find that "No money shall be raised by way of loan by the Crown except under the authority of this or any other Act of the Legislature."

The only other authority granted in the Financial Administration Act that I could find, and I may have overlooked some of the pro-

visions, was the fact that any refunding operation can be carried through without the authorization of a special Act. It can be carried through for refunding purposes under the authority of the Financial Administration Act itself. But I have taken into account in arriving at the net debt transactions, as shown by the financial statements of the government, those very loans that have been matured or retired. And I assume that the figures here exclude any refunding operations.

So it would appear, following the logic of that argument, that in four out of the last five years, the government has exceeded the statutory authority. If that were true, of course, it's in breach of the statute. And if that's true, it is not paying any attention to the limit of borrowing placed upon the government, upon the Crown, by the actions of this assembly.

The only way that I can understand it in accordance with this bill that is before us, which is similar to the bill that was passed in each of the other years, is that in subsection 2 of the bill it said:

The sum or sums of money authorized to be raised by subsection 1, for the purposes mentioned therein, shall be in addition to all sums of money authorized to be raised by way of loan under any other Act.

Mr. Good: That answers the question.

Mr. Renwick: No. All I want to know now is what are the other Acts under which there is authority to borrow money? In the net effect of my comments my good friend, the member for Waterloo North, indicates he knows the answer to it. I would like to know under the authority of what statute the excess borrowings or the excess of the net debt transactions over what was authorized took place? I don't know myself what those statutes are.

The explanation we have received in other years, of course, is that the non-public borrowings and the public borrowings were the kind of borrowings which were authorized by this annual statute. That's the first point I want to make.

I think I'd like, finally, to understand whether or not there is statutory authority for the borrowings of the government in excess of the authorities which we grant annually in these bills. I'd like to know specifically under which Acts that excess borrowing takes place.

The second matter which was of concern and, naturally, is of concern to all of us, is that while in each of the preceding five

years the amounts have grown from 1970's \$460 million, nevertheless, from 1971 to 1974, they were either \$800 million or \$900 million. In three of the years, they were \$800 million; in one of the years \$900 million. This year, of course, it's \$1,400 million that we're being asked to authorize. Of course, my friends on the right are concerned about that particular matter.

I thought I would take a look at the 10-year review that appears in the financial statements of the government. I looked at the 10-year review included in the financial statement for 1974 and the 10-year review that appeared in the financial statement of 1970. I find, of course, that the figures are quite interesting and all are quite within any realistic percentage.

The net debt, if I may say so, is a defined term or an accepted term of art for the purposes of these financial statements. It is defined both by the auditor and by the Treasurer in identical terms that the net debt of the province is the excess of liabilities over revenue-producing and realizable assets. Year-to-year changes in that debt are related directly to the amount by which revenues exceed or are less than expenditures in budgetary transactions.

That definition is for what it's worth because in these statements the net debt is shown for each of the 15-year periods that I was looking at and is then related by way of percentage to certain matters. It shows that the net debt as a percentage of budgetary revenue, even in the year 1974, was only 41.9 per cent. In 1973 it was 41.2 percent. In 1972 it was 39.9 per cent. I need not go back because, for practical purposes, in the early part of the last decade and in the latter part of it it was a substantially higher proportion of the budgetary revenues.

I think, however, the ratio which is of significance is the net debt as a percentage of gross provincial product. In that case, it is of significance that that ratio is 5.3 per cent in 1974. In 1973 it was six per cent. In 1972 it was 5.7 per cent. In 1971 it was 4.4 per cent. In 1970 it was 4.3 per cent. It varies but it was within that sort of range for the preceding 15 years.

It does not seem to me, and I've tried to give some consideration to the position taken by my friends on the right—it does not seem to me that at this particular juncture it is unreasonable for the government to have projected a deficit of \$1.6 billion, as was set out in the budget. I think it is quite within the principles, as I understand them,

under which the Smith committee operated in setting out what it believed to be a reasonable position for the government to take.

It does appear to me that, subject to whatever accounting changes there have been by the government—and I know there have been accounting changes by the government since the time of the Smith committee report, but not so significant as to alter the principles that were set forth by Smith. I refer in this particular instance to the Smith committee report, from which there is no disagreement, even though it is about 10 years old, Chapter 40 of that report was headed, "Provincial debt policy to 1975," and they made various projections of one kind or another in order to try to understand the range within which government borrowing should take place.

They clearly state, of course, that they did not expect that the projections which they made would become historic fact. They made the projections for the purpose of illustrating the kinds of conclusions to which they came about provincial government borrowings. In paragraph two—and I think it should go on the record—of chapter 40 of the Smith report, Smith states:

In this context the relevant policy issue is that of deciding in what proportions the government's projected levels of expenditures should be financed by revenues and by borrowing, and in this chapter we advance certain recommendations concerning some basic requirements of a sound provincial debt policy with particular reference to the forthcoming decade.

We shall first discuss the most appropriate behaviour of provincial debt in terms of its secular trend—that is, its longer-term average rate of growth—and then conclude with some observations relating to appropriate cyclical or short-term variations from the trend, viewed as a fiscal contribution toward the attainment of economic stability. As presented in chapter 6, the projected burden of provincial net debt (the ratio of net debt to provincial domestic product) in 1966 is approximately nine per cent.

Well, I think with the accounting adjustments, if the accounting was reflected back, it would have been somewhat less than that, but there certainly would have been a margin between the present level of borrowing by this government on the long term and the percentage recommended by the Smith committee report. It then goes on to say:

It is nevertheless appropriate, in view of the prospective continuing growth of the Ontario economy, that the province undertake a substantial expansion of debt as one means of financing the continuously rising levels of government expenditures forecast during the next decade. Failure to do so would necessarily be reflected in undesirably heavy increases in taxation, with possible adverse effects upon growth and other economic objectives.

He goes on to state the committee's conclusion:

We think that a policy that restrains the rate of expansion of provincial net debt to that of the rise in provincial domestic product [which we now know, of course, as gross provincial product] represents a basically conservative approach to provincial finance.

And they make a recommendation:

As a partial solution to the projected annual expenditure-revenue gaps, the province permit a modest expansion of its net debt at a rate at least equal to the growth in provincial domestic product (or gross provincial product).

Well, that is the longer-term trend, and it seems to me that when you look back to 1965, or indeed to 1960, that has been a realistic approach, and I do not think that we in this party would quarrel with that particular way of looking at the provincial debt in relation to the revenues through taxation of the province.

But then the Smith committee report went on to deal with cyclical fluctuations in provincial debt and stated that in doing so, they emphasized again that appropriate fiscal policies at any particular time will necessarily reflect current economic conditions and recommended that in any given period provincial policies concerning appropriate levels in composition of taxation and expenditures be consciously directed toward the objectives of moderating cyclical fluctuations within the Ontario economy.

Within that framework, I think that we in this party, in the discussions which we have had would—in this caucus in any event—indicate that the proposed deficit of the government in light of the current economic situation in the Province of Ontario is and would be, to us, an acceptable one, even though it is an immensely substantial increase over what we have been used to authorizing

the funding of through borrowing in previous years.

Having said that, it would appear to me that basically what we are concerned with is whether or not it is an acceptable level. We certainly say a deficit of the amount projected in the Treasurer's budget is not inappropriate. But whether or not it is appropriate, in the light of the deterioration of the economic situation, presumably only time will tell. But within broad limits, I, and I believe my colleagues in this caucus, do not have any quarrel with the overall amount.

It is interesting, strangely enough, that up until 1973, one of the items which was included in the 10-year period forecast was the net debt per capita in dollars. Of course, if you look at those figures, Mr. Speaker, they do appear rather dramatic. In 1971 it was \$210.57; in 1972 it was \$276.09; in 1973 it was \$326.57. But, of course, in 1974, the government in its wisdom, decided to eliminate that particular calculation. So I don't know what the per capita net debt is for the year 1974, nor do I know what the projected per capita debt is for the year 1975. My third comment to the Treasurer is that I hope he would elucidate in the course of his remarks the net debt per capita for 1974 and what is the projected net debt per capita for 1975.

Mr. Lawlor: Put it back in the budget.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It's in table C9.

Mr. Renwick: All right. I was looking only at the financial statements of the government as presented for 1974, and I do hope that it will go back into the financial statement in subsequent years so that we will have the benefit of that figure.

I want to ask the Treasurer if he, once and for all, at least for my benefit, would explain to me why it is that the total net debt transactions as shown by the financial statements of the province for the last five years are—for four out of the five years—in excess of the amount authorized by this Act. This is assuming, as I do, that the refunding operations were done under the Financial Administration Act or, in any event, are taken into account in the net debt transactions. I would like to know under what other statutes of the Province of Ontario the government is authorized to raise the kinds of funds which are reflected in its debt transaction statement in its annual reports.

Mr. Speaker: Will there be other speakers?

Mr. Good: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but there are only a few minutes left.

Mr. Speaker: Okay.

Mr. Good moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, on Thursday we will continue with these bills and the other bills announced by the House leader.

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 15, 1975

Liquor legislation, statement by Mr. Handleman	827
Fire safety on licensed premises, question of Mr. Handleman: Mr. R. F. Nixon	829
Entertainment in licensed premises, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Roy, Mr. Lewis	829
Conditions at Don Jail, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Singer	830
Teacher-schoolboard bargaining legislation, questions of Mrs. Birch: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis	831
Emergency quarters for cabinet, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. R. F. Nixon	831
Minister's statement about equal pay, questions of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Foulds, Mrs. Campbell	832
Protection for public servants, questions of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Roy	834
Health and safety hazards at Elliot Lake, questions of Mr. Miller: Mr. Lewis	835
Ontario Hydro policy, question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Riddell	835
Ontario Hydro policy on agricultural supervisors, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Spence	835
Lawyers' trust funds, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Reid	836
Huron County Board of Education, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Foulds	836
Rent controls, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Yakabuski, Mr. Deans, Mr. Braithwaite ..	837
Portrayal of violence by communications industry, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Roy, Mr. Reid	838
Hamilton area HOME programme standards, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Deans	839
Halton regional council OHAP loan, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Singer	839
Effluent at Inco plant, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Martel	840
ODC lending policy, question of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Riddell	840
OMERS pension benefits, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. B. Newman	841
Hazards in Kitchener area plants	842
Liquor Control Act, Mr. Handleman, first reading	842
Liquor Licence Act, Mr. Handleman, first reading	842
Mental Health Amendment Act, Mr. Roy, first reading	842

Public Hospitals Amendment Act, Mr. Roy, first reading	842
Ontario Bill of Rights Act, Mr. Roy, first reading	843
Landlord and Tenant Amendment Act, Mr. Braithwaite, first reading	843
Public Health Amendment Act, Mr. Braithwaite, first reading	843
Athletics Control Amendment Act, Mr. Braithwaite, first reading	843
Environmental Protection Amendment Act, Mr. Braithwaite, first reading	843
Ontario Waste Disposal and Reclamation Commission Act, Mr. B. Newman, first reading	844
Ontario Home Buyers Grant Act, Mr. McKeough, second reading	844
Ontario Loan Act, Mr. McKeough, on second reading	869
Motion to adjourn, Mr. McKeough, agreed to	873



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, April 17, 1975
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 1975

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour and a privilege to welcome here this afternoon 40 students from the grade 10 class of Welland High and Vocational School. Mr. J. Zold is in charge of these students. I am very proud indeed to represent them here in the Ontario Legislature. These fine young people are indeed excellent examples of the younger generation, those young people who will one day take over the reins of leadership in our province, the province of opportunity.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Is this a ministerial statement?

Mr. Morningstar: May I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members join me in welcoming my young friends from the Welland High and Vocational School.

Hon. A. K. Meen (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to try to outdo the member for Welland this afternoon with that very delightful introduction, but I would like to introduce 28 students from Northlea Public School in my riding under the very able leadership of their teacher, Mr. MacDougall. They are in the west gallery.

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the members to join with me in welcoming a group of grade 7 students from Davenport Public School in Aylmer who are seated with their teachers and some of their mothers in the east gallery of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

GUELPH CORRECTIONAL CENTRE JAYCEE CHAPTER

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House that the Jaycee movement has now crossed our institutional threshold with the granting on Saturday evening last, of a charter to the Guelph Correctional Centre Jaycee Chapter. Before an invited

audience of 225 guests, the 50 inmates who have formed the chapter, received the charter and fraternal gifts from a wide variety of Ontario chapters. The ceremony marked the result of over three years' preparation by the Jaycee movement and particularly by Mr. Angelo Mior, a Guelph Correctional Centre correctional officer who is president of the Guelph City Jaycees and chairman of the Great Lakes region correctional programmes committee.

The Guelph Correctional Centre chapter is the first in a provincial correctional institution in Canada. It was necessary for the Ontario Jaycees to take the initiative in proposing an amendment to the federal charter at a recent Canadian Jaycee conference before they could operate within a provincial institution. There are already five chapters in federal penitentiaries: at New Westminster, at Matsqui, at Dorchester, at Springhill and at the Warkworth Institution here in Ontario.

If this first chapter should prove effective, there are 55 other provincial institutions and centres where the Jaycee movement may develop in the future. They could have a beneficial effect on the more than 70,000 adults who pass through our centres each year.

We feel that volunteers, especially those who are organized and disciplined and who, like the Jaycees, have their traditions well established, will help to provide a positive community contact with our inmates, many of whom are with us only for very brief periods.

This Jaycee programme augments the work of the 2,100 volunteers who are already active with our 18,000 probationers and parolees as well as with the men, women and children in our various institutions. The ministry has co-operated fully in the expansion of its volunteer programme to include formal organizations and sees this development as having great significance in community corrections.

Jaycee volunteers will come into Guelph Correctional Centre to teach a wide variety of life skills to their incarcerated confrères, who in turn are expected to join existing

Jaycee chapters when they return to the community.

I am sure the House will share my pleasure at this significant development and will echo my hope that it marks yet another phase in the ministry's continuing effort to encourage public understanding of, and participation in, the rehabilitative process.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Why doesn't the minister try building a new Don Jail?

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Housing.

HOUSING PROGRAMMES

Hon. D. R. Irvine (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, today I wish to report on my ministry's housing programmes for the 1974-1975 fiscal year.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): He means his non-housing programme.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I also want to relate our performance to overall Ontario production and compare it with the previous fiscal year.

Mr. Cassidy: The non-housing programmes.

Mr. Foulds: Another recycled announcement brought to you by your Minister of Housing.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Last May, the Ministry of Housing set production targets for each programme. We also stressed the need for working partnerships involving all levels of government and the private sector, if these goals were to be met. Much of our debate during the past year has centred on these targets and the effectiveness of the partnerships.

Mr. Cassidy: No, it has centred on the need for housing in the province.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I am tabling a summary of our targets and actual production figures for the fiscal year 1974-1975. This corresponds to page 40 in our Housing Ontario 1974 policy statement.

Mr. S. Lewis: (Scarborough West): That isn't so.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Our target for the Ontario Housing Action Programme was to produce a combination of 12,000 housing starts and accelerated lots. I might remind members that an important function of OHAP is to bring land, which would not normally be serviced for several years, on to the market

now. Our other objective, of course, is to reduce the cost of housing units constructed under OHAP.

Our actual OHAP production for the fiscal year was 4,104 housing starts and 8,773 lots brought to market. The accelerated lots include some 6,000 in Brampton, part of an agreement which will provide a total of 15,000 housing units during the next three years.

Under the family rental housing programme, we aimed for 2,000 rent-geared-to-income units. In fact, we started only 825. I must say to the members and to you, Mr. Speaker, the reluctance of many communities to accept low-income family rental housing, even on a fully integrated basis, was the biggest disappointment of the past year.

Mr. Cassidy: He is off again.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Somebody else's fault.

Mr. Cassidy: Now face the facts.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, our senior citizen programme came very close to its target of 6,000 units, producing 5,660 units.

In our community integrated housing programme, we wanted to finance 2,000 starts, of which 500 would be for rent-geared-to-income tenants. In fact, we financed 1,060 such units, of which 264 were rent-geared-to-income.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): The minister fell flat on his face again.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: The Home Ownership Made Easy plan set a target of 6,000 starts for the fiscal year and—I'm very pleased to say this—we achieved almost 5,000 of those starts. This represents almost 2½ times the output of the previous year.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: The new community sponsored housing programme was one of the most rewarding and productive undertaken last year. We set a target of 2,000 starts or renovations for low- and moderate-income households, with 500 units guaranteed for low-income families. The programme actually resulted in 2,393 units, with 1,258 for low-income earners.

Another successful programme was rent supplement. We wanted to obtain 1,100 units from the private sector and we actually achieved 1,437. Therefore, in total, our target of units started and accelerated lots was 31,100. Adding up the programme results I've just mentioned, we have actually achieved

29,156. For the benefit of all hon. members that is almost 94 per cent of our target.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express it another way. It is almost three times the output of the provincial government in the housing field in the previous fiscal year.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): The minister wasn't doing anything before.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: We have also increased our percentage share of Ontario housing starts from seven per cent to 24 per cent and I would like the hon. members now just to understand that.

Mr. Cassidy: A lot is not a start—7,000 lots are not housing starts.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, a great deal of our activity has been aimed at the low- and moderate-income earners.

Mr. Martel: They haven't achieved one target.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Of the new units I've mentioned, some 14,000 were specifically targeted for this group. At the same time, we recognize that by helping moderate-income families achieve home ownership, we are increasing the supply of rental accommodation.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Oh come on, don't do this.

Hon. S. B. Handleman (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Then move from somewhere.

Mr. Deans: Oh come on.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I would also like to respond to recent comments that my ministry has failed to spend large amounts from its budgetary allocations.

Mr. Lewis: Ah, the minister has been stung into a reply—stung into a reply.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I was just waiting for the proper time so that the leader of the NDP would be here to hear it.

[Interjections by hon. members.]

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Lewis: And look at the minister's reply. The minister should be embarrassed to read it.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, the initial budget presented one year ago called for \$226 million. During the year, as this government responded to new problems in the

housing market, we added \$103 million for low-interest mortgages and other programmes. However, negotiations with North Pickering landowners who volunteered to sell to the province went more slowly than we expected, resulting in an underspending of \$5.5 million.

Similarly, about \$4 million in urban renewal and neighbourhood improvement programme funds were not spent because municipalities at that time had not met federal government conditions.

Three million dollars less than budget was forwarded to non-profit groups because payments are now spread over 15 years, instead of being disbursed as a single grant.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, rent supplement subsidies for community-sponsored housing were about \$350,000 below budget, because the enabling agreement has not yet been settled with Central Mortgage and Housing Corp.

Mr. Speaker, may I say this to all the hon. members: I am very proud of the record of this ministry since its inception.

[Interjections by hon. members.]

Mr. Roy: The minister doesn't believe that?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I say to the hon. members, furthermore, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Foulds: Never has so much pride been taken for so little by so many.

Mr. Lewis: And so long.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): And so often.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —with the incentives provided in the recent budget, with the commitment as stated in the Throne Speech, and with the very obvious commitment this government has had in the past and has now in regard to housing, I am confident we will have 90,000 housing starts in Ontario this year, which is an excellent record as far as I am concerned.

An hon. member: All of that, eh?

Mr. Deans: Not even the remotest possibility.

Mr. Cassidy: Only 18,000, instead of 31,000.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Better than any other jurisdiction.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is in trouble because that statement conflicts.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

REAL ESTATE SALES PERSONNEL

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce to the House some improvements that my ministry will be making in the preregistration education programme for those wishing to become real estate sales personnel.

The qualifications of prospective real estate agents have long been the concern of both the government and the real estate industry. In 1960 we established a preregistration examination for all those wishing to become real estate salesmen. In 1972, after consultation with the real estate industry, a mandatory 90-hour preregistration course was instituted as well.

The standing committee on real estate education, which was made up of representatives of the Real Estate Association and officials of my ministry, made a careful evaluation of our experiences with the course in the last three years. It became obvious to them that some further improvements were required.

The preregistration course became immediately popular after its introduction in 1972. So popular, in fact, that overcrowding resulted. The standing committee determined that the overcrowding was caused because some of the students were taking the course for reasons of personal self-improvement. In fact, they had no intention of entering the real estate profession. Additionally, the committee found that a number of persons were enrolling who did not have the necessary ability or comprehension to successfully complete the programme or pass the examination.

After careful deliberation, the standing committee made a number of recommendations which we are acting upon. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce to the House that effective July 1, 1975, the mandatory preregistration real estate education programme will be expanded to 150 hours and will be divided into three segments. These segments will include a general introduction to real estate, theoretical aspects of the industry and practical considerations of real estate sales. There will be examinations at the end of each segment, which must be successfully completed before a student can progress to the next segment.

Mr. Martel: The moral of which is that Shouldice should not have been registered.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: To permit this restructuring of the programme, an intensive instructor's course will upgrade the qualifica-

tions of those who will be teaching the preregistration programme.

My ministry is also undertaking to increase its involvement in the programme. We will actively communicate in the classrooms the government's role in the real estate industry.

Mr. Speaker, I feel these improvements in the programme will be of major benefit to the Ontario consumer as well as the Ontario real estate profession and will keep Ontario in the forefront of real estate education in Canada.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions. The Leader of the Opposition.

MERCURY POLLUTION

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to put a question to the Premier regarding the continuing situation at the Whitedog-Grassy Narrows Indian reservation. Since the problems with mercury poisoning there involve four of the ministries, as well as the policy secretariat, could the Premier indicate clearly whether the government policy is to direct the Indians that it is safe to eat the fish or it is not safe? Or if we can assume that it is not safe because of the mercury levels, what co-ordinated programme is there to provide them with a diet with sufficient protein so they are not forced by their economic situation to eat the contaminated fish?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I think that part of the question might be properly directed to the Minister of Health (Mr. Miller). I am informed by the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Grossman) that he, along with his colleague the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier), is going to visit with the people involved, I believe early next week, to discuss this matter with them.

As I say, on the second part of the question, I believe that should be directed to the Minister of Health.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary, on a matter of policy, if I may, which in my view could fairly be directed to the Premier: Is one of the alternatives available to the policy secretary and his colleagues the authority to offer the Indians of that area a food supplement, which would mean that for once they would not be pressed, or forced economically, to eat the contaminated fish? Since this is going to require co-ordination by a number

of ministries, surely it's in the Premier's responsibility to respond.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well Mr. Speaker, of course on anything it is the Premier's responsibility to respond. We are trying to solve the problem, not play politics.

Mr. Roy: Oh, are they?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On a point of order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Are you prepared to listen to a point of order or not?

Hon. Mr. Davis: As I say, that is one of the options that is being considered.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Is this a new policy of the government?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. A point of order.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to bring to your attention that all of us in this House have a responsibility for the health and welfare of the residents and citizens of Ontario; but I would suggest to you, sir, that it should be possible to put forward a question of that type without the kind of inane put-down which seems to be the only alternative for the Premier.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

An hon. member: That's the only way he can answer a question.

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me there are some political remarks from both sides at times.

Mr. Lewis: Well, let me add a further comment—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Speaker; on the point of order—

Mr. Breithaupt: I bet the provincial secretary takes his lunch with him.

Mr. Lewis: I want to ask the Premier, since the social development secretariat trundled off to northwestern Ontario some months ago making horrified noises—particularly the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch)—about the situation up there and absolutely nothing came of it from that day to this, what makes the Premier confident now that his government policy will change one jot?

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough West): Because the member is selling his house.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Provincial Secretary for Social Development that she did not trundle to northwestern Ontario; I don't think the Minister of Natural Resources is trundling to northwestern Ontario, and, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the Leader of the Opposition **we treat every problem seriously and try to do something about it, while he comes down on both sides of every issue at the same time.**

Mr. Drea: That's right.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Playing politics; the Premier is playing cheap politics. That is the way he responds.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The Premier had the floor, if he is not finished with his answer. Is the Premier's answer completed?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary. Order please.

Mr. Lewis: Well, the government has let it go for four years and has played around with it.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Will the hon. member for Scarborough West please restrain himself. The member for Downsview has a supplementary I believe.

Mr. Singer: Could the Premier explain, if this investigation is now going to take place, the logic and sense, and in fact the factual nature, of the earlier statements by the Minister of Health that letters had gone forward to the Indians and publicity had gone forward warning them not to eat the mercury-contaminated food? Is what he said completely false? Or is the story in the paper this morning completely false? Or, if neither of them is true, why is the government sending these people forward next week, in view of what the Minister of Health has said?

Mr. Breithaupt: It is just a political reaction.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I shall try once more. If the member for Downsview really wants an answer to this question, as it is related to statements made by the Minister of Health, I would say, with respect, he should direct that question to the Minister of Health, of course.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary, the member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: As this problem has been brought to the attention of the government for—what? five years now—

Mr. Lewis: That's right.

Mr. Foulds: —why has the resources development field not pushed through the road for three miles to a lake which is not contaminated and in which the Indians could fish? Why has it taken that long to get a three-mile bush road through that part of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to get involved in all of these topics, but I would say that that question, once again, should properly be directed to the Minister of Natural Resources.

Mr. Lewis: That's not so.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is so.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: If I may, Mr. Speaker, a serious supplementary: If all of his ministerial colleagues have failed, one after the other over the last four years, to respond to the problem—

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): Nonsense.

Mr. Lewis: —well, it still exists—doesn't the Premier as Premier have some sense of ultimate responsibility to provide a solution?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I recognize my responsibilities as Premier in the ultimate sense, and I have on all issues on all occasions. I'm saying that in this particular situation those particular questions should have been directed to the appropriate minister.

Mr. Lewis: I don't think so.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

MERCURY POLLUTION

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We don't think so either. The Minister of Health, however, is here. Can the minister explain to the House and perhaps to the Premier why, when his directive was not to eat the fish, there were printed directives to the Indian community and the individuals there that it was safe to do so? How can that happen?

Hon. F. S. Miller (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I have talked to my staff about that

apparent contradiction. There is no question that we are correct in saying the letters went out to all of the people in the area—many more than were on the reserves, as a matter of fact—warning them that they should not eat the fish of the English River system.

The letters referred to in the paper today were signed sometimes by provincial doctors, but more often by the federal doctor, who was basically in charge of this operation and remains in charge of it. They were signed at that point because they said they really had no alternative food measures. They were telling the people that as a result of the existing blood mercury levels they should take the following actions, and they named three—

Mr. Breithaupt: Just eat them slowly.

Hon. Mr. Miller: —according to the level found in the person. No one condoned eating the fish, but it was recognized that it was going on and would likely go on until such time as other food sources were found.

Mr. Lewis: There is something terribly wrong about all this. It's just crazy.

Mr. Singer: It is just beyond belief.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Singer: The minister tells us here in the House that they couldn't eat it, and then he lets his own people turn around and say it's all right to eat it.

Hon. Mr. Miller: My people were involved in that, but I can assure the member that the federal doctor on the scene signed them as the person responsible.

Mr. Singer: The minister's people did it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is the minister defending them?

Hon. Mr. Miller: No, I'm not. I'm defending the fact—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A question has been asked.

Mr. Singer: The minister tells the House one thing and his civil servants do the other.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Miller: My staff has said the problem will not go away until we have found alternative food sources.

Mr. Roy: The government has known that for four years.

Hon. Mr. Miller: That is our recommendation and it is still our recommendation. And that is why, I understand, the minister and the secretary of the resources development field are taking these steps.

Mr. Singer: Years after the event.

Hon. Mr. Miller: I hope very shortly to get in the freezer facilities and the alternative food sources, as recommended by my ministry.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Since the Premier is not prepared to involve himself on a policy level with this, is it the Minister of Health's opinion that perhaps the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) could come up with a programme, for example, whereby beef animals that are selling at a very low level now could be put there on, let's say, a co-operative programme between the two levels of government, so that these people can have adequate protein in their diet without eating the contaminated fish? What is the answer? What is even a partial answer? Just to continue to delay?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I believe there are lakes as close as three miles from the river system—

Mr. Lewis: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Miller: —that contain the fish that we would like to see the Indians using.

Mr. Lewis: Why doesn't the government build the road?

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Put through the road.

Hon. Mr. Miller: This is what I hope will result from the visit I understand is taking place.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, if I may. On March 13, 1975, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. W. Newman) made a statement on mercury levels in Ontario water and on page three, at the end of it, he said: "The Ministry of Health has been monitoring the blood levels of the residents in affected areas."

Can the minister tell the Legislature what the results of the testing at the Freshwater Institute in Manitoba on the Indian people have been, and what the levels of danger are four years after the first request for food alternatives was made?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Not by memory, Mr. Speaker. I know that 100 parts per billion is our benchmark.

Mr. Lewis: One hundred?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Yes, 100 parts per billion as the threshold past which the person is warned that he has, in our opinion, a dangerous level of mercury and should cease eating fish totally if possible, should go and have a doctor look at him, and have himself tested for these things. That is based upon an extrapolation of the experiences in Japan, where no one is quite sure what the levels of the first people were who died from this disease—

Mr. Lewis: One hundred—that's very high.

Hon. Mr. Miller: The lowest possible levels we ever extrapolated were 200. In other words, it has been suspected that people with levels as low as 200 had died; and up to this point we haven't been able to solidify the Japanese data. And as you know, Mr. Speaker, at that time even measurement was very poor.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister know the results of the tests?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Not by memory. In other words, I was told there were about six people or eight people who had levels over 100 the last time round.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could tell us how, after he told this House that at his direction letters had gone out warning the people not to eat the contaminated fish, that any official from his ministry could send out contrary letters and that nothing be done to him. Secondly, when the minister knew those letters were going out from his ministry, could he explain to us how he failed to discharge the responsibility of having this government provide some alternative source of protein to those people who needed something to eat in order to live?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, first of all the hon. member is not quite correct in his allusion to my authority. The letters were sent out some long while back before I was minister.

Mr. Singer: Well, his ministry has the authority.

Hon. Mr. Miller: All right, all right, I can only talk about those things I had control over.

Mr. Singer: Well, the minister was responsible for it.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Miller: I am not responsible for those things that went on before I was minister.

Mr. Singer: The former minister sloughed it off to this minister so no one is responsible. If there is a new Minister of Health tomorrow, he is not responsible for a thing.

Hon. Mr. Miller: The letters did not have our signature. They didn't even come from our ministry, they came from the federal government.

Mr. Roy: Not all of them.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

ASBESTOS IN THUNDER BAY HARBOUR

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to put a question to the Minister of the Environment pertaining to the possibility of serious asbestos fibre pollution in the water supply of Port Arthur—not the city; what do you call it?—Port Arthur ward.

Has the minister been in receipt of the most recent figures that indicate the asbestos fibre level is at a seriously high level and that most reasonable people attribute this to the continuing dumping from Reserve Mining Corp. of Duluth, as quoted in questions which were asked pertaining to this a week ago? Can the minister assure the House that he is aware of the level of pollution and that he is doing something about it, or that, in fact, he can assure the residents that it is not of a damaging nature?

Hon. W. Newman (Minister of the Environment): **Mr. Speaker,** I might say the member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes) did ask me about this the other day—

Mr. Lewis: He certainly did. The minister didn't give him the right reply.

Hon. W. Newman: The last testing we did was in February of this year, when our readings read around 800,000 parts per litre. There was some testing done at the university which indicated their count at somewhere around 12 million particles—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It was 10 to 20 million particles.

Hon. W. Newman: Well, 10 to 12 parts per million, I believe, was what it said.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: This was in a report by McMaster.

Hon. W. Newman: Does the member want to listen, or doesn't he?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes.

Hon. W. Newman: All right, then listen. Our samples were sent to the Ontario Research Foundation for counting. We are reasonably sure that the way a sample was taken at Port Arthur—or Thunder Bay, I should say—was the proper way. We have some doubts about exactly how the testing was done, although we are quite sure their results are accurate. We will be doing some further testing in May.

I have suggested to the news media up there that if they would like to do a joint test with us, we will be glad to take a joint sample of water. Our sample will be sent down to the Ontario Research Foundation and they can test their sample to clear up any discrepancies. According to our reading, and the checking done by the Ontario Research Foundation, the asbestos levels are well below those of many water supplies in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary question, **Mr. Speaker:** The position the minister is taking with the civic officials in the community is that he will test again in co-operation with them if they choose; but surely he is continuing independent testing?

Hon. W. Newman: Absolutely, we will be doing testing. We've suggested that it might be a good idea if we each took half of a joint sample so that we could get the sample taken in a proper manner with proper results.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: A supplementary, **Mr. Speaker:** Why is it that the testing which I brought to the minister's attention by the university on Feb. 3 was not followed up by his ministry? Why is it that the university testing confirmed by McMaster University is 150 times his ministry's testing? Doesn't he think it's about time he immediately put some funds into a filtration plant in Thunder Bay, as he promised for Sarnia? Why is he trying to whitewash this matter?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Newman: **Mr. Speaker,** these kinds of questions make me ill, because the

hon. member for Port Arthur doesn't realize what we are doing. He has no idea of what we are doing.

Mr. Foulds: The asbestos is going to make people of Port Arthur sick.

Hon. W. Newman: We are running control experiments now in our labs at Downsview, which I have said in the House before. They are control experiments, because when samples are taken, as the member asked the other day, water conditions can be different from day to day depending on weather conditions, and we are running control experiments now to deal with it in the operation of plants.

I believe it was said before, there is a lot in the way the plants are operated in the flocculation to take out the asbestos fibres. We are concerned and we are doing control experiments on it and these experiments should be completed sometime in either April or early May.

Mr. Foulds: Meanwhile people may be dying.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Foulds: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware that his ministry is—

Mr. Havrot: The member should quit acting.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order. Will the hon. member for Port Arthur take his seat. This question period is developing into too much of a hassle. I might say that the hon. Leader of the Opposition's time was, shall we say, extended by, in my opinion, too many supplementary questions and he gets the blame for it. I say that. Now, does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

SUICIDE OF PSYCHIATRIC PATIENT

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask the Minister of Health if he has informed himself of the circumstances surrounding the suicide of Richard Connor, a patient in the Kingston Psychiatric Hospital? The incident occurred on April 1. Has he assured himself that there was sufficient supervision and care and that, in fact, the members of the family, who feel that the suicide might have been prevented, can be reassured otherwise?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that, but I'll have the case brought to my attention.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions? The member for Scarborough West.

MERCURY POLLUTION

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Health to follow up questions which have been asked already. I take it these blood mercury levels that have emerged at the Freshwater Institute for half a dozen or eight people are as a result of the recent testing? How is it that that fact has not been made public and the entire community alerted to what is apparently a very real, not a vague hazard, that the continued eating of the fish induces physical illness?

Hon. Mr. Miller: This is one of those cases, Mr. Speaker, where, far from trying to keep the results secret, we've been doing a good deal of talking with the people and trying to make them aware of their individual test results. I don't feel that we've been trying to suppress information in any sense at all. It's just the opposite—we've been deliberately trying to make people concerned.

I said earlier, and I repeat again, I don't like having to defend the position that we wonder why somebody isn't sick. We are wondering why somebody isn't sick. It's not one of those questions where we underestimate the dangers.

Mr. Lewis: I appreciate that.

Hon. Mr. Miller: I'm very concerned that, in fact, the potential danger is there and we have a different set of conditions.

Mr. Lewis: I guess what I am asking is, doesn't the minister recognize that if it were made public—which it wasn't; it was just alluded to by the Minister of the Environment in March—if it were made public that he found people with blood mercury levels above the danger maximum, doctors on his staff might not then write letters saying: "You can continue to eat the fish"? Surely this is a matter for public information.

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I have stated in this House a number of times that there were people over our maximum levels.

Mr. Lewis: Not on the recent test results.

Hon. Mr. Miller: Those are ongoing, as the hon. member knows now, on a very steady basis and they are dealt with on an individual basis. In other words, as the hon. member knows, the federal government is taking a sample. They are giving it to us and

they are now reporting to the person. They have taken that role over from us. I understand they have also brought in a nutritionist and put her full-time into the Whitedog—at least, the two reserves—in an attempt to do some of those things which we've been recommending.

I wrote the federal minister not long ago and asked him whether we had permission to do the same thing, and we got that permission. It's my understanding that staff have now been assigned to that duty from the nutrition point of view; something, hopefully, we can work with them on. It's not just a question of putting beef up there; it is almost a question of saying "eat beef" and part of their life has been—it is a very difficult thing to make so many people believe there is even a problem. I agree with the member on that. We need co-operation.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Rainy River have a supplementary?

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Can the minister explain, really, the statement of the Minister of the Environment in which he seemed to give the impression the levels of mercury were going down and there wasn't really any problem, while in the same week the Minister of Natural Resources told the people who sell fishing licences to put a tag on the licence saying "eating fish from these waters might be injurious to health"? Where is the co-ordination over there?

Mr. Roy: That's why they have got policy secretaries.

Hon. Mr. Miller: I believe that tag goes on all fishing licences in the province. It's going on those sold in Muskoka. I can assure members it's going on them because I've had lots of calls from people in my area wondering what the problems are.

Mr. Foulds: But the minister can't even give any information on it.

Mr. Breithaupt: There are lots of fish caught there.

Hon. Mr. Miller: It was assumed it was better to make people aware of the problems of mercury. I believe, if I'm not wrong—the minister isn't here—there is some information given to back this up, saying what river system and what lake systems are considered to be hazardous. They wanted to bring people's attention to a risk before they ate wild fish.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Forgive me for pressing, I want to try to get an explicit answer. When in the year 1975 can the minister guarantee that an alternative and acceptable food supply will be available to the Islington and Grassy Narrows reserves?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, the provision of that is being done by the resources development field and I have made my recommendation that it be done very quickly. That's all I can say.

Mr. Cassidy: So limp.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister mean, after all this time, he is shunting his responsibility to another policy development field and cannot give this Legislature a time? Surely alternatives can be fashioned.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the member have a question?

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): He hasn't asked me yet.

Mr. Lewis: I wouldn't ask that minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why? Is the member afraid I may have an answer for him?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He hasn't been up north yet.

Mr. Lewis: Has the minister been through the Whitedog reserve? Has he been there? Does he know the conditions on the reserve?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member knows what it is. Let him ask me the question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Are there further questions?

VISITS TO INDIAN RESERVES

Mr. Lewis: I'll ask the minister the question. Has he been up to the Whitedog-Islington reserve, since the mercury problem?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I don't know that it is necessary for me to prove it.

Mr. Lewis: That's all I asked.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let me give him the answer.

Mr. Roy: Give it, yes or no.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to answer the ques-

tion and I will but if the opposition is really interested in getting the details of this very serious problem it wouldn't have done any harm to have given us one day's notice so we could bring the files up and give them the exact information.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: Excuse us.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They've had three years.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: The minister couldn't have guessed that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I haven't seen the story in the *Globe and Mail*.

Mr. Lewis: We'll give him notice in writing.

Mr. Foulds: By registered mail?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The policy field meets—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The policy field meets on Thursday mornings. I've been there from 9 o'clock in the morning and I had a luncheon appointment with another meeting—

Mr. Breithaupt: It was in this morning's paper. The minister should read.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just a moment, I haven't read the paper. Five weeks ago—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: It is ludicrous.

Mr. Speaker: So is the behaviour of several people in this room. Has the minister finished the answer? If not, will he continue.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, we have had numerous meetings with the representatives from Grassy Narrows and Whitedog reserves. The last one—I just looked it up in my diary—was about five weeks ago at which we discussed many potential solutions. I can tell the members that as a result of that meeting we made arrangements to visit the location next week.

Mr. Lewis: Did they?

Mr. Singer: Isn't that nice?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, some of the suggestions thrown across the floor of this House may be solutions which the non-Indians may think are acceptable to the Indians in those locations but I could tell the hon. members that is not necessarily so.

An hon. member: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are working with them in a very co-operative fashion. If the hon. members will give us—

Mr. Reid: Another five years?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —an opportunity to do this in this kind of fashion, we hope we will have a solution for the problem very shortly.

Mr. Singer: A supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: No. Order please. We are spending too much time—

Mr. Singer: Could I ask just one supplementary of this minister?

Mr. Speaker: No. The hon. member for Scarborough West will proceed with his further questions.

Mr. Singer: Then the minister's ludicrous answer stands by itself.

HOUSING PROGRAMMES

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Housing, if I may: How did he happen conveniently to miss the statement at the top of page 16 in *Housing Ontario*, which says:

It is estimated that OHAP will directly influence the production of 12,000 dwelling units in 1974 which might otherwise be built in 1975 or later. This does not include dwellings made available to the Home Ownership Made Easy programme through OHAP.

How has he suddenly amended that in order to make the figures read more flatteringly to the government?

Mr. Deans: Because he is a fraud.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I didn't miss it at all. I am fully aware of what is in the paper, as the hon. member should be. Housing units can be defined—

Mr. Lewis: As units that will be built.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —as lots brought onto the market or as starts. That is what we have been saying time and time again in the House: it's lots and starts.

Mr. Deans: That's very convenient.

Mr. Lewis: Well, it's convenient to change the definition every time.

Is it not true that the 12,000 units which otherwise would be built in 1975 or later—it's clear that was the intended production in 1974-1975—actually were only 4,000, of which the minister hasn't told us 1,100 were HOME units, so that the target of 12,000 was really a reality of 2,900? How can the minister bring in that kind of discrepancy, a figure 25 per cent off the target, for the past year?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, again the hon. leader of the NDP doesn't understand what the statement says—

Mr. Deans: Nobody does—no one ever understands the minister.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: All he has to do is look at the figures and he'll find out that we have exceeded our figures as far as the accelerated lots and housing starts through OHAP are concerned—

Mr. Lewis: The lots, yes.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: As I said before, we are certainly down on the rent-geared-to-income family housing—and we feel badly that that is the case and that communities and certain municipal leaders will not accept socially assisted housing. But we have achieved a very commendable record in the fiscal year 1974-1975.

Mr. Deans: It's a disgusting record.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the statement in the summary on page 35 of Housing Ontario last year, that "the Ontario government will itself have a direct involvement in 31,000 of the total starts—"

Mr. Lewis: Starts!

Mr. Cassidy: That's right. Can the minister explain why he is so proud of his record when his statement today admits that the ministry's share of total Ontario starts is only 18,148? In other words, the ministry has barely exceeded by half the target that was set out a year ago for its involvement in total starts in the province during the past year.

Mr. Lewis: Don't give us lots, but starts.

Mr. Cassidy: He talked about starts last year.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what is the matter with the hon. member in regard to understanding the statement—

Mr. Deans: Isn't it funny that nobody ever understands the minister?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: We have said we influenced 29,000—that's 94 per cent of the 31,000 we had anticipated—and that's an actual fact. Regardless of how the member wants to twist the figures, there is absolutely no way he can.

Mr. Cassidy: You can't live in a lot; that is the truth.

Mr. Lewis: No further questions, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Carleton East.

PAY TELEVISION

Mr. P. Taylor (Carleton East): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. The Canadian Radio-Television Commission will hold a public hearing on the future of pay television in Canada on June 10 in Ottawa. The deadline for filing comments with the commission is May 16. Would the minister say whether his ministry, on behalf of the government of Ontario, will make its views known to the commission on this important issue?

Hon. J. R. Rhodes (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, we haven't really decided whether we are going to make a formal intervention and submission at the CRTC hearings.

Mr. Roy: There should be some politics in that, eh?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We have made our feelings known as they relate to the policies that are being developed by the CRTC, both to the Minister of Communications, Mr. Pelletier, and to the chairman of the CRTC, Mr. Juneau. To appear before the CRTC as nothing more than an intervener isn't going to add anything. We have made our position quite clear to the most responsible persons in that field. I think they understand how we feel about what they are doing.

Mr. P. Taylor: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister say whether it is

the government's intention to levy the Ontario sales tax on cable TV subscribers and potential pay TV subscribers?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member is aware that I have absolutely nothing to do with the levying of sales tax.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: No, he isn't aware; he is not aware of anything.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur.

ASBESTOS IN THUNDER BAY HARBOUR

Mr. Foulds: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Minister of the Environment, if I may: Is the minister not aware that his ministry has had, since 1973, photographs from the NASA earth resources satellite programme, which show clearly that effluent from Reserve Mining in Silver Harbour goes around the lake into Thunder Bay? Why has the ministry not been constantly monitoring the asbestos counts in Thunder Bay as a result of that information? Does the minister not think it's time, with the obvious research that is being done independently, that he immediately put the money into a filtration plant for the Port Arthur drinking system?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of where Reserve Mining is. I have had considerable correspondence through our federal counterpart dealing with that situation and we have expressed our concern about it. As far as the levels and the testing that we have done in the Port Arthur area go, I am told by the health people that from the levels in Port Arthur that we have obtained and from the results of the testing that has been done for us at the Ontario Research Foundation, the levels in Port Arthur are not excessive. There is some doubt, as I have said before, because of the university testing and the high levels that they have received. We are going to be doing some further testing in early May.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the minister mean to say he is willing to wait another month before he even starts a testing programme, during which people may be exposed to the danger?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The question should be seeking information.

Mr. Foulds: —as well as inhaling asbestos through humidifiers, vaporizers and sauna baths.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is the type of question which is spoiling the question period, I might say. It's argumentative and more of a debate than a question and answer period. The member for York Centre.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, he is killing people in Thunder Bay. This ministry is responsible for deaths.

Hon. W. Newman: Don't go around—

Mr. Speaker: If a question is out of order, any reply is out of order. I would ask hon. members not to ask such a multiple-type question and to ask for information rather than try to debate. The member for York Centre.

NORTH PICKERING DEVELOPMENT

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): I have a question of the Minister of Housing: Will his ministry admit the serious errors made in processing the expropriations in the North Pickering project, as has been illustrated by the results of the Roy Bambrough case, and stop playing games with those residents?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I don't admit there was any serious error whatsoever. I think the people in the area of North Pickering have been dealt with quite fairly.

Mr. Lewis: He never does.

Mr. Deans: The minister has never admitted an error in his life.

Mr. Martel: Nobody understands him.

Mr. Deans: They probably don't understand him.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: We have had the best settlements that we can possibly achieve for the people in that area, regardless of the Bambrough case or whatever: case the member may wish to bring forward. The Attorney General (Mr. Clement) has consistently said, as I have said, that we have done our best to make sure the people there were treated fairly.

Mr. Deans: The minister is really quite incompetent.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary, the member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Deans: He doesn't understand.

Mr. Roy: With regard to the minister's answer that there has been no serious error, what does he think of the decision of the divisional court of the Court of Appeal of

Ontario which said the ministry had made an error?

Mr. Deans: They didn't understand him.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Not necessarily.

Mr. Roy: Doesn't the minister feel that he is misleading the public and people like Mr. Bambrugh when he sends out estimates under one signature when the individual has not prepared it? Does he not feel that he is misleading these individuals and that his officials are bordering on contempt of the Ontario Court of Appeal?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the question has been asked.

Mr. Roy: Doesn't he feel that?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the minister have an answer?

Mr. Deans: Why doesn't the member for Ottawa East just tell the minister he doesn't understand.

Mr. Roy: He doesn't understand.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Ottawa East is a very intelligent lawyer. I understand that part and his record proves that. Why don't we let the courts decide whether we have been misleading anyone or not? I think that's the proper answer to give him.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Parkdale.

OPTOMETRISTS

Mr. J. Duksza (Parkdale): I have a question of the Minister of Health: I have in my hands the regulations from the College of Optometry. I want to ask the minister whether he really intends to put them into action and deprive 100 to 150 optometrists of work, because they have been associated with the various companies or in the employ of the various companies?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member was present during the discussion of the health disciplines bill when the conflict-of-interest possibilities of an optometrist employed by any retailer who also merchandises eyeglasses were discussed. It was in an attempt to allow a person receiving a diagnosis or a measurement of need to be a free agent in purchasing his ophthalmic devices in a free market that this was agreed upon by the college and by the people present, and put into regulatory form.

Any other form appears to be a conflict of interest where a professional is employed to make potential diagnoses that may benefit his employer.

Mr. Duksza: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: One supplementary by the member who asked the original question.

Mr. Duksza: Is the minister aware that; one, there was no real decision made on that; and two, the regulation actually excludes those people from work? We only discussed that there should be no conflict of interest. The regulations suggest—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is this a statement or a debate?

Mr. Duksza: No, I want—

Mr. Speaker: Is there a question?

Mr. Duksza: Yes. The minister has just misled us on that point and the question is, is he aware that the regulations have proceeded further than was intended?

An hon. member: I wouldn't just call it a misleading statement.

Hon. Mr. Miller: The regulations are in draft form right now and are being circulated to all disciplines for discussion. They are still changeable and therefore I don't feel at this moment that I am committed totally to them. They are being sent out for the very kinds of discussion the member is raising now.

I only tell the members that to begin with the college opposed any change of this nature. If the members recall, the ophthalmologists and other groups present felt strongly that a man couldn't serve two masters. He couldn't be a professional if, at the same time he was worrying about the sales of the business. I would think the member's party at least would understand that.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): We did.

Hon. Mr. Miller: Having agreed to that principle, we asked the College of Optometry to put it into a workable form and, incidentally, to work out those exclusions for people who had served long periods of time with companies and who would find it difficult—

Mr. Roy: Will the minister send us a copy of the regulations?

Hon. Mr. Miller: I have circulated them to all the disciplines. I don't know—

Mr. Roy: Not to us. He amended the regulations.

Hon. Mr. Miller: Regulatory changes don't necessarily go to members, as they know, but it was agreed they would go to the other people.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Huron-Bruce.

ALLEGED BIAS IN RYERSON EXAMINATIONS

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Colleges and Universities.

Is the minister in a position to report to the House progress, if any, in regard to the meeting last week between his officials and the officials of Natural Resources, and officials from Ryerson in relation to the problems encountered at that institution with respect to bias in the examinations given to students taking the Ontario land surveyors' course?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Unfortunately, I am not in a position to do so today, Mr. Speaker, but I may be tomorrow. I didn't have an opportunity this week to talk with my people. I know of the meeting; I listened to it for a few moments. I will try to have something for the member, for the House, tomorrow morning.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa Centre.

NORFOLK ROAD WORKERS' DISPUTE

Mr. Cassidy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Is the minister aware that the township of Norfolk is threatening to sell a half-million dollars worth of road equipment, which was bought only last year, as part of its effort to break the strike of its 17 road workers and destroy their union? Is he aware the township has been accused of bad faith bargaining and its only offer is \$1 less than the prevailing rate in the area? Does he agree that the ministry's exceptionally rapid verbal consent for the township to switch to an urban subsidy from a road subsidy and to sell its equipment will facilitate the township's efforts to break the union? Will the minister agree to withdraw ministry support backing the management side—that is the township side—by deferring that approval until January, 1976, or until the labour dispute is resolved?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Is the speech over?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, first of all I am not aware of the particular request being used for the purposes suggested by the member. I do know there has been a request for this approval.

The request from the township is not necessarily going to have any effect as far as the sharing of the original purchase of the equipment is concerned. The subsidies and what have you would not be affected whether the township is in its present status or urban status. The changing of the status would have no bearing on whether it decides to contract out the work, which I understand is what it is trying to do.

I also understand the workers do not really have a union at this time; they are in the process of bargaining for their first contract.

Mr. Cassidy: They were certified in July.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I was not aware of that. I can tell the member that I understand what the situation is. It has been brought to my attention by him today and others and the approval has not gone forward. It can be delayed and I would like to look into the matter in some detail before I make a decision on the delay.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Thank you, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: No. There were four questions at least in that first one. I think it is time we went on to give other people an opportunity to ask questions.

The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food, but before I ask that question may I ask the members of the Legislature to join with me in welcoming 70 students, with several teachers and parents, from the Hugh Beaton School in Windsor, in the great riding of Windsor-Walkerville. Mr. Speaker, they are under the guidance of Miss Sheila Parent, and they are the ones responsible for the nice weather we are enjoying here in Toronto. They brought it with them.

SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food: Is

the minister prepared to introduce a food stamp or a food voucher plan to assist in eliminating some of the surplus agricultural products, and at the same time to assist those who are living on limited incomes so that by that plan they could help in reducing some of the surplus; especially potatoes today?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't realize the member's question was addressed to me.

Mr. Roy: It is against the rules to be sleeping like that in the House.

Mr. J. Riddell (Huron): He must be thinking about that election coming up in Huron-Middlesex. Was the minister thinking about that?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Oh come on, really; give them higher income.

Mr. Deans: Ask him if he is prepared to do that.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

An hon. member: That woke him up.

Mr. Roy: Once he is awake it doesn't matter what the question is, he has an answer.

Mr. B. Newman: Is the minister prepared to implement a food voucher plan or a food stamp plan to assist in eliminating some of the surplus food products and also to help those who are living on limited and fixed incomes?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, we discussed with the federal minister, just last week, some possibilities to remove some of the surplus food we have in this province and I hope ways and means may be found.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park.

Mr. Singer: On a point of order.

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, Mr. Speaker, in view of our—

Mr. Speaker: Order please. A point of order?

by the federal people. Could I draw to the attention of the House and to the minister, page 4856 I think it is, of Hansard, Nov. 7, 1974, where in answer to a question put by me the Minister of Health said:

Letters were sent out to all the doctors in the area, the tourist operators in the area, and individuals, signed by the Minister of Health, warning that the fish should not be eaten.

The minister outlined in the earlier part of that answer, tests taken by his own department; if the Minister of Health did not mean himself when he gave that answer, then he was deliberately misleading this House.

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I don't deliberately mislead this House and the hon. member should know better than that. I want the member to withdraw that statement.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. It's wrong for the hon. member to accuse another member of deliberately misleading the House, and I await the hon. member for Downsview's action in that respect.

Mr. Singer: On a point of order, I said if the minister did not mean himself in that answer, then he was deliberately misleading the House. Now if he didn't mean himself by "the Minister of Health," who did he mean?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Well, Mr. Speaker, has the member read the entire transcript? Has he looked for dates? Has he looked at any of that stuff?

Mr. Singer: I have just read the minister his answer, which he said he didn't make in the House; on Nov. 7.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Miller: You know, Mr. Speaker, the member for Downsview is not a bad person.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is reaching levels of high dudgeon for the first time in his political career.

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Affairs, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

MERCURY POLLUTION

Mr. Singer: Yes. A few moments ago, the Minister of Health said he did not warn people not to eat the fish, it had been done

LIMOUSINE FOR SECURITIES DIVISION CHIEF

Mr. Shulman: In view of our rather difficult financial position this year, why has the

minister decided in his ministry to vote a chauffeured limousine for the head of security division?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Well Mr. Speaker, that particular perk is one of long standing. The present commissioner continues to enjoy it in accordance with the nature of his position, which is one of great stature. I can only say that it is the incumbent's only perk.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Waterloo North.

An hon. member: He deserves it.

LONDON PAIN CLINIC

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a very short question of the Minister of Health.

Mr. Roy: And let the minister try to give him a straight answer.

Mr. Good: Make it a short answer. Is it true that he is closing down the London Pain Clinic, which is being run in conjunction with the University Hospital; and if so why?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Not that I know of, Mr. Speaker, but I don't think I should say this unequivocally. Is that the acupuncture treatment experiment?

Mr. Good: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Miller: It may well be that the funds we gave that particular group, which I think was \$25,000, have been used up and their experiments are complete. I'll be glad to get the member more information on it.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Cochrane South.

ASSISTANCE FOR LAID-OFF WORKERS

Mr. Ferrier: I have a question for the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware of the policy of Manpower in the closing of a plant or an operation, such as the Reeves Mine in Timmins, where the policy is to set up a committee to look for other employment for the men so displaced, with the payment of that committee to be funded 50 per cent by the federal government, 25 per cent by the provincial government, 12.5 per cent by the company and 12.5 per cent by the local union? And does the minister think that kind of a policy is

fair to the men who are put out of work by a plant closing for one reason or another?

Hon. J. P. MacBeth (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, there are various arrangements in connection with that type of an agreement. They are generally four-party agreements, as the member has suggested, with the union, with management, with the province and with the Dominion. Now, actually, the federal government generally puts more money or has more money available for this than we ourselves do. Very often we're just a co-operating partner, loaning our facilities but not putting very much money in. Other times the union puts money in; and sometimes they don't, depending on the circumstances.

But yes, I think the arrangements are reasonable. Generally when you have some money in it you have a little more interest in it, Mr. Speaker, and I think the best way to work this out is by four-party agreement and co-operation. I think the schemes are reasonable, sir.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. Ewen from the standing private bills committee presented the committee's report, which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr10, An Act respecting the Borough of York.

Bill Pr15, An Act respecting the Borough of North York.

Bill Pr17, An Act respecting the City of Brantford.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the City of Brantford.

Bill Pr8, An Act respecting the Borough of Etobicoke.

Bill Pr23, An Act respecting Huron College.

Bill Pr27, An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie.

Your committee would recommend that the fees, less the actual cost of printing and penalties, if any, be remitted on Bill Pr23, An Act respecting Huron College.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

FAMILY BENEFITS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Martel moves first reading of bill intitled, An Act to amend the Family Benefits Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the amendment is to remove any reference to the sex of the parent, thereby enabling either the father or the mother of the child to be eligible for benefits.

CONSUMER PROTECTION
AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Braithwaite moves first reading of bill intitled, An Act to amend the Consumer Protection Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to eliminate the practice, prevalent in supermarkets and large chain stores, of repricing upwards goods already on the shelves.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Roy moves first reading of bill intitled, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I intend to comment on the following bill so I might as well keep my comments together.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Roy moves first reading of bill intitled, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of introducing this legislation has to do with motor vehicle accidents on the highways.

In 1973 100,000 people were injured and 2,000 killed on Ontario highways. The first bill introduced, Mr. Speaker, deals with the mandatory use of seat belts; and the second bill deals with the limitation of the speed on a highway to 55 miles per hour.

Mr. Speaker, the government's own figures and statistics indicate that it costs the—

Mr. Speaker: We don't debate the bill here.

Mr. Roy: No, no; but I want to—

Mr. Speaker: No, you state the principle of the bill only on these statements.

Mr. Roy: The principle of the bill basically, Mr. Speaker, is this. The first bill introduced makes the use of seatbelts mandatory; the purpose of the second bill is to reduce the speed limit to 55 miles per hour. The main purpose of the two pieces of the legislation Mr. Speaker, is in the nature of preventive medicine to help reduce the health costs in this province.

I have another bill to introduce, Mr. Speaker.

BUSINESS CORPORATIONS
AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Roy moves first reading of bill intitled, An Act to amend the Business Corporations Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to prevent corporations from forcing persons to submit to fingerprinting in exchange for their right to shop at certain stores and to limit the use of whatever can be done with fingerprints. This bill has been introduced on three different occasions now.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I wonder if I could ask unanimous consent to revert to petitions?

Mr. Speaker: We have no petitions that have been approved here. Did you say petitions?

Mr. Cassidy: Yes. May I have unanimous consent to revert to petitions, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: There were no petitions. The petitions, I might remind the hon. member, must be submitted to the Clerk of the House for approval first to see that they are in the proper form. So perhaps you could look after that detail for next day?

Mr. Cassidy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, through you and to the House, may I introduce the students of St. Maria Goretti Separate School, in Scarborough, who entered the Legislature later than the question period. On behalf of the teachers with them, I wish that you would welcome them.

Mr. A. W. Downer (Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, through you, I would like to inform the House, although it's not a pleasure, of the death of

Miss Lillian Wingfield, who for 43 years was a dedicated civil servant of this province. For 21 years she was on the executive of the Quarter Century Club. Her sister is still working here in the Ministry of Government Services as supervisor of telephone accounts. I'm sure we offer the family our deepest sympathy and we'd like to pay tribute to the memory of a very dedicated civil servant.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The eighth order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 29, An Act to authorize the Raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

ONTARIO LOAN ACT (concluded)

Mr. Speaker: I believe the hon. member for Waterloo North has the floor.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a few questions which I would like to raise on this bill and I hope the hon. minister will reply to them.

As we are aware, Mr. Speaker, the bill before us comes up each year and the amount being asked for authorization this year is \$1.4 billion. The necessity for this bill is that certain borrowings are not permitted by other statutes and must be covered in this bill. As I understand it, the borrowings by the province, that is, non-public borrowings under the OMERS Act and the Teachers' Superannuation Act, are not included in this particular bill because permission is given in those Acts for the government to borrow. Therefore, it would appear that the \$575 million required in public borrowing, which is designated as "financing to be determined," plus the \$750 million of Canada Pension Plan money would be the amounts covered by this legislation. That amounts to \$75 million less than \$1.4 billion, so I would like to ask, first of all, whether that \$75 million has to include the \$33 million from the federal-provincial winter capital projects fund or if that's included under another statute, and also the \$19 million under the CMHC pollution control loans?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Both are included in the \$1,377 million here.

Mr. Good: Both are included in the \$1,377 million, so there is a surplus then of \$33 million that is not really required. That's fine. That clears up this question for me, I must

confess, Mr. Speaker, I had the same problem with this bill last year that the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) had this year, until I inquired and found that certain authorization is given under the other two statutes which is not included in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the main question I would like to ask—and I think it's perfectly in order when debating this bill—is, as we borrow from the Canada Pension Plan fund and other non-public borrowing annually, where do we find the accumulation of non-public borrowing in the budget? I have checked and the latest information I can find is that the total liabilities were carried until 1973-1974 at \$9,390 million offset by \$6,488 million, but for last year and this year I see no accumulative figure of the non-public borrowings. Certainly, we don't pay the Canada Pension Plan fund back in short order.

This is probably somewhere in the budget, but I couldn't find it. So maybe the minister would be good enough to find out the accumulative non-public borrowing which would be covered year by year in this bill, but for which I can't find an accumulative total? Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Do any other hon. members wish to speak to this bill? The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, there are several questions here. First of all, regarding the question raised by my friend from Lakeshore, basically this amount does not agree, and never has agreed, with the amount shown to be totally financed in the budget. There are two differences—essentially those pointed out by my friend from Kitchener—in that there are two items not included in this bill; the Teachers' Superannuation Act and the Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act.

The four items which are covered under the authority of this Act for borrowing are the Canada Pension Plan, the winter works capital projects fund, CMHC pollution control loans and the financing to be determined, which at this moment may be up to \$575 million for a total of \$1,377 million. Now, Mr. Speaker, to that you add teachers' superannuation and OMERS—\$201 million and \$128 million—and you come to \$1,706 million. You have to subtract from that the retirements, which come to \$37 million, for a net total financing of \$1,669 million which this year happens to be very close to the amount of the net cash requirements. But we don't attempt to coincide—I don't mean to say that the figure of \$1.4 billion is pulled out of the air.

Actually the other thing which should be said—and I remember explaining this to my friend from Lakeshore I think three or four years ago—is that there is a carryover. What's left in this bill carries over into the following year. That's why the amount which is needed may vary substantially from the amount of the net cash requirements, even with those adjustments that are in the budget.

The reason there is the carryover is the variables. There may well be, I suppose, another winter works programme—all the variables which can happen. Our best guess is that there would be a carryover into 1976-1977 from 1975-1976 of about 400 and some odd million dollars. We should have enough to carry forward, depending on the amount of borrowing we do, and the kind of borrowing which we ultimately do. This authorizes that amount of borrowing and it means we don't have to come back to the House on day one, but will probably have to come before, as our guess is now, July of 1976.

Perhaps we should take a look at the Act. Perhaps it's a bit of an anachronism in this day and age—I suppose it's been there since day one. Why we need authority to borrow from Canada Pension under this Act but not from the teachers' superannuation is something I—

Mr. Good: That's not in the OMERS Act though.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, why that provision is in the other Act escapes me. There must be some reason, I suppose, in antiquity. But those are the differences in the figures.

Mr. Good: What about the accumulation?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The accumulation you won't find—in the budget, Mr. Speaker—at least not for the last couple of years—because we won't know what it is until the end of the year. We don't attempt to put those figures in public accounts or the financial statement of the province. We really don't know what the debt will be until the books are all balanced off and we don't attempt to project that in the budget. We could, I suppose, but we are talking about a great number of variables, and this is a budget as opposed to a financial statement.

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence, since this bill will probably not go to committee, could I ask one more question?

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): No, I am going to ask that it goes to committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Committee of the whole House please.

Mr. Speaker: Committee of the whole House?

Agreed.

ONTARIO UNCONDITIONAL GRANTS ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves second reading of Bill 40, An Act to provide the Payment of Unconditional Grants.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker; just give me a moment to get organized.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is one of utmost importance to the municipalities in the Province of Ontario. This, of course, was discussed in some detail this afternoon at the PMLC meeting which went on from 1 until 2 o'clock. It's significant that the discussion at that meeting followed very closely the notes which I made on this bill last week when it was called for debate and didn't arrive.

The grants in this bill, Mr. Speaker, are those which were formerly in the Municipal Unconditional Grants Act, the Regional Municipal Grants Act and the Property Tax Stabilization Act. Now, the Property Tax Stabilization Act included the general support grants that the municipalities got before, as well as the resources equalization grant.

It's also significant, Mr. Speaker, that the split mill rate, which was utilized before in some areas and not in others, as I understand it, is now incorporated in the budget as a provision that all municipalities will now tax at a different rate for commercial and industrial property than is applicable for residential property. I think that perhaps one of the reasons that this will be of major importance in the future is that when market value assessment is implemented, if it ever is, it will be one way of avoiding some of the shifts which, by past experience, definitely do occur. Assessment ratios will shift more and more to residential property, with less and less on commercial. This differential can be ironed out to some extent by creating a different tax rate or different mill rate for residential property than for industrial and commercial. This was suggested some years ago by the opposition.

There is no way market value assessment can work without distorting the tax picture as we now know it. I think it should be that the burden on residential property has to be less than on industrial. Incorporating this differential of 15 per cent in legislation will at least provide a basis on which to start to see what other adjustments have to be made when market value does come across the province. There is no doubt about it, shifts do take place. Presently, the county of Bruce, the county of Grey, and, I believe, the east part of Parry Sound, are on market value assessment. I think there were close to 4,000 appeals last year in Grey county.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: And in Peel and Pickering.

Mr. Good: Oh, I am sorry, I was not aware of those—they may have been put on for 1975.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, they were in for 1974.

Mr. Good: They were in for 1974; I wasn't aware of that.

Undoubtedly people are concerned that the shift has taken place. So, that particular part of this bill will to some extent take care of that particular problem.

Now, to deal with the other grants that are covered in this particular bill. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I think that we have to remember that this bill is dealing with those grants which are designated as unconditional payments. When we look at table C5 on page C15 in the budget, we note that while the general increase of funds to the municipality is reasonable, with the 16.3 per cent increase, the total grant of financial support to the municipality is really only 13.6 per cent. But when you get right down to the crunch of it, Mr. Speaker, for the moneys over which the municipal councillors have control, we find that the increase for next year will be only 9.8 per cent, if I recall the figure in the white budget book. Therefore, the municipalities are only going to have control over 9.8 per cent more funds. Mr. Speaker, that is not very much additional money to reduce the tremendous increases in municipal financing that are evident at this early stage.

It is unfortunate that the minister has seen fit to set out the budget in such a manner that all moneys going to the local level appear to be municipal moneys. They are described as "Ontario payments to local governments and agencies."

At first glance, it would appear that the municipalities are going to get a lot of additional money—somewhere in the budget I think the minister mentioned the sum of \$380 million—but when you take out the additional funds that are going for education, transportation, social assistance, housing, environment, health and things of those nature; payments to old age homes, Children's Aid Societies, conservation authorities, library boards and so on; and then the other funds, such as payments in lieu of taxes, we find that the actual unconditional grant—the money that the municipality has to do with as it chooses—is very limited; it is only an additional \$29 million which I have said is less than a 10 per cent increase.

There is no way that the municipalities are going to hold their tax rate at anywhere near respectable levels with such a small amount of educational money at the local level. Granted, the former Treasurer warned on two or three occasions last year that the province would not be providing additional large sums of money. The province has all it can handle to meet its other requirements, he said.

The municipalities were then warned by the present Treasurer that the funds would not be forthcoming. He did a pretty good job in the budget of making it look as if there were a lot of additional funds going to the municipalities. For instance, the additional money for educational purposes is only 13 per cent—well, there is no way the school boards can keep their increases this year to 13 per cent. The Treasurer must know that. He knows that when the other half of the municipal tax bill is figured out and the budgeting is completed, there are going to be increases on the educational side and, in many areas, sizeable increases. That is just as important as the moneys over which the municipal council has control. Unfortunately, that is not a very great area.

The \$29 million that is being given as an increase under the unconditional grants section is made up entirely of increased grants for police purposes. We had a discussion in the PMLC meeting at noon today regarding the advisability of attaching that grant or even linking it in name for police purposes.

I can see that there is some validity in the argument that we have to designate which municipalities get it. In actual fact and in actual law, the municipality can do with that money whatever it sees fit. But what happens when the police commission hears that there is going to be a \$5 increase per capita in those areas where there is a regional police force? As was pointed out today, there were

more police contracts and police decisions made the day after the budget by the police commission simply because they figured, "Ah ha, we have this extra money to play around with." Really, in law they don't, but as long as we have police commissions overridden by provincial appointees and judges, the local municipality isn't going to have any control over expenditures on the police force, because as soon as extra money is available, it's no problem at all for the police commission to find ways to spend it. Undoubtedly they have a good point and they do need the additional funds.

On that particular point of reasoning, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that the amount of money over which the municipality has undisputed control is very limited. It amounts only to an increase of less than 10 per cent.

Even though the regional-municipal grant and the per capita grant to other municipalities have gone up infinitesimally, the general expenditures in the municipalities are going to increase considerably. We look at the per capita grant. That is a general grant to both non-regional governments and regional governments and the formula for non-regional governments is shown in the bill on page 11 under schedule 2. This varies from \$6 to \$8 depending on the population. For regional governments that is set at \$9. Even with those small increases we find the general per capita grant is increasing only 1.6 per cent over last year, from \$63 to \$64 million. There is no way the municipalities are going to manage on increases of that particular size.

In fairness, Mr. Speaker, I must point out one thing. That is that last year not all of the general support grant, because of its complicated formula, ever got into the hands of the municipalities—that is, in the fiscal year by which the municipalities operate. There is some \$17 million outstanding and that is why this discrepancy appears in the white book, "Ontario Assistance to Local Governments and Taxpayers" and in the budget in table C5. The budget shows that the grant has dropped from \$85 million to \$66 million. In effect, the \$85 million of 1974-1975 was never paid out; only \$67 million of that was paid out.

That proves only one thing to me, Mr. Speaker. That is the government fell exactly into the trap many of us said it would last year because the municipalities had no alternative but to have increased spending of a considerable amount. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that those municipalities which had a considerable increase in their spending received the small amount of the grant. Consequently the government couldn't—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I don't want to interrupt but if I can correct the member before he goes any further, that is not the reason. The reason there was the difference was that the government had underestimated the growth in its revenues and the proportion which was applicable to the Edmonton commitment.

Mr. Good: That may be the reason the minister thinks but it is not the reason I believe and it is not the reason the people in the municipalities believe. If we look on page 22 of last year's budget—Ontario Budget 1974—we find the grants under the general support grant got down as low as three per cent and could be as high as nine per cent. This varied inversely in proportion to the increase in the spending of that municipality.

We had warned last year that many municipalities would have to spend more than the minister had averaged—I suppose nine per cent or 10 per cent—even to get this six per cent which was supposed to be the norm. There were 11 per cent increases.

Some municipalities had to go over the 14 per cent limit and received only three per cent increase over the previous year, with the result that the municipalities did not even get all the money that had been budgeted for.

The minister may very well say they had increased revenue. If this formula had been set up properly in the first place the municipalities would have got—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No. I am sorry, I don't want to interrupt but I know the member wants to be accurate.

The province estimated certain revenue growth and certain total revenues. Of that, under the Edmonton commitment, the municipalities were entitled to a share.

Mr. Good: Right.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The fact was that our revenues rose more quickly than we expected and therefore they were entitled to an extra whatever the figure was—\$67 million, which we are paying out this year.

Mr. Good: But I am talking, Mr. Speaker, only of the \$17 million under the general support grant which was not paid out to the municipalities in 1974. The Treasurer had budgeted for \$85 million in 1974-1975 under the general support grant and we paid out only \$67 million under that grant. The reason he underspent that budget by \$17 million was because his formula was such that the municipalities couldn't qualify for it. The minister can interrupt me and correct me as much as he wants, but those are the facts, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: He agrees.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, they are getting them this year.

Mr. Good: All right, so, now they are getting it. But even with the municipalities getting that extra \$17 million this year, the overall unconditional grants to the municipalities are still only going to be increased 9.8 per cent over the year before. When one isolates the unconditional grants from the other moneys, we find that it is certainly insufficient to do the job that the municipalities will have to do.

I would like to draw a little attention to a few other facts. Some particular things—and I speak particularly of transportation—in fairness, are getting a good healthy increase, 25 per cent. On the other hand, transportation can be the responsibility of that particular municipality and it cuts its cloth according to the money that is available through the fare box and through grants.

On the other hand, the conservation authorities have had no increase according to this budget. The 1974 amount was \$31 million and in 1975-1976 the amount designated is \$31 million. Now we know that inflation affects the operation of the conservation authorities in the same manner as that of anyone else. Where are they going to get their money that they are going to have to have and require? From the municipalities. So there is another manner in which the municipalities are going to be asked to raise their mill rate further.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention a few examples here. These are some figures from my own region. All that could be ascertained up to now are the preliminary budget figures for the region of Waterloo—these are not the final budget figures, let me make that perfectly clear.

The police budget is certainly eating up a tremendous portion of any regional government, if there is a regional police force. This has gone up from \$8 million to \$10 million, or from \$32 per capita to \$40 per capita. Now the minister mentioned today in the PMLC meeting that policing costs vary up to \$55 per capita across the province. I forget what he said the low figure was.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Twenty dollars.

Mr. Good: Twenty dollars per capita up to \$55 per capita.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: An average is about \$34.

Mr. Good: An average of about \$34 across the province. But, Mr. Speaker, let me assure you that any municipality that has an area police force is going to find their costs considerably higher than others. Consequently, there is provision here for additional grants from \$7 to \$12. But even with the additional grant, we find that our costs have risen \$8 this year per capita in Waterloo region and the grant will reimburse only \$5 of that \$8.

Our engineering costs have risen from \$8 million to \$12 million. Our health and social services, from \$9 million to \$11 million. The total expenditures, Mr. Speaker, in Waterloo region in 1974 were \$30.6 million, and for 1975 they will be roughly \$37.4 million. So we see an increase of \$22 million in the proposed budget—I am sorry, I correct that—an increase of 22 per cent in the regional budget.

Now, when we look at the income side—income that is expected, taking this budget into consideration—we find that the income will be raised from \$8.9 million to \$22.5 million, or an increase of 19 per cent. Consequently, the remainder must come by additional levies on the area governments. And the area governments, Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, must contribute to the regional government on the basis of their weighted assessment.

The increase that is expected to be required on the area levies will be from \$11.7 million to \$14.9 million, which is an increase of 21.5 per cent. Twenty-one point five per cent will be the increase that the area governments must contribute toward the regional levy. This is before we've even considered the educational cost increase.

Everyone in my particular area is predicting that there's no way, even with the most rigid cutting of budget estimates—and they've already gone through one cutting in the region—that there can be anything but a 15 per cent to 20 per cent increase, and probably much heavier on the 20 per cent side of it than on the 15 per cent side. Some are predicting 20, some are predicting 16 or 18. This is about the increase that is expected in the area from which I come, and other areas to whom I have spoken.

What the educational budgets will be is a little too early to tell. Consequently, one can't predict how much increase there'll be at the municipal level in the form of taxes. But, undoubtedly, it will be in the form of 20 per cent minimum, I would think. One area municipality's preliminary budget shows an increase of 40 per cent, and they hardly know where to start to cut it back because everything appears to be essential.

Let me relate an unfortunate instance, Mr. Speaker, that happened in Waterloo region. So desperate are they to trim back their budgets that the social service committee of council suggested that a saving of some \$37,000 be registered by eliminating support for the municipally and provincially supported daycare children who were in private day care. What false economy this would have been. The whole municipality suddenly became alarmed over this particular measure, and I think the most recent news is that it will be reinstated. It would have been a tragedy for mothers who are working to have to go back onto welfare rolls simply because the municipality was not going to pay for their children while they were in daycare centres.

But the municipalities are desperate to find ways to trim their spending this year in order to bring the proposed costs on the tax bill even within reasonable limits.

The minister has given additional funds to the municipalities, but I don't think they're nearly enough. The regional municipalities have been created by the province; the municipalities must now live with them and try to make ends meet. I certainly have to support the bill for the money that it is giving to the regions, but as has been pointed out, the unconditional part of it is certainly far from what it should be. There should be additional money there. The support grant, while it has been simplified to six per cent across the board, does have one redeeming factor—that no one will receive less than 95 per cent of what that municipality got the year before. But that's little comfort for a municipality that only got a three per cent or a four per cent increase last year; they couldn't manage on that because their spending just had to exceed the limits that were designated by the province.

I can't wholeheartedly support this expenditure of money because I don't think it has taken into consideration the real problem of the municipalities, and that is that the municipalities want to deal with their finances according to their own priorities. The minister must know there are those areas in the province that reject the concept of a regional health unit and will take a smaller subsidy. There are those areas in the region which reject the idea of having the regional police force in their area, and they pay their levy to the region. This happens in the Niagara region. They are satisfied with the provincial police force, even though they have to pay for the regional police force.

The autonomy of the local municipality is not enhanced by this budget. The uncon-

dional grants, instead of getting better, are getting worse, in that they are only increased by less than 10 per cent.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a number of comments to make about this particular bill. I guess the main one is one of disappointment that the minister has come along, taken the torch from the former Treasurer, and it is sputtering over there and not doing anything particularly as far as the municipalities are concerned; and that's what we are talking about in this particular bill.

Moreover, his words in the budget where he, with resignation, indicates that mill rates are going to go up this year, are one of the keys to understanding this budget for the election year of 1975. The Treasurer had decided that he could not raise provincial taxes, even after he had gotten the deficit up to \$1.6 billion, or thereabouts. Some things still had to give. And what had to give, he decided, would not be an agency that would come back into his lap, it would be the municipalities.

I am sorry that the Treasurer is leaving; I hadn't even worked up to a climax yet, Mr. Speaker. But it does worry us that the municipalities are being asked to carry the can, and they will be asked to take the responsibility for provincial decisions which ought to be reflected in provincial tax changes. There is not that kind of courage around here, Mr. Speaker.

The municipal financial crisis has been with us for as long as this parliament has sat. We have had some efforts to solve it. In fact, if one wanted to be fair, one could say that in some small ways municipal taxation is a bit fairer and a bit more equitable today than it was three or four years ago. That hardly means, however, that the basic financial problems of municipalities have been solved.

Those basic problems are that municipal revenues simply have not been expanding in line with the municipal responsibilities. Senior levels of government continue to pour responsibility on to the local level, but they do not give revenues commensurate with the responsibilities. The fastest growing area of government services that the citizens are seeking is at the local level, whether it is in recreation, whether it is in social services, whether it is in services for the aged, whether it is protection or safety, minimum standards,

rooming house standards, that kind of thing—all of these things come back down to the local level.

In many cases, citizens' groups and so on are seeking a much more active role in planning their communities. That costs money. They want to restructure the orientation of streets, they want to make their area more pleasant. That affects their municipal budget. They want to get their municipality involved in a big way in housing, as in the case of the city of Toronto. That, too, as we all know, requires very substantial sums of money. And those sums of money are not coming from the very rigid tax base to which municipalities are forced to adhere.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but various actions by the government have had the effect of making life that much more difficult for municipal governments. Chief among these is the fact that assessment reform has now dragged on in this province for a period of about seven years, I believe, and is still not complete. Some time after the election, we are told, we may have an updated assessment roll.

Now, let's face it, there has been a growth in the municipal tax base, because of inflation, because of the increase in construction, because of renovations and that kind of thing of the property on which municipalities depend for so much of their revenues. But that has not been reflected in the tax base because the assessments have been frozen now for a period of about three or four years. And that freeze, I understand, is to continue until 1976 or 1977.

One fears that there may be a boondoggle there that will never end, and that we will never, in fact, see a reform of the assessment system so long as this government is in power.

I fear specifically—since I have heard nothing to the contrary—that the government hasn't a clue about what changes it will make to the market value assessments once it has them in order to ensure a measure of social equity between various classes and types of property holders, whether they be owners or tenants. It's a tragedy that we didn't get into assessment reform in an evolutionary kind of way so that these adjustments could have been worked out over a period of time, rather than having a new assessment which will be launched full-blown on the province in two or three years' time.

The province has flirted with the idea of the municipal foundation plan, as we have called it, ever since it was introduced in this Legislature by the member for York South

(Mr. MacDonald) about 1963 or 1964, I believe, or 1965. This party has recommended since that time that, in the same way as we do for education, we should ensure the municipalities are not shortchanged because of a deficient assessment base in providing a level of services to their citizens.

The minister, who is responsible for almost everything in the government, knows full well that we have too much growth and development in areas like Toronto and too little in the east and north of the province; for that matter, in many of the small towns. One of the reasons is that those areas have been chronically starved for local revenues in order to provide the infrastructure and the services that would provide housing, attract industry, provide social services and recreation and the other things we expect from local government nowadays.

If a municipality in north Frontenac wants to add a mill to its tax rate it may come up with an extra revenue of \$5 or \$10 per capita of the people who live within its borders. If a municipality within 20 miles of where we are today adds a mill to its tax rate it may get twice, three, five, even 10 times that amount of money in tax revenues. Therefore, the obvious result is that the overdeveloped areas of the province are encouraged to continue overdeveloping. They continue to add amenities, industrial land, infrastructure and so on, which makes them more attractive for growth. The self-perpetuating qualities of growth are continued and, in the meantime, the poor areas of the province starve.

Surely we have come to the stage, Mr. Speaker, where we could have a foundation plan of the province which ensured that every municipality could afford to provide the same level of services for the same tax burden expressed in mills on an equalized tax rate. In other words, a tax rate of 20 mills in north Frontenac or in northern Ontario or in some other less favoured part of the province would produce the same kind of revenues per capita, the same kind of ability to provide services, that the same number of mills would produce down here.

That's not the situation right now and the catch up entailed in the minister's proposal, in this bill, is only 60 per cent of the deficiency and is only to a maximum of 25 per cent of the total tax levied on the part of a municipality. Obviously that doesn't hurt. Obviously that is welcomed by those municipalities which receive it but when it is so little and has taken so long to come and has a ceiling of only 25 per cent of the overall revenues clearly, it doesn't do anything sub-

stantial to close the very large gap that's built up over decades between the services and facilities of the smaller towns in the poorer areas of the province and the very fast growth areas, the overdeveloped areas, particularly those around Toronto.

It's been the policy of the government, Mr. Speaker, over the last few years that there will be a de-emphasis on property tax and for that I give it credit. That credit having been given, however, one has to read very carefully what the minister is saying now because the government has decided, in its wisdom, that because property tax has now become a smaller part of family incomes in the province, therefore there is tax room which it can proceed to exploit.

It will exploit the municipalities by making them impose the taxes. It will exploit the taxpayers by reinstituting a regressive tax which everybody agreed a few years ago ought to become less and less important and, some said, ought to be entirely eliminated.

That isn't the policy of the government at all. In a cynical kind of fashion, it is saying that for a while it though it could reduce the burden of the property tax but now that it's to its convenience to think otherwise, it does think otherwise and it is going to let the property taxpayer suffer. Property taxes are going to revive or be restored to the share of income that they were three or four years ago, if not more. Tax increases this year of 15, 20, 25, or even 30 per cent, in the mill rate will be tolerated by the government. If anybody asks why, the government will say that the municipal councils aren't exercising restraint.

The other day, Mr. Speaker I saw something distributed by the province itself. It showed the increases in cost that the provincial government was experiencing in its purchasing. Those increases in cost are felt at the municipal level as well and you can't avoid them because you are a municipality, Mr. Speaker. You can't say: "I'm sorry, the Treasurer tells me to exercise restraint. Therefore, I can only give you a dime a gallon less for the petroleum product or \$5,000 less for the truck or \$10,000 less than you are asking for the bulldozer or 20 per cent less than what you are asking for concrete pipe.

Obviously those kinds of favours aren't available. Municipalities have got to pay the costs which are entailed in the present inflation. No matter how much restraint they practise, an enormous part of their budgets is in uncontrollable areas, such as social assistance, such as day care, such as maintenance and such as the continuation of established

programmes which there is no way you can turn off, Mr. Speaker. It is exceptionally difficult and rather nugatory, if I can quote the member for Lakeshore, I hope correctly—

Mr. Lawlor: It is nugatory.

Mr. Cassidy: It is nugatory to tell the municipalities they should have been exercising restraint when they are finding it very difficult to keep their mill rates down even with no increase in programmes at all. In my case, in the municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, I think the capital programme budget has been cut to the point where there are virtually no new road programmes at all to offer the minister an example.

I grant the minister there are certain cases where municipalities are not exercising restraint. I have in mind the plans of the minister's buddies in North York, where, Paul Godfrey came from, to build an enormous, fancy, new municipal centre somewhere up at Yonge and Finch at a cost of about \$30 million or \$40 million. We don't think that kind of thing should go on. We don't believe in it. We believe the Ontario Municipal Board, or the ministry in its control over capital budgeting, should tell the municipalities that this is not the year for that kind of extravaganza.

But in the main, for most municipalities Mr. Speaker, you will find that the mill rates that are going up are going up because of essentials; or the mill rates that are going up are going up because of settlements that have been reached through the collective bargaining process, which are fair settlements; or the mill rates are going up because of arbitrations, as for example the police arbitration here in the city of Toronto, a system imposed by the province, which created difficulties for the police commission here in Metro Toronto. These are the kinds of things that are making municipal costs rise.

That's not to speak of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that a large reason for the reduction or the flattening out of mill rates—and it's certainly not been a reduction in many parts of the province—has been in the field of education.

In the field of education, which is where a large part of the provincial dollars is going to go in grants this year, there are obviously going to be substantial increases in costs. The 12 per cent increase in grants from the government will not be sufficient to accommodate those increases in costs. In fact, the 12 per cent increase in provincial grants is far below the increase in ceilings which has been allowed by the government.

You, therefore, get a situation, Mr. Speaker, where the government magnanimously says: "Look, we agree that we've been awfully tight on the school boards, we haven't let them spend enough money to provide quality education. We will, therefore, dish out \$50 here, \$80 there and a special grant there, and so on, on the ceiling." And it all looks as though Queen's Park is fulfilling its responsibilities.

When you get down to the figures, however, Mr. Speaker, as I can read them here from the documents that have been tabled by the minister, the amount for education is going to go up by only 12.7 per cent over 1974-1975. As a consequence, there will be an enormous additional burden put onto local school boards just to meet increases in their costs, without making any effort to take advantage of the increased ceilings in order to provide for added quality of education, for example, at the elementary level.

That's cynical too. Clearly the ministry and the government have now decided they will allow mill rates to go back up. They will permit property taxes on homes to go up to an average of \$1,000 or \$1,200 per annum, because that is where they are going to be over the next two or three years at the rate the ministry is going to go. They will permit property taxes on apartments to go up to the level of \$500 or \$600 or more per annum. And all of this is because they refuse to come in with fundamental tax reform but sort of cynically deal with it around the edges.

Mr. Speaker, the money that is going to the municipalities is going mainly in a conditional form. Education accounts for more than half of the total; money tied to transportation and transit—\$418 million—is about a sixth of the total; and funds for social assistance, which is basically a programme the municipalities have no discretion over at all, total \$164 million.

When you get down to it, that is a total of \$2.16 billion in conditional grants, compared with only \$324 million in unconditional grants. The unconditional grants are up by only 10 per cent and the conditional grants are up by 17 per cent.

Clearly a commitment to giving the municipalities more responsibility, more ability to plan their own affairs and more ability to set their own priorities, is not reflected in this budget insofar as municipal support is involved. It just isn't there, Mr. Speaker.

When you look at the unconditional grants even more closely, you find that even there there is really a form of conditionality involved, because half of the \$65-million in-

crease in grants is half in the police grants and will be used for law and order, since that has now been made a priority by the government in the Throne Speech and during the course of this particular session.

In fact, we don't disagree with that. The level of provincial financing for the provincial responsibilities carried out by local police forces is still inadequate. It seems rather ludicrous to us that between \$8 and \$12 per capita is spent on policing, while the total cost is about \$30 per capita for policing in most of the major municipalities in the province; the figure may even be higher than that. Provincial support therefore is only about one third; as a consequence, and despite these proclaimed priorities, provincial support for the police is at a lower level than the provincial support for local government activity in general.

The unconditional general support grant goes up by only \$17 million, and the per capita grant on a general basis is going up by the princely sum of \$1 million, or 13 or 14 cents for every Ontario citizen. That's the commitment of free money which is being given as part of this government's so-called commitment to allow municipalities greater freedom in planning their own affairs and in running their own finances.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the government is going to do if education costs go up by a higher amount than it expects, and we suspect there has been an understatement of some of the costs in the budget and that there will be even greater sums going into education, but we regret the fact that nothing is going over in the municipal side.

The New Democratic Party, as I have said, has advocated a foundation plan for municipal financing; we have advocated that over the past decade. We were glad when the government began to move in that direction two years ago. We are saddened by the fact the government is moving in such a halting, fleeting way.

We are also committed to providing a major access for municipalities to the provincial or federal income tax as an alternative to the property tax. We believe that in the case of regional municipalities, for example, their share of the income tax ought to be equal to two per cent, or two points, of income tax. We see this as a major reform, intended to ensure that municipalities can share in the growth of revenues in the province, rather than constantly having to appear on bended knee before the minister in order to try to get any crumbs that he may deign to give to them off his table. We believe that municipi-

palities should be dealt with as partners and not as subservients in the government picture, and we don't think the government is doing that. We don't believe that the government's comments about the hard-heartedness and intransigence of the federal government are a sufficient answer. Words do not buy services and the other things that municipalities have to provide. All they have had for year after year from the government has been words about how Ottawa won't come through and therefore how the provincial government is unwilling to act as well.

A province as strong and prosperous as this one generally is—regardless of our economic situation in this current year—can do far more for putting municipal financing on a sane, sound, long-term basis and giving municipalities the same kind of access to progressive tax sources as is enjoyed by the senior levels of government. We think that reforms ought to go in that way. We believe this particular bill simply fiddles around with the problem and the municipalities and their taxpayers are going to be the victims, particularly in this inflationary and recessionary year when there will be so many substantial and hard-to-bear local property tax increases, which will hit people in the most regressive fashion in the way that they can least well bear and a way which will be particularly cruel at a time when many people are suffering from stagnant income, declining income, from unemployment and all the other problems to which we're subject this year.

That said, I haven't quite convinced myself that we will oppose the bill. However, it is with absolutely no enthusiasm at all, and with great regret at opportunities lost, that we will reluctantly support this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Parry Sound.

Mr. L. Maeck (Parry Sound): Mr. Speaker, thank you. First of all, I would like to congratulate the minister on this piece of legislation. I would not like to seem ungrateful, particularly dealing with section 17 of this Act, for 7½ per cent mentioned, of course, for conditional grants to municipalities. In my riding, the district of Parry Sound, application has been made over the years many times to the government of the province to have Parry Sound included as part of northern Ontario.

The reasons for this are many. First of all, culturally, the people in Parry Sound feel that they are northern Ontario people. Long before there was any such thing as additional

grants for the northern part of the province, Parry Sound was already then talking about becoming part of the north. Of course, there has been a great incentive since the additional grants to the northern areas of the province have come into effect. The pressure has built up over these last two or three years. I would like to point out to the hon. minister that Parry Sound is the only territorial district in the province that is not a part of northern Ontario. The district municipality of Muskoka is now under regional government and has received untold thousands of dollars from this government in the transformation from a territorial district to a regional municipality.

I had the occasion to attend a meeting yesterday of the Parry Sound Municipal Association, which again passed another resolution asking the government to reconsider the decision that has been made through section 17 of this particular Act. I would like to ask the minister to tell us, when he is giving us his remarks, if this section covers Cameron and Chisholm townships in the district of Nipissing, which are not considered part of northern Ontario at the present time and are not receiving any additional grants of any kind.

I compare the district of Parry Sound with the district of Nipissing because they're our neighbours. Nipissing is economically much better off than the district of Parry Sound and is subject to all the northern Ontario unconditional grants, whereas the district of Parry Sound has been deprived of these particular grants that are given to northern Ontario.

The matter of education, of course, comes into this. It is not just a matter of unconditional grants to the municipalities. However, that's the only thing we can talk about in this particular bill, I guess.

I would ask the minister perhaps to think about amending this bill in some way to include Parry Sound completely in northern Ontario, rather than this piecemeal fashion. I would also remind him that many ministries in this government have already treated Parry Sound as part of northern Ontario—as an example, the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, and the Ministry of Education in some parts of their grant system. I would just ask that this be given further consideration.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the minister's attention once again the situation in my own community and how we in the city of Windsor think we are being unfairly treated in the distribution of finances from the provincial government.

Quite often we like to compare ourselves with equal municipalities in an attempt to see if we are being treated in exactly the same fashion. The Windsor city manager, Mr. John Steel, prepared a substantial brief which was presented by Mayor Bert Weeks at the conference held in the city of London when the various members of cabinet met to listen to submission from municipalities in the southwestern Ontario area.

One of the problems in the community, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the request for a grant similar to that which would be received by the city of London, is the fact that we in the community, as a result of environmental projects find a disproportionate amount of the city's budget has to be spent as a result of orders from the Ministry of the Environment. That leaves the community without funds necessary to provide other needed and worthwhile projects.

We think that even though we may not be a regional government or a regional municipality, because of us not only providing services to the city of Windsor but to the surrounding areas, for all intents and purposes we are performing the responsibilities of a regional government.

It is not the fault of the community that there is no regional government imposed on it. I am not saying that it would want it imposed, but we think if responsibilities are the same in one part of the province as they are in the other, then the grant to the municipality should be exactly the same.

I would assume the minister was very familiar with the brief, because his reply to the municipality at the hearing, according to the press releases, was simply a flat no. But may I, Mr. Speaker, once again bring to his attention part of the brief so that he may, in rethinking the situation in the city of Windsor, give more consideration to it. The people in Windsor deserve the same type of consideration as is given to other municipalities.

The submission was made to the minister in the city of London one day in January. I don't intend to read the whole submission, because it is only pertinent paragraphs in the submission that I would like once again to

bring to the minister's attention. On page 15 of the brief it says:

Large municipalities, such as the city of Windsor and the city of London, have equal if not more responsibilities than some regional governments in the province.

The taxpayers are faced with the same increasing costs and the requirements for services are similar to those governed by two-tier government.

The province has seen fit to give substantially more grants to the regional governments and, frankly, I do not see the justification.

I am reading from the brief and these are the mayor's words:

I believe that cities such as Windsor with equal responsibilities should receive grants equal to regional governments.

It appears that the basis of the property tax stabilization programme requires changing. There are some obvious inequities that the city of Windsor is victim of.

According to information supplied by the hon. John White where he outlined the review of the 1973 and 1974 tax stabilization programme, the city of London was entitled to \$6,936,000 in 1973 and \$9,476,000 in 1974 whereas the city of Windsor was entitled to \$4,985,000 and \$5,811,000 respectively.

These figures include the per capita grant and since London has approximately 32,000 people more than Windsor, they would be entitled to an additional \$256,000 as a per capita grant whereas the differential in 1974 grants is estimated at over \$3.5 million.

We don't begrudge the city of London additional moneys but we feel that Windsor should receive similar unconditional grants. There is something drastically wrong with a formula that would generate such discrepancies in grants to cities with similar size and similar service requirements. The controls that are placed upon expenditures under the property tax stabilization programme do not take into account the unusual and non-recurring expenses that such municipalities are faced with.

For example, in 1974, Windsor was required to spend approximately \$500,000 in nutrient removal costs, such as purchase of chemicals and so forth, none of these costs of a capital nature. This was an expenditure which was generated by the requirements of the Ministry of Environment and yet those costs are included in determining our

expenditure increase of 1974 over 1973 and could result in our receiving a lower grant from the province.

Mr. Speaker, I could read more but I think the minister understands exactly what I am trying to convey to him—that the need of the community of Windsor is just as great as the community of London. Whether one happens to have a regional government or not to be under regional government, if one is providing facilities which are on a regional basis, for the sake of financial assistance, it should be exactly the same as a regional government.

I could read into the record an editorial in support of additional financial assistance to the city. It was an editorial in the Windsor paper in April. I know that coming from the Windsor paper it would be putting a Windsor point of view. I don't intend to read it, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure the minister is aware of this Windsor situation. He is aware of the unusual expenditures in relation to the protection of the environment.

I would respectfully suggest to him that he reconsider the grants for the community and increase them substantially so the citizens of Windsor would be able to enjoy exactly the same treatment as is given to the city of London or is given to regional governments.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Do any other members wish to speak to this bill?

The minister.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could answer the questions raised in the reverse order if I may. Sometimes it does one good to go backwards.

Speaking about Windsor and the comments of my friend from Windsor-Walkerville, I am aware of Windsor's problems and we answered a number of the mayor's concerns of that day—or attempted to answer them. There are enormous differences between London and Windsor and I would be glad to provide the documentation to the member which we provided to the mayor.

Mr. B. Newman: Will the minister do so?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes.

Mr. B. Newman: Thanks.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It indicates that Windsor is relatively much better off. We really can't have it both ways. Most of us in this House subscribe to the principle of the resource equalization grant. My friends in the New Democratic Party talk about a

foundation plan; in some ways one and the same thing. It happens that Windsor is a more advantaged municipality than London in terms of financial strength, in terms of hourly wages and a whole host of other ways. Windsor doesn't like to admit that, but those are the facts of life.

I would point out that a part of that brief concerned itself with the controls on spending which were part of the old general support grant, and that Windsor had had trouble living with them because of special circumstances—whatever they were; environmental—and that, of course, has been recognized in this new Act and in this new budget, and the general support grant is a flat amount.

The other point that the member makes is that Windsor claims it provides regional services. One might ask, do they not charge for it? In fact, don't they make a profit at it? I'd be very surprised if Windsor is not selling water to St. Clair Beach, to Tecumseh and to several other municipalities in the same way that my city of Chatham sells water to people who live in the riding of Kent, to people who live in Harwich township, and I believe that they charge double rates; an enormous sum.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Therefore, I hardly think they're entitled to a provincial regional subsidy. That's not the purpose of it. Windsor provided those services on its own volition as opposed to being part of a region, and I would suggest that my friend from Windsor-Walkerville talk to his seatmate the member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt), and he will find out some of the costs—that was part of my friend's remarks—the costs associated with a region. Therefore, not regretfully, I would say that it's just a fact of life that we are not proposing to make regional grants available to cities such as Windsor or Chatham or London, which are not parts of regional governments. We're talking apples and oranges.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Why isn't Chatham part of a regional government?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Because they are now part of a study and they may well be. Ask why Windsor isn't or why London isn't, and the reasons are exactly the same—because there wasn't the local initiation of the projects.

My friend from Parry Sound raised the question of whether Parry Sound was in northern Ontario or southern Ontario. We've

moved to recognize its unique position in this year's budget. I will, of course, continue to review the uniqueness of that position and the financial position of the district of Parry Sound. I will particularly look at the two townships which he mentions and which perhaps can be changed by regulation, and I would also say to him that we have begun a review of provisions of grants and programmes in other ministries which are applicable to northern Ontario as opposed to southern Ontario, and which perhaps should be reviewed in the light of the unique circumstances of the district of Parry Sound, or the municipalities in the district of Parry Sound. We have undertaken that review and will certainly undertake a more general review of its uniqueness as the days go by. For the record, the two townships which he mentioned are Cameron and Chisholm.

Finally, the remarks of my friend from Kitchener—

Mr. Good: Waterloo.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: From Waterloo, I'm sorry. What it all boils down to is that the amount of money would never seem to be enough. The municipalities, the agencies, would always like to have more.

I simply point out the table which was contained in the document which was tabled on April 8, outlining the assistance to local governments and taxpayers. He didn't like the heading that was on table C5, I think it is, in the main budget. Surely the heading should simply be, "Provincial Assistance to Reduce Local Tax Rates." That's what it's all about. Whether it goes to school boards or municipalities or to children's aid societies, one way or another, or conservation authorities, the purpose of provincial assistance and transfers is to reduce the burden on local taxpayers, whether they pay it directly or whether, for that matter, they pay it through their rents, or through the prices of things which they buy, which reflects in the commercial mill rates.

The interesting part about that table in the April 8th document is the fact that provincial revenue has risen between 1969-1970 and 1975-1976 at a compounded rate of about 12.6 per cent per year, from \$4.4 billion to nearly \$9 billion. During that time, provincial assistance to local governments, to agencies and to education, has risen from \$1.08 billion to this year's estimated figure of \$2.7 billion, or at a rate of 16.5 per cent.

In short—and I think this is most important—our assistance to local governments as a percentage of provincial revenue has risen from

something like 24½ per cent in 1969-1970 to an estimated 30.1 per cent this year. I don't want to hold out hope that this is going to continue to rise. We have made the Edmonton commitment; we will honour the Edmonton commitment. I don't know that we will be able to do more than the Edmonton commitment, not having adequate tax room from the senior level of government—we may talk about that—in Ottawa. We simply have not got the growth in our revenue to go on transferring larger and larger amounts of revenue to the municipalities and to the school boards.

We have had some discussion here this afternoon about conditional grants vs unconditional grants simply by reducing the grants ment perhaps it becomes somewhat academic. We could pay more in municipal unconditional grants simply by reducing the grants that are given through the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, for example; we could lower those grants from 50 per cent to 40 per cent, and put more into the unconditional grants. We could reduce the transit grants, which are conditional grants, from whatever they are—say from 50 per cent down to 25 per cent—and add that to the unconditional grants. But I am here to say that the total amount isn't going to change, because we have difficulty living up to the Edmonton commitment; and barring large new sources of revenue from Ottawa.

Really, we have arrived at the point that when municipalities ask for increases in grants, as they did in asking that the children's aid societies' grants, which go to the municipalities, be increased from 60 per cent to 80 per cent—I believe that works out to something like \$8 million in this year's budget—then the money comes right out of what is left over to put in the unconditional grant. That's part and parcel of the Edmonton commitment, and I hope I made that point to the municipal liaison committee this afternoon.

It would be fine if we lived in a world where everybody had pockets that never emptied, but our pockets are not that full. We will live up to the commitment we have made, but we cannot go on transferring larger and larger percentages of our revenue to the municipalities. In fact, we have increased our transfers this year by about 16 per cent, whereas our own expenditures have only risen about 12 per cent. How long we can go on doing that, I simply don't know.

Finally, I might respond to one further point which was raised by the member for Waterloo; it is really part of the next bill, but

perhaps I might deal with it here because he raised it here. I refer to the freezing of the split between the commercial and industrial mill rate on the one hand, and the residential and farm rate on the other hand. It is in both bills.

This is probably one of the most significant moves being made this year in terms of tax reform. It means that over the years we have frozen that split at 15 per cent, first of all in Metropolitan Toronto and in the other regions as they came into being, and were able to cushion the shock of doing so in the restructured county of Oxford. As a result, nearly 70 per cent of the population lives in a part of the province where the split mill rate is frozen. We are now extending it to the other municipalities in the province.

Mr. Lawlor: Weren't we going to abolish the split mill rate at one time?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The very first thing we have to do is to get hold of it, and we do that in this bill. The money is there to cushion that, and it is not going to be much of an upset to get hold of it. In effect, one could abolish it or one can, with great certainty, widen it out. One could abolish it and just use the business tax but the first thing one must do is get hold of it. It wandered all over the place and varied from municipality to municipality.

In terms of tax reform or in moving to tax reform, this isn't tax reform in itself. This is a rather significant step which my friend from Waterloo North mentioned and I put those remarks in conjunction with it on the record.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Mr. Good: If it's going to third reading could I ask the minister one question which I thought would be dealt with in committee?

Mr. Speaker: Will the minister allow a question?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes.

Mr. Good: It's on section 15

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Let it go to committee and we'll deal with all of it if the member wants.

Mr. Speaker: All right; to committee of the whole House.

Agreed.

MUNICIPAL AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves second reading of Bill 41, An Act to amend the Municipal Act.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: Thank you. My remarks are brief because many of these provisions are covered in the previous bill, the first being that the provision for split mill rate now will be uniform across the province as indicated in the previous bill and will no longer need to be designated in section 302 of the Municipal Act.

I don't know what the significance is now that the minister determines the various institutions on which municipalities may levy an amount in the nature of a tax. Formerly it was done by the Lieutenant Governor in Council or the cabinet. Now each minister has the authority to designate those institutions within his jurisdiction. This includes other institutions in addition to those we've had for some time such as the universities. It was extended to the Ministry of Community and Social Services, certain mental health units and so forth and other educational units.

Now the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) is brought into it and agricultural research stations are included. An amount is paid to the municipality in lieu of taxes of \$5 per acre for the first 100 acres of agricultural research stations and \$2 per acre in excess of 100 acres. If my memory serves me correctly, perhaps the minister could answer this—I believe this is comparable to the municipal taxation of provincial parks. I think the rate is the same in that bill as in this. There is the limit of over 10,000 acres when the rate reduces and, if I'm not mistaken, that's the same as provincial park payments so that is kept even.

There is one thing about this bill that needs some explanation. I just don't understand why the previous limitation of 25 per cent of municipal tax is lifted. In other words, if more than 25 per cent of the municipal tax base is raised by grants in lieu of taxes under this bill, the municipality could not collect more than 25 per cent. It just got 25 per cent. That limitation is lifted except, Mr. Speaker, for institutions designated by the Development Services Act, 1974. I presume those are institutions under the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Brunelle) and would include such

things as Ontario Hospital schools and mental institutions.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is not a direct exception made to counteract the argument going on in Montague township at the present time. The municipality is collecting tax on the institution. It is providing those services, granted, but it is a windfall to the township and I understand pressure is being put on it because of the money it gets because it has an Ontario Hospital school in the little township. Pressure is being put on it to help pay fire and water services to the town of Smiths Falls. Surely this exception is not being made just to put that one little municipality over a barrel. I'd like to hear the minister's reply on that.

There is another rather amusing thing, Mr. Speaker, in view of the controversy we had when the Oxford bill was passed. It's unfortunate the member for Oxford (Mr. Parrott) isn't here as he will now see that, according to this bill, reconstructed Oxford county is now in the same category as a regional municipality for this purpose. Well, we told him all along they were making a regional government out of Oxford, and one piece of legislation after another seems to confirm it. Those are all the remarks I have, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, any major matters that may be under this bill we will discuss in committee. Since the minister is good enough to send them all to committee, this one may as well go there too.

I have only one or two comments, one having to do with the designation by the minister. I'm thoroughly in accord with that. The responsibilities of the executive council or the cabinet are much too great these days to have to have this matter go through the Lieutenant Governor in Council. The greater the power the better that the minister can constitute in his own department and elsewhere the delegating out or relieving of cabinet of machinery matters of this and minutia with which he is completely loaded.

The government is not streamlined in there at all. There are whole diversities of things that could be settled by far inferior tribunals or by persons than what the cabinet is obliged to do under innumerable Acts of this Legislature. This is a case in point. It's the first instance I've noticed where that sub-delegation and that reference out are encompassed in legislation, and as I say it's a good thing.

The other matter is that I was a little bit amused by subsection 7 and its requirements and as to exactly why the minister is lifting that. What is the impact of it and the meaning of this removal of the 25 per cent situation in this context? What's it designed to do?

Mr. Speaker: Do any other hon. members wish to speak to this bill? The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, subsection 7, removing the 25 per cent, does exactly what my friend from Waterloo North says it will do, which is to straighten away a situation in Montague township and which really doesn't affect any other municipality. That's subsection 7. Subsection 8 was necessary to maintain the limitation for 1974 only since the designation of beds was made in January, 1975, for both years. It doesn't carry on.

Mr. Good: Will the Treasurer read that again?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We'll come back to it in committee. That's the reason that subsection is there at the urging of the member for Lanark (Mr. Wiseman) who had a problem. He didn't have a problem, but there is a problem, as my friend from Waterloo North knows, in the township of Montague. It is rather complex—one would not believe how complex—but this subsection does straighten it away. My staff assure me that subsection 8 does not unstraighten it away. Perhaps by the time we get into committee of the whole we'll have that straightened away.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: I understand this is to go to committee of the whole House also.

Agreed.

Clerk of the House: The second order, House in committee of the whole.

ONTARIO LOAN ACT

House in committee on Bill 29, An Act to authorize the raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any comments, questions or amendments to any section of the bill and, if so, to what section? The hon. minister.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): There are

amendments, Mr. Chairman, on sections 2, 5, and 7.

Mr. Chairman: I am wondering if we are on the same bill, Mr. Minister, this is Bill 29.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I'm sorry, I thought we were on Bill 28. It's Bill 28 I want to go to first.

Mr. Chairman: I'm sorry. We'll call another order.

ONTARIO HOME BUYERS GRANT ACT

House in committee on Bill 28, An Act to provide for the Payment of Grants to First Time Home Buyers.

Mr. Chairman: The minister has amendments on sections 2, 5 and 7. Are there any comments or questions on section 1?

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Yes.

On section 1:

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: Clause d.

Mr. Chairman: On clause d. I assume the subsections of the clause will carry up to d? Agreed.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, this is a section that limits the "period of eligibility" from April 8 to Dec. 31, 1975. The part to which I object particularly is the fact that this particular section limits the first-time home buyer to this calendar year. I think it has been pointed out by various economists and various people that there is no guarantee that suddenly, come fall, everything in the economy is going to turn and things are going to be on the up and up; that the house buying cycle will no longer need any stimulation; that house building will no longer need any stimulation.

Limiting the \$1,000 grant for first-time home buyers to this particular year seems to be a Band-Aid measure in an industry that is suffering very badly for various reasons, and we are not going to go into those particular reasons. So I would like to move an amendment, if it is in order, Mr. Chairman, to section 1, clause d.

Mr. Good moves that subsection 1, clause d be amended by deleting therefrom the

words "to and including the first day of December, 1975."

Mr. Good: Is the minister going to support that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well Mr. Chairman, just commenting very briefly, and I think we discussed this a bit on second reading, what we are looking for, of course, is short-term stimulation. There were two or three places in the budget where short-term stimulation was prescribed, and particularly in the housing area. It's our best estimate, confirmed by a great number of others, that by the end of this year—the last quarter particularly—hopefully we can move some of that recovery forward. The economy should be back, not to full potential, but certainly in a healthier condition than it is now.

Quite frankly, I don't think the finances of the province, which are in good shape, could sustain for a long period of time such measures as the reduction in the sales tax or the home owners' grants; nor should it be necessary. Basically the economy, for example, which was producing houses at the rate of 110,000 two years ago, dropped off to 85,000 last year. The industry and everything associated with it needs the stimulation and we would hope that by the end of the year we would see housing starts back to a more acceptable level.

What I said on budget day was that I don't preclude the possibility that we're going to have to take a look at things again. We will be continually monitoring the economy to see if further stimulation is needed; or for that matter if the economy becomes too stimulated and starts to inflate too much, then within the limits of our ability here in Ontario we will take the kind of action which is necessary.

It may well be that this powerful measure will need to be extended. I think that it is much too early to say that at this moment. I think that what we also have to bear in mind is to see what kind of stimulation is applied to the economy by Mr. Turner in his budget, which he has now indicated is necessary and presumably it will be stimulatory, if there is such a word; it will be a budget which will provide stimulation to the economy and, hopefully, we've suggested to him, the housing and construction industry in particular. Therefore, regretfully, I cannot accept my friend's amendment.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, there is one further thing I want to say which is of most

importance to me. I object to the way this is worded in that they can cut this off at the end of the year without further debate at that time. To me it would make much more sense to bring in the measure and then at such time as the government thinks the measure should be cancelled out, at least there would be a debate at that time and it would have to rescind the provisions of this bill or repeal the legislation at that time. There would be a chance for discussion before they could cancel the provisions of this bill. This is the same thing they pulled on the sales tax thing. They reduce it for a nine-month period, and come the end of the nine months there's no debate in this legislature, no debate anywhere—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Back up to seven per cent.

Mr. Good: —no public opinion registered, not even a word from a member who is representing people. The sales tax automatically goes up to seven per cent without any further debate.

We see the same thing here. The Treasurer is bringing in a measure which is undoubtedly a good measure, because it received the support of this caucus. Consequently, he can bring that to an end at the end of the year regardless of what the financial condition is in the province, regardless of what the housing position is in the province, and nobody in this Legislature will have one word to say.

I don't think that's right. That's doing two pieces of legislation in one bill nine months apart and I don't think that the minister's crystal ball is that clear and that he can forecast that accurately. His own budgets have shown that.

That is the real major objection to doing this all in one step instead of in two steps. Bring it in and then cancel it, and if the opposition or the people of the province felt it was not an opportune time to cancel that particular programme, at least there would be a public debate and this forum would be the vehicle through which it could be done. That is now being denied.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on the amendment?

All those in favour of Mr. Good's motion will please say "aye".

Those opposed will please say "nay".

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

I declare the amendment defeated and the section carried.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. Chairman: Are there any further amendments, comments or questions?

Mr. Good: Section 2, subsection 2.

Mr. Chairman: I'm wondering if we might have the minister's amendment first and then we will continue the discussion.

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves that subsection 2 of section 2 of the bill be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

No grant shall be made to a person applying therefor where at any time prior to April 8, 1975: (a) that person or the spouse of that person owns, whether jointly with another person or otherwise, a housing unit in Ontario that was ordinarily inhabited as the principal residence by that person or his spouse; or (b) by any other person who has an interest in the housing unit in respect of which the application for the grant is made, or the spouse of that person who owned, whether jointly with another person or otherwise, a housing unit in Ontario that was ordinarily inhabited as the principal residence by that person or his spouse.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I may say, by way of explanation, that subsection 2 presently prevents any applicant or his spouse who has previously owned a principal residence in Ontario from applying for a grant. This amendment extends that prohibition to a co-owner or a spouse of the co-owner.

As a result, no grant will be made to an applicant where the co-owner of the property or the spouse of that co-owner has previously owned a principal residence in Ontario. Does that make it clear?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): What about outside the province?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: If I gather the implication there, the minister is saying that divorced people, whose former spouses had owned property, would now be excluded from applying for this grant. If that interpretation is correct, I will have to have a moment to think about it.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any further discussion on the minister's amendment?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I think the member's concern is something else.

Mr. Good: Yes, my concern is something else.

Mr. Gaunt: Just on a matter of clarification, Mr. Chairman, I presume from what the minister says that this doesn't apply to anyone outside the province. For instance, a couple could have a home in Saskatchewan, move down to the Province of Ontario and apply for this grant and do so quite legitimately?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That's right. I think that's one of the things we want to encourage. If somebody moved here tomorrow from Saskatchewan or from Alberta, although the movement seems to be the other way these days, but if that did happen—or for that matter from Newfoundland—and this was to be his principal residence, then one of the purposes of this Act, of course, is to encourage that person to buy a home to get this market moving. If he buys a new home, of course, it impacts directly on the housing industry situation. If he buys a used home it undoubtedly has a secondary impact on the housing industry. So we wouldn't draw this distinction between whether they're—

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): They are all Canadians.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They are all Canadians, that's right.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): I think (a) is all right; as I see it it is simply renunciation basically of sub 2. But (b) bothers me a bit. It says:

... any other person who has an interest [the word interest is the niggling word] in the housing unit with respect of which the application for the grant is made, or the spouse of that person, owned a housing unit that was ordinarily inhabited...

My problem is, suppose somebody is renting the premises and then during the period involved here decides to buy them. Is the kind of interest of which the minister is speaking that kind of an interest?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am sorry, I missed the end of that.

Mr. Lawlor: Very often there are situations where people have been living in a house as tenants, with a landlord, for quite a while. That's certainly an interest in law. It's a personality interest and not an interest in real property, properly speaking. Suppose

those individuals made a deal with the landlord to buy the house during this period of time when the \$1,500 might be available to them. Is that feasible? I take it that the wording here wouldn't rule that possibility out. The tenants would then become the owners—the purchasers—and would, nevertheless, qualify for the grant.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, let me say two things.

The amendment that I have moved picks up joint owners of a property other than a spouse, and I think this leads into the question which my friend from Lakeshore has asked.

Mr. Lawlor: That's all the minister is concerned with, just other than spouse?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It refers to a joint tenant interest. It refers to a tenant in common or a joint tenant. It doesn't include a person who rents, but a joint tenant or a tenant in common. Is that the answer?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, I think that's right. In other words, what you are saying is that there may be a husband and wife here and another husband and wife over here. These are joint tenants—and these are joint tenants and these joint tenants joint tenantly conjoin. That's a possibility; or as tenants in common dividing a half of a half. All those combinations are possible, and I am taking what you are saying here—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Bob and Carol and Ted and Alice, or whatever it was.

Mr. Lawlor: I can't hear you. All right; I think I know what you are after and I think it probably does it.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: Yes, I have no objection to supporting the amendment. I think it is going a little bit far, but I suppose in today's society it's necessary with the intermingling of spouses and we have to accept that.

What I would like is a little direction, Mr. Chairman. If this amendment is approved the other principle in this particular section is that the grant will be given when no house has been previously owned in Ontario. On that particular aspect of this section, I would like to ask the minister a question. Is her limiting former ownership to Ontario because of inability to enforce the matter if people come from out of Ontario; or is it a matter of government policy that he would give this grant to people coming

in from out of the province, when people in the same circumstances living in Ontario would not qualify?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think that the member has said it. Both are correct. How can we prove—or at least it becomes difficult to prove—where they had owned a principal residence; how and when and where. In the second instance, if they are coming in, they are Canadians; they want to make their principal residence here in Ontario. Let's let them get on with it.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Can I ask a question about that particular section?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Can you explain to me what happens in a common law relationship? The common law relationship is now recognized by Ontario Housing Corp. under the HOME plan provided they sign for tenancy in common or ownership in common, whatever the actual legal term is. One of them, though, could quite easily have been in the position where they were joint purchasers of another accommodation at some previous time. Is that covered under this? Are they excluded?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: As I understand it from my friend from Lakeshore—

Mr. Deans: That's what I asked him and he—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, ask him.

Mr. Deans: Well, I did and he told me to ask you.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: He is not listening at the moment. He hasn't got his aid on.

Mr. Deans: But I asked him and he told me to ask you.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, we agreed. Yes, I think the problem the member is referring to is satisfied by this point.

Mr. Deans: It is?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is not necessarily a problem but the point the member was making is settled by this amendment.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, I would like to pose a question to the minister. I haven't too much objection to people out of the province not having to

have any residence requirements but I am envisaging a situation in which a foreigner—a foreign person from another country, maybe the United States—would come to Canada. He could take advantage of this giveaway programme as far as I read it. Usually, any time we give money away, whether it's old age pension, drug plans, GAINS programme or anything else, we have residence requirements in the legislation for those people who apply for this sort of a giveaway programme.

I am surprised at the largess I see here. Any person, providing he is 18 years of age, from any land or any province can come into this province and with a residency of only, say one day or one week, can obtain a \$1,000 grant from the Province of Ontario. This seems to fly in the face of any other programme which any government in this country has ever instituted. I wondered how you rationalize our past approach to these things with what I see in the present legislation.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, it doesn't differ. Remember that person has to establish that this is his principal residence and you can only have one principal residence. We don't see that there will be much of a problem in this area. It is probably a person who has been here for some time and it is reasonable to assume that he is on his way to citizenship. If he said Ontario is going to be his principal residence, he's probably on his way through to gaining his citizenship.

Mr. Germa: Have you laid down criteria in order to determine a principal residence?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It's laid down in a number of places. That's one of the reasons we pick up the same definition here so that we're not changing definitions. The principal residence criteria are found in all the income tax legislation, and we're using the same principles in this bill as is in other bills.

Mr. Germa: Should that not be cited in the bill?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I don't think you need to because principal residence is a well known definition.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, I think the matter of giving this grant to people who have owned property as a principal residence outside of Ontario, and then giving it to them when they come into Ontario needs a little

more discussion. You're either trying to help people to get into homes, and if you do that you should be doing it only for Ontario residents, or else you're trying to get an excess supply of houses off the market.

I'm sure the only houses on the market now are overpriced and in a high price range. If that's what you're trying to do, to help the developers to sell their overpriced houses, I don't think you should be giving the grant to people who come in from outside the province.

If you're trying to get people into houses, the average person is going to be helped by the \$1,000 or \$1,500 because he has not owned a house previously. He hasn't built up equity. He or she has not benefited from inflation by owning property. Those are the people this benefit should be given to. But when you say you'll give it to anybody who hasn't owned a house in Ontario, you could very well be giving it to people coming in who have owned property previously. They've built up equity and they've benefited from inflation, whether it be in another part of Canada or in the US. They're coming in with their money and saying, "Gee, isn't that great? Although I work in Detroit, I'm going to move and buy a house over in Windsor, in Ontario, because I can get \$1,500 out of that government."

I don't think that principle is right, Mr. Chairman. Therefore, I think the minister should reconsider that. We have an amendment to this section which would delete the words "in Ontario, with any person or persons a housing unit that was ordinarily inhabited as a principal residence." That would exclude people whose principal residence is in any other jurisdiction. It's just maybe a difference in philosophy.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore. I would ask the member to make his remarks to the minister's amendment, please.

Mr. Lawlor: I'd rather not. I think the remarks of my friend were far broader than the minister's amendment.

Mr. Chairman: I think we should dispose of the amendment and then carry on with the debate.

Mr. Lawlor: Well the amendment broadens out the principle, cuts back the number of people who become eligible, meets this narrow, finessed criteria invented by the minister in order to pretend that he's a great Pooh-Bah while doing, really, very little;

namely the business of people owning other homes at previous times. They are simply ruled out of the picture and therefore, in this kind of constriction or restriction, he is able to move on a nice tightrope across the void.

However, one false step Darcy, and you'll fall into the swamp. As far as I can see, you're over the Niagara Gorge at the moment and it's likely to swallow you up.

The amendment moved by the minister broadens out the basic principle. However, we find it insufferable in his legislation. I won't take exception to that, but I would like to speak on section 2 before it's moved through.

Mr. Chairman: We'll put the amendment and that won't limit the discussion on section 2.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Chairman, has the minister clarified whether a person who lives in Detroit and owns a home there can now decide to move to Windsor? He's had a house in Detroit, he has been an owner. But it's a first-time owner in Ontario that counts, is that it?

Mr. Gaunt: He would be eligible.

Mr. Burr: It's the first-time ownership in Ontario, is that right?

Mr. Gaunt: Have we passed the amendment?

Mr. Chairman: We are going to vote on it now.

Mr. Good: Could we have further discussion on the section?

Mr. Chairman: On the section, yes.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Are people in northern Ontario going to be employed up there?

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the minister's amendment will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion the "ayes" have it.

Mr. Martel: Did anyone vote?

Mr. Chairman: Does the member for Lakeshore wish to comment further on section 2?

Mr. Lawlor: Just a word on that earlier section; because of conferences held over here we did not join in the debate.

We would agree with the Liberals; we would extend that time. We find a degree

of mercurialness on the part of the minister and pure visitation of the advantageous that serves his immediate purpose. To come here barefaced and to hold yourself up as having statesmen-like qualities, masked by wraiths of cynicism in this particular thing, does deserve some kind of philippic in the course of this House. What a put-down, what a pull-a-charade you make of this place. What deceptions you think you are capable of. It's a kind of petty aristocracy. A kind of primping and dancing takes place; people think it is a pirouette when all he is doing is falling flat on his face.

However, that isn't the main point of the thing. It is on the previous section; I thought we had better get it on the record in this regard.

As far as this one is concerned we would amend this. We think you should amend this with a view to setting up certain types of limitations and restrictions apart from the ones you have already moved and amended in the course of the House. We see no reason why homes going at \$200,000 or half a million dollars ought to enjoy the same benefits. We think there should be some kind of ceilings or some kind of criteria.

We don't think the criteria should be particularly on a means test basis, namely, the amount of money an individual is making himself. We do think you should give consideration in the course of this bill going through the House—if not then, at least perhaps, on a subsequent occasion—to limitation within the terms of the National Housing Act. The terms and conditions applicable in this regard are restrictive enough, Lord knows, with respect to the benefits under mortgages and what amounts may be conferred.

All we want is that the benefits to be given are not given to the wealthy; that it be restricted to those who need it and can use it and where it is beneficial and the impact is felt. You don't even lose any votes by it because there ain't that many guys with houses valued at a quarter of a million bucks who will pick up the \$1,500, as someone said here the other day, to take a little extra trip this year, which they might not otherwise have taken, down to Nassau or Barbados where they can roll in the surf with E. P. Taylor and the rest of the boys—even some of the girls, probably.

In any event, we would desire to see the thing restricted and limited in an area that would be beneficial if the legislation is to have any efficacy at all. I personally believe

it will be the reverse of beneficial, in the sense that the whole bally value of the \$1,500 is being eaten up, even as we stand here, in the escalation of prices. How can the minister, with an already severely restrictive economy, which has been in constant escalation, which fell for a while because of certain tax measures, add purchasing power or add demand into the economy?

The minister is always shaking his head or scratching it, or doing something with it—whatever he does with his head.

With respect to governmental spending, extra money is flushed into the economy, which has an exponential value with respect to the inflation. The Treasurer does it with respect to the most critically restricted area in the whole economy, namely with respect to housing, particularly in the metropolitan areas of this province. It is supposed to be a benefice, but when you turn over the rock you find worms underneath. You are making your own petty contribution to an increase in the price of housing in the province. So be it.

If you're going to do that, then I would ask you simply to restrict it to certain levels of houses and not to the emporiums of the rich; not to mansions; not to the high-flown. Keep it down to the \$50,000-\$65,000 levels where the people who are going to buy in that area need your pittance more than these other people of whom I'm speaking. You well know this. I don't understand the failure to place such limitations, some kind of intelligent limitations, upon this wide open piece of legislation which is in the process, on many counts—and I won't speak much longer—of thwarting itself. It's a thwarting action in many ways, and there is no reason why it should be quite so thwarting as it is.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville):

Mr. Chairman, I want to bring to the minister's attention a situation that I think would be unfair. Many of the people who are going to qualify for this first-time home buyer grant are young folk. They could be as young as 18 years of age. Yet an individual, who owned a home 18, 20 or 25 years ago, and has been in the rental field since then, now sees the effects of inflation and would like to invest his money in some type of a home as a hedge against inflation, he is being denied the opportunity of getting that \$1,500 homeowner grant.

I think, Mr. Minister, that maybe there should be something to enable that indi-

vidual, who hasn't owned a home for a considerable period of time, to be able likewise to qualify for the grant.

Then again there is the situation of the divorced individual who may have owned a home jointly with the husband and, having been divorced quite some time ago, likewise doesn't qualify for the grant. I think both of those individuals buying homes would stimulate the home market and home construction. In my estimation, it would be a worthwhile endeavour to include that type of a couple.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I have some concern with respect to the definition of principal residence. Frankly, I don't think that definition covers the problem with which I'm wrestling, and I think several other members are too.

I can see a situation here where a lot of people who went over to the United States during the depression of 1929-1930, lived over there, worked over there for all their working years and now as Canadians—they were born here—would like to come back. Many of them are coming back here. I think there's a substantial flow of older people who have spent all their working years in the United States, and are now coming back into the province. They have built up an equity over the years by living in the United States and owning a home. They come back here, they buy a home for the first time in Ontario, even though they may be 70 or 75, and even though they have owned a home in the United States and have built up a substantial equity in that property over the years because of inflation and so on, they can come back here and qualify under the terms of this Act for that \$1,500 grant.

Quite frankly, I don't think that's proper. Canadians, the minister says. Fine, I agree. Anybody living in this country. I can accept that. But I don't think we should be so generous as to provide \$1,500 out of the public treasury for people who have lived the greater part of their lives over in the United States, who were in the first place citizens of Canada and living in the province, were born in Ontario. We shouldn't provide those people with a \$1,500 grant, particularly when they've had a chance over their lifetime to build up a substantial equity in property in another country, mostly in the United States.

Frankly, I think the government is being over-generous, and as far as I'm concerned that's very unfair. I don't think the taxpayers in the Province of Ontario should have to subsidize those people who want to come back here and spend their latter years in the place of their birth. I think we've got to do something with the second section here to tighten it up.

Mr. Chairman: I'm wondering if the hon. minister would like to comment on the observations of the two previous speakers.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, I'll just deal with two or three points. The other day my friend from Windsor-Walkerville raised the point of the person who lived in a mobile home 18 years ago. I think it was. That probably wouldn't be now, but 18 or 20 years ago—and I'm not going to give a legal interpretation—I doubt very much whether that would have been described at that point in time as a principal residence. We are having enough trouble getting that fact established—

Mr. B. Newman: No mobile home, really, would be considered as a principal residence, at least up until now.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They would be now. You can't have it both ways. You are one of the people pushing very strongly to have a recognition of prefabricated homes as suitable homes for a great number of people. But it wasn't considered that way 20 years ago.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Minister, in my comments the other day I did not make mention of a mobile homeowner 18 years ago or so.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: All right, you've mentioned people who perhaps bought a home today; you've mentioned people who bought a home 20 years ago, sold it, rented and now are going to buy a home as an investment. That's not the kind of person we are trying to help; a person who is out to buy a home as an investment. I regret they don't come under the provisions of this, but we are talking—just as the federal legislation does—about first-time home buyers.

Mr. B. Newman: You were concerned about stirring the economy.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Sure, if you want to stir it you open the doors and say that everybody who buys a home in the next nine months is going to qualify for the grant. That would really stir the pot.

Mr. B. Newman: Okay, okay.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I don't propose to do that. I think that we are trying to encourage first-time home ownership, and hopefully they remain as home owners. We all subscribe to that; at least most of us do.

Mr. Deans: We all do.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: But we are not opening the doors wide and saying to everybody who buys a house in the next period of time, we'll give you a grant to do it. That is not our intent. You are going to find situations where any one of us, I'm sure, for a variety of reasons might say we wished we'd written the Act in a little different way; but you are opening door after door after door.

I say to my friend who is worried about this, who are these people who are coming back? They are not really coming home. They are taking up residence in Canada again as permanent residents in Ontario or Canada. Are you really going to be that hard on them? They are not coming home. The truth of the matter is the people you are talking about probably are going the other way and establishing a permanent residence in a warmer climate, rather than coming back here.

Mr. Gaunt: Just for three months.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I don't really think you are opening the door to very many people in that category. My friend from Lakeshore raises the question about putting limits on, either income limits or limits on the value of the house. We are trying to stimulate an industry. You want to put all the controls on the first-time home buyer. there may be one person, before this programme is over, who is going to go out and buy a \$150,000 house—well, hallelujah. He's going to get the \$1,500 grant. By and large, the first-time home buyer is not going to be buying that kind of a house. Now, if you want to put on the red tape for which the NDP is famous, and on which it thrives—

Mr. Lawlor: We want to protect people—

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): You do a pretty good job of putting on red tape too, you know.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If you want to put it on, and wrap it up in bureaucratic nonsense, it can be done—but you won't be doing the job we are setting out to.

Mr. Lawlor: It's open-handed largess to the rich.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: You love those controls and you love those forms—

Mr. Lawlor: Socialism for the rich, Darcy.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Your party would say we would need more social workers to get out to see that the needs test forms are filled in correctly.

Mr. Lawlor: We see the statistics—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: But we are not doing that in this programme. The federal government did put on limits; do you know how many houses have moved under their programme in Metro? Six hundred. Well, we want to move homes.

Mr. Lawlor: Their limits are too low. They changed them two weeks ago.

Hon. McKeough: We had 9,000 phone calls up until yesterday. We want to get this industry moving; and we are not going to wrap it up in bureaucracy, pink, socialistic forms and procedures. We reject that approach.

Mr. Martel: You are not getting anything moving. You live in a dream.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): You may have had 9,000 calls, but you are not moving 9,000 homes.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Oh yes, we are. They are moving.

Mr. Bullbrook: No, you are not.

Mr. Deans: You might have had 9,000 calls, but 8,500 of them were from people who closed before April 8 and wanted to ask how they could get it.

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes.

Mr. Deans: I have had a lot of calls about this, but I am going to tell you that the majority of people leave the phone very unhappy because they discover that they don't qualify.

What I want to ask you about is a little different matter that relates directly to this kind of legislation and in fact to this bill. The current practice—it's okay; I want you to listen because—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am listening. I am listening.

Mr. Deans: Oh, I am delighted to know that.

Mr. Good: Spare him the torture of having to look at you.

Mr. Deans: Yes, that's okay. The current practice of the Ontario Housing Corp., under the HOME programme, is not to allow people's overtime earnings to be considered when calculating whether they are eligible for the HOME programme when it is to be used to bring them up to the lowest level. Am I making sense? There is a lower level, which is about \$10,200, and they are not permitted to use their overtime earnings for that purpose. Okay? Of course, the overtime earnings are used at the upper level; if by chance they worked overtime during the previous year, and their earnings take them over the upper level, they are disqualified. If their earnings take them above the lower level at the other end, they are also disqualified, because they don't measure up.

I want to ask you whether it is possible for a person to use the grant as part of their income for the purposes of calculating their eligibility under the home ownership programme. Now, I realize it's technical. I know we are being awkward. But these are the kinds of questions people ask.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I doubt it very much. If the grant is not classified as income under the Income Tax Act, then I doubt very much if we could have it that way. I think it is a question you are going to have to ask the Minister of Housing (Mr. Irvine), who administers the HOME programme, not me.

Mr. Deans: Well, I have to ask whoever it is that's talking to me at the time; he is not talking to me these days.

Regarding the grant that is available, the deduction of that amount from the principal of the home could bring the eligibility level down. In other words, the right to deduct \$1,000 this year from the \$18,300 value that has been established for the home would allow more people to get into the HOME programme. Does that make sense to you?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I can't answer your question. You'll have to ask the Minister of Housing.

Mr. Deans: But I'm not asking about income; I'm asking you whether you have co-ordinated your programmes to determine whether an individual who had been accepted under the HOME programme could apply the grant directly against the principal in order to reduce that principal, thereby

to reduce the mortgage level and thereby again to make themselves eligible at a lower income level. Now, I don't see anything unusual or silly about that. That makes home ownership available to another group of people earning less—

Mr. Chairman: Order please. I think the minister did indicate that this question and the problem should be directed to the Minister of Housing. I fail to see where this really applies to section 2 of this bill on a clause by clause discussion.

Mr. Deans: Let me try talking to you for a second because I can't accept that. You may be right, maybe this is the wrong minister to ask, but this is part of the housing programme of the government. Unfortunately, the Treasurer is carrying it through the House, but the fact of the matter is this is supposed to make more houses available in the marketplace—to increase the numbers of transactions.

One of the big difficulties is that there are very few homes available for people earning less than \$10,000 a year—I don't want to get into that argument with the minister at the moment. What I want to suggest is that there is some considerable difference in the income level required for a person to carry a \$17,000 mortgage, over and against carrying a \$16,000 mortgage. A person could be earning \$500 or \$600 or \$700 or \$800 a year less and qualify for the \$16,000 mortgage; they would have to earn that much more to qualify for the larger mortgage.

Mr. Bullbrook: Does he have an answer?

Mr. Deans: You know what I'm trying to find out. Are you going to permit them to apply it directly against the mortgage at the time of purchase to make themselves eligible?

Mr. Gaunt: They should be allowed to.

Mr. Deans: I think it is a perfectly legitimate question, and I've got to have an answer on it somewhere.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think it is a question that you will have to put to the Minister of Housing, who administers that programme.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: You have got the procedures and carriage, you should have all the answers.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: Is it possible, just to go on in that line, to get your feeling in connection with this? It seems to some degree a reasonable request. You would agree?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I frankly don't know enough about the procedures under the HOME programme to—

Mr. Deans: Well, why don't you?

Mr. Bullbrook: All right, if you don't, fine. That is fine.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I just don't. The person has to have taken possession before he can apply. He puts out on the down-payment—there it is.

Mr. Bullbrook: I'm just going to say that's one of the technical difficulties that's quite obvious. Under the Act, as I read it and understand it, to qualify for the grant you must be in possession. So it's very difficult from a legal point of view—

Mr. Deans: That is why I am asking.

Mr. Bullbrook: I realize that and I just wanted to lend what semblance of knowledge I had to that.

I want to say this in connection with it; I wasn't able to join in the debate on second reading. I want to compliment the government in connection with this concept. It's far, far in advance of the tragicomedy that we were involved with from the federal government. In my particular constituency I haven't yet been able to find anybody to qualify for the federal grant and I see some merit, therefore, in the universality of this.

I see merit only because of the need that you have to move existing inventory, but this is cosmetic at best, and I think the Treasurer and the rest of us better have an understanding that it's cosmetic at best, because don't for a moment think with the limitations, that you're going to get any great development scope as a result of this particular grant. You just can't. You just don't have the time.

You, as the former chief planner, know that if I wanted to put together some type of development based on the thrust and the impetus from this legislation, I couldn't do it by Dec. 31 of this year. So the purpose of the statute is to move in some sections of our province an overextended inventory. I agree with that.

You've had 9,000 calls. I think my wife and I are up to 58 now in our own riding. I want to make some practical suggestions to you, if I might—I recognize that I might be slightly out of order. I've spoken to the Minister of Revenue. I suggest that all members be given the opportunity to have the final applications available to them immediately they become available, because we're getting the burden. I know you're going to get them out if you can to the lawyers and trust companies, but I've already phoned the gentleman in charge because I want to have at least three dozen of them to distribute to constituents, so they can get out and get into this.

So having complimented you—having tempered my compliment as I wanted to—I want to speak to what my colleague from Huron-Bruce said. There is no validity in the concept that it should apply to people living outside of Ontario. Mr. Minister, I'd go further, than he did. I don't believe people in Quebec should qualify in connection with this grant, and I want to say this to you, if I may. In a response to him, your answer is that we want to encourage the development of the housing industry and as a result of that sincere attempt on our part we don't want to inhibit. Then the minister turns around in connection with the answer to the member for Lakeshore and of course uses the contrary argument entirely.

The fact is—I'll give you one example that goes on right now—when you pass laws you pass laws on the basis of valid principles and not on the basis of general intent in connection with industry. The fact of the matter is that what you are doing is going to remove a certain inventory at the present time. You're not going to spur on contemplated housing—you're not going to do that, except peripherally at best.

I am going to give you an example. There is a gentleman living today in Detroit, a very good friend of mine who happens to be a social worker and a professional pianist. He plays at the Golden Lion. Does the Treasurer know the Golden Lion? A lovely club. He is going to retire to the Leamington area. He has got himself a lot, he is building a house, he is going to qualify. The fact of the matter is, were he here today I would say, "Tom, you shouldn't. You've never contributed one cent to the Province of Ontario, with the possible exception of paying three per cent land transfer tax on the registration of your deed," and I don't know how much that was.

You might resist by saying, "All right, it is one individual isolated case." I say to

you that the words "in Ontario" should be removed, I believe my client—or my colleague; I was in that other realm this morning—my colleague from Waterloo North—

Mr. Good: That's right.

Mr. Bullbrook: —is going to, I hope, shortly—if he doesn't, I will; maybe I will do it right now, then.

Mr. Good: In Ontario.

Mr. Bullbrook: Do we require a seconder in committee?

Mr. Chairman: No.

Mr. Bullbrook moves that section 2, subsection 2, be amended by deleting therefrom the words "in Ontario" in the fourth line thereof.

Mr. Bullbrook: Albeit that the hypothesis put forward by my colleague from Huron-Bruce might only apply to one individual, the concept of us treating people coming into Ontario with a grant paid for out of the taxes contributed by the people of Ontario is anathema to me. I just don't think you can rationalize it on the basis of saying that this is a spur to the industry, because the lack of logic in that argument is that very few people are going to be benefiting in the context of what my colleague from Huron-Bruce says, and therefore it would be little spur to the industry.

Mr. Gaunt: No spur—further competition to our local people.

Mr. Bullbrook: No spur at all. I think the principle must abide that we cannot use funds contributed by the people of the Province of Ontario for the benefit of people who have never made such a contribution. I think there is something fundamentally wrong in that.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sarnia has moved an amendment which I assume would apply to the minister's amendment. The amendment would be to section 2, subsection 2, that it be amended by deleting therefrom the words "in Ontario" in the fourth line thereof.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, before I vote for my friend from Sarnia's amendment, I should say so. He's convinced me of the wisdom of his move. And he said such nice things at the beginning.

I don't think it is really going to affect that many people. We could qualify it in other ways—"that have been here for five

years" or something. You are just going to complicate it, and perhaps this is the easiest to arrive at a solution and not affect very many people. But I feel sorry for your friend Tom and we'll go there and we'll have to buy him a drink.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the hon. member's amendment say "aye".

All those opposed say "nay".

In my opinion the "ayes" have it.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any further discussion on subsection 2?

Section 2, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any further discussions at all prior to section 5 to which the minister has an amendment?

Sections 3 and 4 agreed to.

On section 5:

Mr. Chairman: Would the hon. minister read his amendment?

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves that section 5 of the bill be amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

Where a person who has received a grant under section 3 dies prior to making application for a first or second supplementary grant under subsection 1, the minister may on application therefor make a grant provided for in subsection 1 to the surviving spouse or co-owner who continues to inhabit the housing unit as his principal residence.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think that's self-explanatory.

Mr. Lawlor: I don't even know why it is necessary.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Do you mean they would get in anyway? Receive it anyway?

Mr. Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Motion agreed to:

Section 5, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussions, comments or criticisms to any other section?

On section 6:

Mr. Lawlor: I am going to move that section 6 be deleted. Surely, if the benefits to be conferred under the Act are to be felt and to be appreciated, the inability to assign—

to take the thing to the bank to raise the money—the fact that the \$1,000 could be available by bank loan at the inception or at the time of closing would reduce the size of the mortgage and do what my friend from Hamilton-Wentworth mentioned, namely, have a mortgage which has less principal value and therefore less interest over the period of year.

Once you are locked into a mortgage, you are locked in. That's all there is to it for five years. You can't pay it off so why shouldn't this money be available with respect to this? That would have an appreciable effect upon reducing the price of houses, too. In other words, it would be more—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Can I answer my friend quickly? A person can assign. I am just not bound by that assignment. If you are a first-time home buyer, I want to make sure that the cheque from the Treasurer of Ontario goes out from Revenue to you. If you have assigned it to someone, fine and dandy. Funnily enough, my friend is asking—we have had pleas from a number of developers today asking for the same amendment to the Act which he has asked for. I don't want to put him in that embarrassing position for very long and I have cut him off quickly.

Mr. Lawlor: No, not at all. I find myself in good company for a change. It's not just developers; I am thinking, too, of people who want to buy furniture. There are any number of cases. Can't you restrict it in the wording, if you want to keep it in and you don't want them simply assigning it out hither and yon, assigning it to certain designated financial institutions?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am not talking of assigning. They can assign but I send the cheque to them.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, but for the institution involved—if they raise the \$1,500 from the Bank of Nova Scotia, the Bank of Nova Scotia would kind of like to see the money come to them, in case it gets by them somehow. In other words, they are lending money on this precise security without having the security in their mitt. That makes quite a bit of difference as to what you can borrow in terms of the collateral involved and you restrict it.

I thought there would be another reason which I hadn't detected behind your refusal to assign, apart from falling into the wrong hands. Is there any other reason? Let me put it this way. It struck me that perhaps the minister was opposed to permitting assign-

ments to any body because the deals may never close, so to speak. Because a loan is obtained from some source of the strength of this matter, and then they renege, or they pull out, or they do any other number of things, and you're on the hook. If that's the legal reason then there may be some virtue in your position, I don't know.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That isn't the principal reason, but it does serve to keep us out of that entanglement.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 6 carry?

Mr. Lawlor: You can hold it up while I think of the answer to that. I have put the words in the mouth of the minister. What I really do feel is that the benefit to a lot of home buyers, with respect to what we mentioned earlier, is getting some new furniture into the house with the \$1,500. But it is so portentous and so really valuable, that I would like to confer it. I would like to get the blessing upon their heads, if that is possible. And the way I can do it is either by amending this in the narrow way that I've suggested earlier, or simply knocking it out.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I don't think so.

Mr. Lawlor: I'm going to sit down, believe it or not. I think my own arguments overwhelm me.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 6 carry?

Section 6 agreed to.

On section 7.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Too bad, the member for Lakeshore should have finished.

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves that subsection 1 of section 7 of the bill be amended by adding thereto the following clause: "(c) Prescribing the evidence required to establish the entitlement of an applicant to a grant under this Act."

Hon. Mr. McKeough: By way of comment, this permits the Lieutenant Governor in Council to prescribe by regulation those documents which may be necessary to establish an entitlement of an applicant to a grant under this Act. Specifically, a spouse separated but not divorced from his or her partner may have no knowledge of where the partner resides or whether or not the spouse has purchased a housing unit in Ontario. This amendment will permit a form of affidavit to be prescribed in order to prevent hardship.

Mr. Lawlor: Perfectly all right.

Mr. Chairman: Shall this amendment carry?
Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any further discussion on this bill? Shall the bill be reported?

Bill 28, as amended, reported.

ONTARIO LOAN ACT

House in committee on Bill 29, An Act to authorize the raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any comments, criticisms or amendments to Bill 29? If so, to what section?

The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I was engaged, thinking of higher or lower things. Did you answer my friend, the hon. member for Riverdale's (Mr. Renwick) question the other day?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, I did. Beautifully.

Mr. Lawlor: It's all on the record, is it?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It's all on the record, and I'll write him a letter, if he would like one.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on Bill 29?

Shall the bill be reported?

Bill 29 reported.

ONTARIO UNCONDITIONAL GRANTS ACT

House in committee on Bill 40, An Act to provide for the Payment of Unconditional Grants.

Mr. Chairman: Bill 40; any comments, criticisms or amendments to any section, and if so, to which one?

Mr. Good: Section 15.

Mr. Chairman: Anything prior to section 15?

Sections 1 to 14, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 15:

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

We have an amendment, just for the information of the committee, on section 17.

Mr. Good: Okay. My problem with section 15 is that we knew how poorly the general support grant worked out last year, in that those municipalities that had high spending and necessarily high growth, were penalized by having their grant reduced to somewhere about three, four or five per cent. So this year the minister has seen fit to run a straight six per cent increase in the general support grant right through in all municipalities.

In his budget statement he mentioned that this grant would be modified to some extent where it created hardship in some municipalities, where the six per cent did not work out to be 95 per cent of what they received last year. So no one, as I understand it, would receive less than 95 per cent of what they received last year on the general support grant. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 15 carry?

Mr. Good: Oh, no, just a minute.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I am not sure of the answer to that question. The staff were still thinking about the argument given by the member for Lakeshore on the last bill.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): You need more staff. I think you need more staff.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We have got too many and they are all talking instead of listening.

The question was, if I may repeat it, whether the five per cent limitation on reduction in grant only applies, as I recall, to the split mill rate payment. The question was whether it also applied to the maximizers going down to six per cent. The answer to your question is yes.

Mr. Good: Now I forget what the question was. Reading from page 14 it says: "The rate of the general support grant will no longer be determined by expenditure growth rates." The grant will be a straight six per cent.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Right, right.

Mr. Good: That's fine. Now that is modified in the next section, which says those municipalities which qualified last year for a grant in excess of six per cent would be penalized. But as I read that section in the white book, no municipality would be disadvantaged by more than five per cent. My question is simply, why isn't that in the legislation in section 15?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is in the regulations.

Mr. Good: How do we know that it is in the regulations?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is one year and will be in the regulations. We would never get away with it; it will be done. But it will be in the regulations under the Act. It is only for one year and the bill presumably may carry on for longer than one year. So that's the reason it is in the regulations.

Mr. Good: Oh, it is just for one year.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It's only for the first year.

Mr. Good: Oh, then this limitation to 95 per cent of last year's grant will be just for this one particular year?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: For 1975.

Mr. Good: For 1975. I see. You can do that in regulations and then following that the general support grant will then just follow the terms of section 15—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Correct.

Mr. Good: —as it reads now, but there is a proviso in there for such other percentage as may be prescribed. What does that mean? Does that mean that the minister could say, "If this municipality has problems we can give them a larger support grant"? Why is that put in there?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, the rate is prescribed by regulation and presumably in 1976 this might change to seven per cent of eight per cent, or I suppose it could go down to three, depending on the amount of money that was available, but this gives the authority in future years, by regulation, to set the amount.

Mr. Good: Maybe I just don't understand legislative procedure, but do you mean then you can amend what is actually appearing in the legislation by regulation? You can change that to six or seven by regulation?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes.

Mr. Good: And six to eight; you can do that by regulation?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes.

Section 15 agreed to.

On section 16:

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: On section 16, is that the section which is going to bring northern Ontario to have an average of \$90 less per year in taxation? Is that the section?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Per household, yes.

Mr. Martel: That's where they accomplish that is it? When reading the white book that you handed out, I believe it indicated we were going to get an additional \$5 million more—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes.

Mr. Martel: —which is about \$7 per capita across the north. I'm wondering how the minister arrived at that.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That would be the previous figure. The \$90 reflects the previous northern grant with this addition.

Mr. Martel: Yes, I understand about the additional money bringing about that total. I find that a little hard to believe, though—and maybe I'll give you an opportunity to go on one of your rare tears, like the one I heard a few minutes ago as I sat behind you.

Mr. Lawlor: Rare? He is on a constant tear.

Mr. Martel: Maybe you could provide figures that would indicate the type of taxation for a municipality the size of Sudbury, say, as opposed to another city of equal size, or with respect to a town like Valley East, which has no industrial assessment whatsoever.

Maybe I'm wrong, but I think we're in for some hard times in the Sudbury basin once the startup grants for regional government are gone—and that's only about two years away—unless we start to get a decent return on the type of assessment we can make against the mining companies. Which leads me to a question.

Inco has \$70 million as market value—and really that's what it is; their local assessment is \$70 million—and I understand Falconbridge's total assessment is \$14 million. Is that done by order in council? How is that arrived at? I can't believe that Inco's total holdings in the Sudbury basin can only be valued at \$70 million or that Falconbridge's total assessment is only \$14 million. Really, it boggles the mind.

For example, when I spoke to the regional chairman recently, I was told that the Tradewinds Hotel near Lively has got the same rate of assessment as the new iron ore recovery plant. It's ludicrous for the minister

to stand in his place and tell me that Inco's total assessment is \$70 million when we know that the last two plants they built alone cost well over \$100 million each.

We're crippling the area and we're in dire straits. I've been arguing with the regional council. In fact, they decided they'd never invite me to their inaugural meeting again, because I got up recently after an inaugural meeting and suggested to them that if they don't demand that the government provide a fair assessment of Inco and Falconbridge, we'd be in real financial trouble once the startup grants disappeared. Don Collins, the regional chairman, was so upset by that outburst that he go on radio and said there was no way I would be invited to address the regional council the next time there was an inaugural meeting.

My question is: How does that \$70 million of assessment come about?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, I recognize the concern expressed by the member but I don't have responsibility for municipal assessment. I have no idea in the world. In terms of the \$90, I don't have those figures here. That was based on a survey of households. There is a complete survey, and I'll be glad to get the figures for the member.

Mr. Martel: Are you telling me that the assessment doesn't come under you now?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No.

Mr. Martel: Who is it under?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The Minister of Revenue (Mr. Meen).

Mr. Martel: The Minister of Revenue. Is it by order in council, can you tell me? The \$70 million that Inco is assessed and the \$14 million that Falconbridge is assessed?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, it's done by the assessor, as far as I know.

Mr. Martel: Was he blind?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Pardon?

Mr. Martel: Was the assessor who came to do it handicapped or blind?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I have no idea.

Mr. Martel: Well, he must have been.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. I wonder if the hon. member would return to the section of the bill.

Mr. Martel: I am talking about that section of the bill, the special support grant, because I don't think that \$5 million is going to do a hell of a lot for the Sudbury basin, which I think has some of the highest taxes. The minister has indicated he will send me the material on which that decision was made, but maybe he could carry that over until after the supper hour so I could have a look at it before this section is passed.

Mr. Ferrier: I wonder if I could ask a question about this section as well. You say there is going to be a \$90 difference between taxes on a home in northern Ontario and what is paid by the residents of southern Ontario. Does that increase the differential? Have you any figures as to how much the average is now? Is this going to increase it or is it just going to keep us where we now are? Do you know that at all?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, after this move the differential will be 90.

Mr. Ferrier: But before this, you don't know.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That's the best we can estimate. I'll be glad to give the members the basis of those figures.

Section 16 agreed to.

On section 17:

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves that section 17 of the bill be amended by striking out "any lower tier municipality if such municipality is situated in a territorial district, no part of which is situated within the northern part of Ontario," in the third, fourth and fifth lines, and inserting in lieu thereof "to the township of Chisholm and the improvement district of Cameron and any lower tier municipality situated in the territorial district of Parry Sound."

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This brings in those two townships in Nipissing.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Agreed.

Mr. Good: Just one question. Does that have the effect of putting part of Parry Sound district in northern Ontario for benefits?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It sets the rate at 7½, but this particular amendment change brings in two townships which are in Nipissing and which were formerly not in

Northern Ontario. It brings them into the same alignment and unique position as Parry Sound.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): They were formerly in Nipissing so they received grants on the basis of these in northern Ontario. In effect what you are doing is—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, they didn't.

Mr. R. S. Smith: They didn't receive, even though they were—they are not in my riding, you see.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, they were in the south.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They were in the south, the deep south.

Mr. R. S. Smith: The deep south of Parry Sound? If I might ask a question, why did you not go all the way and bring Parry Sound up to the same grant structure as Caledon, Ont. Why make it a kind of a—I could use a word there, it might be misunderstood—bastard area between the north and the south? I mean that in the best sense. This is what you are doing. You are putting them into a special category all together. I fail to understand why you didn't just go the route and say that it would be included for grant purposes in northern Ontario.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, they have been in southern Ontario for 100 years. It's a unique position. There always is a boundary. The member has discussed this and I think I answered the question, really, on second reading. Basically I'm quite prepared, we're always prepared, to take another look, not only at the geographical position but what the financial implications are in terms of taxes per household and so on, and we'll do that.

We have already started to take a look at seeing what other provisions there are in other Acts and other ministries to find out and develop some consistency or find some consistency in terms of the location, the uniqueness of Parry Sound.

Mr. Martel: That's something new.

Mr. R. S. Smith: There is really no consistency in placing them in a position all by themselves.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There never is with a borderline.

Mr. R. S. Smith: That's what people want.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There is always something on one side of a border and something on the other side.

Mr. R. S. Smith: That's right.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This represents that Parry Sound is unique.

Mr. Martel: I thought 401 was the borderline.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the bill be reported? Bill 40, as amended, reported.

MUNICIPAL AMENDMENT ACT

House in committee on Bill 41, an Act to amend the Municipal Act.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, I don't think there were any questions on Bill 41. Did we carry that?

Mr. Martel: No.

Bill 41 reported.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 17, 1975

Guelph correctional centre Jaycee chapter, statement by Mr. Potter	879
Housing programmes, statement by Mr. Irvine	880
Real estate sales personnel, statement by Mr. Handleman	882
Mercury pollution, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer, Mr. Foulds	882
Mercury pollution, questions of Mr. Miller: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis	884
Asbestos in Thunder Bay Harbour, questions of Mr. Newman: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Foulds	886
Suicide of psychiatric patient, questions of Mr. Miller: Mr. R. F. Nixon	887
Mercury pollution, questions of Mr. Miller: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Reid	887
Visits to Indian reserves, question of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Lewis	888
Housing programmes, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Cassidy	889
Pay television, question of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. P. Taylor	890
Asbestos in Thunder Bay Harbour, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Foulds	891
North Pickering development, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Deacon, Mr. Roy	891
Optometrists, question of Mr. Miller: Mr. Dukszta	892
Alleged bias in Ryerson examinations, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Gaunt	893
Norfolk road workers' dispute, question of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Cassidy	893
Surplus agricultural products, question of Mr. Stewart: Mr. B. Newman	893
Mercury pollution, question of Mr. Miller: Mr. Singer	894
Limousine for securities division chief, question of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Shulman	894
London Pain Clinic, questions of Mr. Miller: Mr. Good	895
Assistance for laid-off workers, questions of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Ferrier	895
Report, standing private bills committee, Mr. Ewen	895
Family Benefits Amendment Act, Mr. Martel, first reading	896
Consumer Protection Amendment Act, Mr. Braithwaite, first reading	896
Highway Traffic Amendment Act, Mr. Roy, first reading	896

Highway Traffic Amendment Act, Mr. Roy, first reading	896
Business Corporations Amendment Act, Mr. Roy, first reading	896
Ontario Loan Act, Mr. McKeough, second reading	897
Ontario Unconditional Grants Act, Mr. McKeough, second reading	898
Municipal Amendment Act, Mr. McKeough, second reading	910
Ontario Home Buyers Grant Act, reported	912
Ontario Loan Act, reported	924
Ontario Unconditional Grants Act, reported	924
Municipal Amendment Act, reported	927
Recess, 6 o'clock	927



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, April 17, 1975

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975



CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 1975

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Hon Mr. Winkler moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report two bills without amendment and two bills with amendments and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 28, An Act to provide for the Payment of Grants to First Time Home Buyers.

Bill 29, An Act to authorize the Raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Bill 40, An Act to provide for the Payment of Unconditional Grants.

Bill 41, An Act to amend the Municipal Act.

FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill 37, An Act to amend the Farm Products Marketing Act.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, we are supporting this bill. There are a number of reasons why we are doing so but mainly we think this is really the only device we have at our disposal by which we can get a handle on the problem.

It seems as though we've got some very serious problems in the egg industry. We've had them for some while, they're not new. The Farm Products Marketing Board has over

the past number of months been spending a lot of time on the problem working in conjunction with the egg board. Even the minister, I think, has been devoting a lot of attention in the last few months to the egg problem. It's a problem that hopefully will be alleviated at least to some extent by this bill. I don't think this is a panacea but I think it is a step in the right direction and, hopefully, it will resolve some of the difficulties we have provincially and nationally.

Everyone agrees with the principle of the bill having to do with production controls. I mentioned there is a widely-held view that this type of thing has to work nationally and herein lies some of the uneasiness, some very real uneasiness, that I sense within the industry itself about the long-term impact of this particular bill if, in fact, it doesn't apply nationally.

One of the problems has been that when Ontario cuts back in its production, Quebec has more than taken up the slack. There are figures which indicate Quebec has increased its egg production 25 per cent this year over last year and last year's production was up 30 per cent over the previous year. These figures may give a somewhat distorted picture because 40 per cent of Quebec's production, I understand, does not go through registered egg-grading stations which are the basis for the calculation. Quebec has a different percentage of eggs going through registered egg-grading stations so it's very difficult to compare.

Nonetheless, there is widespread feeling in the industry that Quebec production has been a seriously disrupting force in the marketplace. This is unfortunate because it's left mistrust on both sides, which is the reason why Ontario people are presently conducting a hen count in Quebec and Quebec people are similarly engaged here. Neither trusted the other's figures, I suppose. I understand that procedure is meeting with limited success.

There's another concern that quotas will not help the smaller family farm operator. As I understand it, the egg board is devoting a lot of its attention to this problem and hopefully it can cope with it. I think there is a system being worked out, if I understand it

correctly, whereby any quota that's available for allocation will be given to the smaller producers first and on up a scale so that this kind of thing can be dealt with and the problem met, insofar as helping the small family farm operator is concerned. A big operator can operate, if he has to, on a 60 per cent quota; he simply leaves one of his buildings empty. But the farmer who has only one building cannot operate efficiently at 60 per cent capacity. In this sense, the quota is tougher on the smaller operator. So I think it is very important for the board to take this matter into consideration and be very cognizant of it.

Of course, the big operator says, "I've got a lot of investment. I've got a great deal of money tied up. Why should I be operating at 60 per cent?" Some of the bigger people in the industry, I am sure, would like to see an open-quota transfer system, but the disadvantage of that is that the bigger operator usually outbids the smaller man when it comes down to purchasing quota in the open market.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Always, not usually; always for practical purposes.

Mr. Gaunt: There has to be some protection there for the smaller operator.

I have another concern. The pullet growers are at the complete mercy of the egg board in setting quotas and administering those quotas. I want to hear from the minister and I hope that he can give me some answers to this and assure the pullet growers across the province that they are going to be dealt with fairly. I am not implying that the present board wouldn't deal with the pullet growers in a fair manner; I think they would. But they are not going to be there forever. There are going to be new people to replace them. There are going to be new people come on to that board.

I think it is important that pullet growers have some sort of formalized protection, whereby if some new members get elected to the board there isn't a complete shift in policy with respect to the board's dealings and the manner in which they deal with the pullet growers, because they have complete control over the setting of quotas and administering those quotas with respect to the pullet growers and with respect to the other people within the industry as well.

It not only refers to the pullet growers but it refers certainly to the breeder flock people and the hatchery people and so on. The complete industry is in a very real sense in the hands of the board when it comes to the set-

ting of quotas and administering of those quotas. I think it is important that the board deal fairly and very openly with all segments of the industry and I am sure that they will. At the same time, I say again I think it is important that some of these things are formalized so that if changes are made in the board then we are not going to be subjected throughout the industry to the whims of the board at any particular point in time.

Is there going to be a cutoff date? That is an important point as far as the other people are concerned. On what basis will the board set up the quotas? What base period will be used?

Mr. Renwick: That is an essential question.

Mr. Gaunt: It is all up to the egg board. In my view there should be a cutoff date and it should be immediate. If the pullet building is not constructed by May 1, that building shouldn't be allocated a quota. Otherwise, after this bill passes there will be a flurry of building to try to get under the wire for a quota. We have seen this happen time and time again. I think surely we can learn from those mistakes that have taken place in the past.

The latter part of the bill deals with the powers to search and inspect, and here again this section of the bill raises some interesting questions. What happens if a producer refuses? What does the board do? Does it prosecute under the Act where it takes two to three months to get to court and where the maximum fine, I think, is set at \$500. Most judges, I am sure, would come down with no more than a \$50 fine on a first offence, which really isn't a deterrent at all.

Is the Farm Products Marketing Board going to give the egg board seizure and detention power like the broiler board received, only to lose it when the board started seizing Quebec broilers? The egg board says it needs that power. Maybe it does. I wonder if it is going to get it.

I have discussed this bill with quite a number of people, to get their viewpoints and to determine the problems within the industry as they see them. I think, generally speaking, the industry is prepared to accept this legislation provided there are certain conditions met which in my view are logical.

One of the points which is of great concern I think to many people within the industry is the matter of the quota credits. It has been suggested to me that if this bill comes into force immediately, the quota credits which have been built up pursuant

to board policy over the past number of months will mean that as many as 300,000 to 350,000 starter pullets will be tossed on to the open market.

I am sure the minister will realize that would certainly create a very real problem and perhaps just aggravate the difficulties with which the board will be faced in the next few months in trying to make this Act work. I think perhaps the minister should give some consideration to that matter and perhaps it could be solved by a phasing-in process whereby this kind of thing could be avoided.

The other point that comes up almost without exception, I would say, is the fact that we have had our problems in dealing with Quebec. It shouldn't be put on that basis, I suppose, because Quebec hasn't always been the offender, but in most instances that's been the case. I think there is some concern within the industry that unless the minister has some agreement and some commitment from the Province of Quebec that it is going to bring its production and its egg industry in total under some sort of control umbrella, there's not really much point in our producers subjecting themselves to this kind of control, and attempting to work out their problems if, in fact, Quebec is going to exacerbate them on the other end of the scale.

Ideally, the other provinces across Canada should be introducing similar legislation. That's ideally. I know it won't happen overnight and it can't happen overnight, but I think that's the long-term objective and let's hope it isn't so long-term. Let's hope it can be accomplished before too long and in that way perhaps we can get some order out of the chaos that we have seen in the egg industry in the past number of months.

The third thing that pops up quite frequently is the fact that if in fact, as a province and as a country, we do put our egg industry in order, then we have to be assured of import control. We have to have import protection. I know that's a federal problem and my friend will no doubt seize the opportunity to verbally spank my colleague in Ottawa, but aside from that, I think it's important to mention it, even though I hesitate. I gave it a great deal of thought before I mentioned it, but I felt impelled to say it.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): The member just reminded me of it.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): The minister is being provocative again.

Mr. Gaunt: It is very important and I think we have to have some sort of commitment in that regard at the federal level. As I understand it, 17 carloads of eggs came into the province this week from the United States. I don't think our producers can ever hope to put their house in order with that kind of interference from outside in regard to the marketplace.

In summary then, I would say that the producers say yes to the bill, provided they can get a fair shake at the national level. They don't want to get whipsawed by the American eggs coming into this province. People in the industry have been asking for this legislation for some while. As a marketing board member suggested to me tonight, when we get the legislation then the big job is to make it work. Let's hope for everyone's sake, Mr. Speaker, that it does work.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, five years ago when I finished my remarks on the report that the minister tabled at that time in the House, I referred to it as a shell game, and that's exactly what this bill perpetuates. My colleague, the member for Huron-Bruce, who has just spoken, referred to it, of course, as a panacea, but what it really is—

Mr. Gaunt: No, I didn't. I said it wasn't a panacea.

Mr. Renwick: It wasn't a panacea, that's right. That's correct. What it is is a placebo; it accomplishes nothing, from the point of view of either the producer or the consumer.

The minister is not listening. Perhaps we'll adjourn the debate until he is ready to listen.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, don't feel so important. Tear along. We'll listen to the member if it's worth listening to.

Mr. Renwick: We pointed out to the minister at the time of the debate on the report which he filed that he was condoning the control of the egg producing business by the feed merchants in the Province of Ontario and by the feed industry because of the financial controls which they exercised over those persons who were producing eggs.

One can always tell when the minister's upset, because he talks in asides to other people.

An hon. member: Don't get him angry.

Mr. Renwick: Let's be perfectly clear, the last thing we saw in the newsprint about the

minister, apart from his constant diatribes about blaming other people for his problems, was that he was going to conduct a head count in the Province of Ontario. We have never heard, either by statement in this Legislature or by announcement, the result of the hen head count in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Breithaupt: It's one each.

Mr. Renwick: I don't know how he does it. I suppose he was going to multiply by four and divide by two and count their feet. I'm not sure how he was going to accomplish it.

Mr. Breithaupt: It's got to be one each.

Mr. Renwick: If anybody had followed the price of loose eggs, as quoted every morning in the *Globe and Mail*, over the last five years, one could only have assumed that there could not have been a more chaotic condition in an industry for which this minister is responsible.

My friend, the member for Huron-Bruce, may speak for the producers. I don't really think he really speaks for the producers. My guess is, in his riding, and certainly in my riding, there are more consumers than there are producers. We speak for the small farm person who wants to produce eggs. And what this minister has done in this bill—as he has done for agriculture in the Province of Ontario—is to provide for the continuing concentration of the industrial control of this industry by financial mechanisms, by agriculture of all kinds. The device which he is now using is to provide for this marketing board, this particular local board as he calls it, absolutely Draconian powers.

My friend from Huron-Bruce is so gracious about these matters. My friend says this will likely help. Oh, he has certain reservations about the small person being hurt and about the quota system. He says that usually it's the big operator who can buy up the quotas. And, of course, it's always the big operator who buys up the quota which is allotted for these purposes.

I suppose in the riding of Riverdale we have the highest per capita consumption of eggs in the Province of Ontario, probably in Canada. The price that the people have had to pay for eggs—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Cheapest thing one can buy today.

Mr. Renwick: —has fluctuated in such a violent manner in five years—

Mr. Ruston: Cheapest thing on the market.

Mr. Gaunt: Is it a very prolific riding?

Mr. Renwick: In five years it has fluctuated in such a manner that this minister has accomplished absolutely nothing to control and stabilize the price of eggs, both to protect the consumer—and he disguises himself as the Minister of Agriculture and Food—and to protect the small person who wants to farm and produce eggs in the Province of Ontario. Do members know what his solution is? It is to grant the kinds of powers that he has indicated in this bill will be provided to this board.

I don't know whether anybody bothers sometimes. My colleague, the member for Lakeshore, who is kind of an expert on this whole question of the delegation of powers to boards and the way in which it is done, would be shattered were he in the House—and I hope he does come in to speak on this bill—when it says that everything done by the local board under the authority of clauses (c), (e), (g) or (i) of subsection 2 shall be deemed to be of an administrative and not of a legislative nature. That is legal gobbledegook for granting the kind of powers from which there is no appeal; no right of any kind for anybody to appeal from the powers which are given to them.

I am not going to recite them all. I don't imagine it is worthwhile, with a government such as this, to try to put this particular bill into committee to try to give somebody some right of appeal, some authority, against the powers which he is granting to this particular board. Let me just recite some of them:

... authorizing the local board . . . to fix and allot to persons quotas for possessing fowl on such basis as the local board considers proper . . . to refuse to fix and allot to any person a quota for possessing fowl for any reason that the local board considers proper . . . to cancel or reduce, or refuse to increase, a quota fixed and allotted to any person [and so on and so forth].

I don't need to recite them. The powers are in clauses (c), (e), (g) or (i) for anybody who wants to peruse the bill.

... authorizing the local board . . . to fix and allot to persons quotas for producing chicks-for-placement on such basis as the local board considers proper . . . to refuse to fix and allot to any person a quota for producing chicks-for-placement for any reason that the local board considers proper . . . to cancel or reduce or refuse to increase a quota . . . to permit any person to whom a quota has been fixed and

allotted for the producing of chicks-for-placement to produce any chicks-for-placement in excess of such quotas on such terms and conditions as the local board considers proper . . .

It goes on, sort of indefinitely, to permit this local board, without any right of appeal, to establish the quotas in such a way that no one who is a producer of eggs has any right of appeal of any kind. He has no recourse of any kind and the minister says this is the method by which he chooses to stabilize the egg market so far as the Province of Ontario is concerned.

The minister stands condemned for the chaotic condition of the egg market. It is a national problem which can be solved only by the co-operation of this minister. This minister has failed to co-operate with the efforts made by the federal government to try to stabilize the problem; to try to work in concert with the federal authority and the other egg marketing boards across the country to produce the kind of stabilization which is necessary and essential. It is not only the small producer—the big fellows will always take care of themselves because people are going to continue to eat eggs—the small producer and the person who buys the eggs to eat the eggs are the people in the Province of Ontario who have been hurt by this minister's policy.

I don't really think there is any point in my suggesting I am some kind of an expert in the producing of eggs. I know a little bit about the marketing of commodities. The minister will have to justify in this House this evening—I would have assumed he would have done it by an opening statement at the time he introduced this bill or at the time this bill was called for second reading—what he in concert with the other Ministers of Agriculture across Canada and the federal minister are really doing to come to grips with this problem. When a Tory is really faced with the problem of chaos he imposes the iron hand and this is exactly what this minister does.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): The last one was a scoundrel.

Mr. Renwick: It's funny to be talking about eggs in this particular term, because nobody really thinks that the egg producer is a person who has something called some rights of due process with respect to the powers which have been granted to this local board. He has no appeal. He has no rights of any kind.

Of course, the consumers in this province have even less protection than the small producers. They don't have any because of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. I would have assumed, as we all did, that the word agriculture covered food. Then he changed his ministry to call it Agriculture and Food. We assumed that meant he was assuming some responsibility for the protection of the consumer over the price of the food which he was going to buy. He has defaulted every time in that obligation of this ministry, just as the whole government has defaulted.

But it's quite all right because, the minister has said, "As long as we give the local board these powers, order will come out of chaos. The small producer will benefit. The big producer will benefit. The feed suppliers who control the major part of this industry will benefit. The consumer will benefit."

Under this bill, we don't think anybody will benefit except the big producers and those who control the feed business in the Province of Ontario, who basically control the small producer.

I'm not nearly as kind as my friend, the member for Huron-Bruce. I think the minister is a disaster. He's been around too long. He hasn't got the staying powers of Anastas Mikoyan. He ought to resign his ministry and make room for somebody other than the member for Middlesex South (Mr. Eaton) to take charge of the food producing business in this province and the field of egg marketing.

I expect, Mr. Speaker, a definitive statement by the minister on this particular isolated food commodity area. It will be a definitive statement about what he is going to do to protect, by decentralizing, the control of the egg producing business in this province; to protect the consumer; to work in concert with the federal government under the divided jurisdiction of the constitution of Canada; to work in co-operation with the Ministers of Agriculture in other provinces; and what he is going to do to provide some method by which the person subject to the Draconian powers of this particular board is going to have some recourse, by way of appeal or otherwise, to have this whole quota system reviewed should he be subject to an adverse ruling by that board. There will be many small producers—no big producers but many small producers—who will be subject to these rulings by the board who have no right of recourse of any kind or of any nature.

But so be it. That's the way a Tory minister has always dealt with the agricultural industry in the Province of Ontario. In this

particular food commodity, we require of the minister that he make a full statement of a major matter which has been the subject of immense press comment, media comment, for so many months, so that we who eat eggs occasionally would like to understand what it is about.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kent.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a point or two here. The member for Huron-Bruce has outlined our stand on this bill but I would like to bring to the attention of the minister some of the problems which have been brought to my attention by egg producers in the area in which I live.

This bill brings about a quota system for the egg producers in the Province of Ontario. As my colleague from Huron-Bruce has said, the egg producers in this province have been facing very difficult problems. Some of the concerns of those egg producers at the present time are that we have been selling a considerable number of eggs in Quebec. If other provinces in Canada don't bring about a quota system similar to what the minister has introduced here tonight, it's hard for them to believe that this quota system in the Province of Ontario is going to work, when some of the other provinces, if I'm informed correctly, such as the government of Quebec give money at three per cent to build poultry houses. Also I'm informed that they subsidize either the eggs or some part of the production of eggs. How are our egg producers in this province, if they are on a quota system, going to compete with a province that has more advantages than we have here in the Province of Ontario?

This is a step maybe in the right direction. If one could bring about a quota system in the other provinces similar to that in Ontario, this would work. But if the other provinces don't move in the same direction, then they will be competing, and it would be unfair competition, here in Canada.

I believe the farmer who had 500 hens was exempt before this bill. I wonder if he still is exempt. Also I'd like to bring to the minister's attention the concern of many and I'd like to hear from him what information he has gained from the other provinces about whether they are going to do something about quotas or cutting back in production in some way or another so that the bill will work.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, I think what we are discussing here tonight

is an emanation which happened a few months ago when we had all of these rotten eggs which were destroyed across Canada. There is no doubt about it that almost every producer of any commodity in the Province of Ontario is in trouble. It doesn't seem to matter which area of production one is talking about. This minister certainly has reneged on his responsibilities for bringing about orderly marketing in the Province of Ontario.

It must be difficult for one of the greatest proponents of the free enterprise system, such as the minister, to come into the House here tonight and advocate that he is going to put controls on the free market economy. As a great free enterpriser or one of the greatest free enterprisers in the front benches, he finally has had to admit that he has to intervene in the marketplace.

Because his heart isn't in it, he's bound to make a fist of it, as happened before when the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency came into existence nearly a year and a half ago. They chose to limit the number of eggs in Canada by counting eggs rather than chickens. Finally, this great farming expert has come to the conclusion that maybe another way to control eggs is to control chickens. Most of us understood that even before we started, that if we are going to have chickens we are going to have eggs. It is so elementary.

Mr. Breithaupt: Which comes first?

Mr. Germa: And he just found that out tonight.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The member wouldn't know.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): He never thought of that, did he?

Mr. Germa: What a burst of wisdom he came in here with tonight.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): One has to feed them though.

Mr. Germa: It's a wonder the minister didn't try to control it by controlling the number of egg crates one could make in Ontario or maybe give chickens birth control pills. He is about the most ridiculous minister in this House. I support the member for Riverdale when he said that the minister should just give up and go away and let somebody else take over.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Good idea!

Mr. Germa: There is no doubt about it, egg marketing in Canada is in a mess and he as the minister in Ontario is responsible for a great part of that.

An hon. member: He has got egg on his face.

Mr. Germa: Sure, he's got egg on his face.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): He should have got advice from the member.

Mr. Laughren: He certainly should.

Mr. Germa: The reason we are here tonight is the production controls the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency has seen fit to levy. Even as early as January, they instructed the Province of Ontario to reduce its flocks to 7.6 million birds. They gave this government six weeks to do it and they haven't done anything on it yet. On Jan. 1, we had 8.5 million laying hens in this province, so you've got to have a severe reduction in the number of hens in the province in order to bring the government's egg quota into line, Mr. Speaker. This is precisely what the minister is going to try to do here tonight. As my colleague from Riverdale has pointed out, the minister over-reacted, as Tories usually do. They over-react. They are a reactionary party and they always go too far the other way.

Mr. Laughren: They don't know anything about farming either.

Mr. Germa: That's another thing—he doesn't know about farming. I understand he's even got out of the business.

There is another problem plaguing the province in the matter of eggs. The per capita consumption is presently falling at the same time as a depressed market in the United States is causing an influx of eggs to come into the country. The federal minister, of course, is reluctant to put import quotas on because of our general agreements in trades and tariffs, or until such time as the Province of Ontario brings its flocks down to what has been dictated.

So that we are certainly in a dilemma. Of course it goes right across the country. Presently in Canada we have 25,984,000 hens and we have to bring that quota in Canada down to 22.5 million. The minister has not seen fit to make a statement as to how the Canadian egg marketing agency is treating the other provinces in response to the legitimate concern expressed by very many members here that we should know exactly how the feds are treating us vis-à-vis the other

provinces, because there is no reason why we should be short-changed.

Another thing that I am concerned about—and it has been pointed out generally and consistently—is that marketing agencies should not be the direct tool of the producer to force prices up. I think the consumer has to be taken into consideration.

This minister is the Minister of Agriculture and Food and he has a dual capacity. He has a dual job. He has to think first of the producer and he also has to think of the supply of food to the residents of Ontario. He has to make a definitive statement of how the consumer is protected from the powers which are enunciated in the legislation. It appears to me that the marketing board is responsible to no one and were it to be overpowered by producers, I can very well see that the consumers in Ontario could suffer.

Now, I would ask the minister to make it clear to this House and to assure us that this is not what is going to happen. I think that is all I have to say on this, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron.

Mr. J. Riddell (Huron): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am just going to comment briefly on this bill. The member for Huron-Bruce has indicated our support of the bill, but he also indicated that there were a number of concerns.

I think we can probably go back to 1960 to make a comparison with the chicken broiler production.

In 1960, when quotas were first introduced, Ontario represented about 47 per cent of the total Canadian production. Now, since the quotas have been in effect, the Ontario production of chicken broilers represents about 35 per cent of the total Canadian production.

I suppose what really has permitted the chicken broiler industry to survive in light of this situation is the fact that when quotas were introduced in the chicken broiler industry, consumption was increasing. In connection with the egg situation, we are facing decreasing consumption, and we are imposing quotas at the same time. Unless we can put this quota business on a national level, I fear very strongly for what might happen in the egg industry in Ontario.

I really think our greatest concern is trying to get the other provinces to somehow adopt a programme similar to the one we are introducing here. Because of decreasing egg consumption and because we are introducing quotas at this particular time, I have a feeling

that we might see our industry end up in pretty dire straits. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other hon. member who wishes to speak to this bill? The member for Middlesex South.

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): Mr. Speaker, I just want to take the opportunity to say a few words in support of this amendment to the Farm Products Marketing Act.

Mr. Laughren: Relax. The hon. member for Middlesex North is running again.

Mr. Eaton: I have had the opportunity of working closely with some of the producers on the board, and have a number of producers in my own area—in fact, Middlesex county produces more eggs, I guess, than any other county in the Province of Ontario. I would like to indicate that I feel there is certainly a need for these amendments to the Farm Products Marketing Act to give the egg producers an opportunity to control their own industry and to provide an opportunity to keep the small producers in business, unlike my friend from Riverdale, who I see is running out now that people are beginning to talk to the other side—

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Right on.

Mr. Eaton: He indicates the amendments would put control in the hands of larger producers. But if one were to see the proposals being made by the Egg Producers' Marketing Board, which have been approved by the Farm Products Marketing Board, to allow quota transfers to take place by a quota being turned into the board and then sold to small producers under 5,000, it would give an indication that the board is certainly taking an interest in the small family farm. I think the board should be given credit for this, because the producers on that board certainly are not producers who are under 5,000. I think it shows their interest in the whole industry in general when they're doing this and giving the small producers this opportunity.

The need for these controls, of course, came about because of a few people. I think that probably 95 per cent or better of the producers have been following very closely the marketing quotas that have been allotted by the board. It's unfortunate that we always get a few people who try to take advantage of a situation—

Mr. D. W. Ewen (Wentworth North): How about that?

Mr. Germa: That's free enterprise.

Mr. Eaton: No, it's not. In this case, the people who are doing this are going to be required to be regulated by stronger terms and conditions than the Egg Producers' Marketing Board have had, and in effect this is what this bill will give to them.

I've talked to many producers in my area and across this province, and a very large majority of them support this bill. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my support and indicate that many of the members of our caucus, who are deeply concerned about what has taken place in the rural area, also support this plan.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to speak to this bill? The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak in support of this bill, which I've introduced, and I welcome the support indicated by my friend, the member for Huron-Bruce. He raised several valid points, and I would like to deal with them, if I may.

First of all, the matter of getting a handle on overproduction is a very great concern to all of us. We had hoped that the marketing controls that were introduced when the egg plan was first introduced in Ontario would have resulted in the kind of reaction that would not have necessitated the introduction of actual production controls on hens themselves. But when one considers the hatchery industry and the pullet-growing industry and indeed, because of the increase in the price of eggs, the reintroduction into many farm yards of the smaller flocks, there has been quite an interest generated in furthering the production of eggs in Ontario.

I want to give members some idea of what we have been able to work out with the Ontario egg board, and to mention that whether the plan proceeds in other provinces or not, I think the Ontario board are entitled to have the kind of information that may be provided by what I would like to think will be a very sophisticated type of computerized control on the number of hens kept in the Province of Ontario.

First of all, we have agreed to provide staff to the Ontario egg board to assist them in setting up the computerized programme. The hatchery will have to have a permit from the Ontario egg board to set eggs and the hatchery will have to have a permit from the pullet grower or the egg producer to obtain chicks from that hatchery. A record will be kept of where those chicks go from that

hatchery—whether it be to a pullet grower or to an egg producer. From there, the pullet grower will have to relay to the computer centre where those pullets are dispersed when he gets rid of them at the appropriate age.

The person with the flock of hens of course will have to get a permit from the board to purchase pullets, whether they be day-olds or 10 weeks or 15 or 20 or whatever it may be. He will be required to keep a mortality check on his hens and indicate regularly—perhaps every two to four weeks at least—what the mortality on that flock has been and then he will be required to submit a sales slip indicating where the birds have gone at the conclusion of the lay period. That will be on his computer card as well.

This applies to the regulated flocks which will be paying levy, and there are about 1,250 such flocks in Ontario. It will also apply, as far as records are concerned, to the flocks under 500—in other words, the unregulated flocks. They will have to have a permit to purchase chicks at any level, the same as the regulated flocks, and they will have to be able to provide information to the computer centre as to where those birds were dispersed when they are through.

Of course, the purpose of this is to detect and to control those who might see fit to moult the birds out and recycle them, while continuing on with a new flock of birds and thereby adding to the problem that we are all so familiar with.

That, basically, is what the egg board is attempting to set up. Of course, plugged in with that information will be information that is required by the national marketing council and the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency which will help them in providing the necessary information for their records and controls as far as the provincial quota is concerned.

We have met on a number of occasions with all of the ministers across Canada. We have been attempting to work out what we had hoped would be a satisfactory arrangement, but we know full well that it didn't work out the way it should have. This is an attempt to come to grips with it in a very positive and direct way.

My friend, the member for Huron-Bruce, mentions the open market sale and transfer of quotas, and if I detected rightly he was opposed to that—at least I think that was what he said—on the free and open market. If that happens I think we can see a very drastic increase in the price of the cost of producing a dozen eggs. The quotas get to an unreasonable level. As he so well pointed out,

the problem, of course, will be that larger or well-financed producers can bid those quotas up for their own particular reasons.

I believe, as the member for Middlesex South has so well said, that the egg board has worked out what I think is a very reasonable and a very fair programme. It will offer to purchase the unused quota that is available at a figure that has been arrived at through a formula and it will then sell back to producers under the 5,000-hen level, on a pro-rata basis, the quota that would be available for them to bring them up to that 5,000 figure. Then, I suppose, from there on they would likely step it up to 10,000 or whatever it may be.

That would seem to be a reasonable way to approach the situation—much more so than throwing it on the open market. I believe, as the member will recall, that Judge Ross in his report suggested this should simply not happen because it would have added, I think he suggested maybe three cents, to the cost of producing a dozen eggs and it would really serve no useful purpose.

My friend mentions the matter of pullet growers, and I share that concern. He suggests they should get fair play and they need formalized protection. I am sure we would all like to see that provided but I can tell the members that it's not as easy to provide as my hon. friend would suggest it might be. It's extremely difficult, because I think we have to recognize that the pullet growing facilities in this province, like egg production facilities, are so vastly over-facilitated that some sacrifices are going to have to be made.

There's no easy answer to this situation in which Ontario producers, and in fact many other producers throughout Canada, find themselves. There's going to be somebody get hurt. There is no question of this at all. To limit the hurt is the purpose which we are all pursuing. I would hope that it could be as painless as possible but I cannot guarantee at all that it won't be painful to some people.

I think we also have to recognize that there has been an enormous build-up in pullet production facilities, encouraged perhaps through inputs from hatcheries but more particularly from feed companies who are interested in supplying ready-to-lay pullets to a variety of farmers throughout the province and in other provinces, regardless of what the net effect might be on egg production, egg marketing or egg pricing. The idea was to get as many pullets out and to sell as much feed as possible and thereby generate more business as far as the feed company was concerned.

Many of the pullet growers who have had contracts with those feed companies now find themselves in the position of having high capital investment in buildings but finding the production from their buildings is being curtailed.

Along with the computerized programme that will be put in place to control the dissemination of the chicks from the hatcheries or the pullet growths to the laying flocks in Ontario, there will also be input reports from the federal government insofar as the inter-provincial or international movement of female chicks is concerned, so that we will have that input. In other words, if some producer of eggs in Ontario decides to buy 25,000 pullets in Ohio or Michigan or somewhere in the United States or in another province, and bring them in here, that will be recorded as soon as they come in, because they have to come in under permit of the government of Canada. We have an assurance from the feds that they will do this.

The matter of the power of seizure is something that we are considering. We would hope that it would not be necessary to grant that power, but if necessary it would have to be done. I can assure my hon. friends, through you, Mr. Speaker, that we are not fooling as far as egg production and hen control is concerned in this province. We intend to make it work. I think we have fooled altogether too long with people who have taken advantage of the situation at the expense of other people, thinking I suppose that if they could work that kind of a plan they would eventually break the plan and, in turn, succeed in destroying what has become a livelihood for a good many people in this province.

The matter of quota credit was mentioned. This is a very complex subject but I believe it is one that the egg board has tried to be fair in and as reasonable as possible. The mention was made that 300,000 pullets were going to be tossed on the open market. I think those were the comments my friend from Huron-Bruce made. I simply ask, why are there 300,000 pullets likely to be tossed on the market? Those people should have known that there were quotas on those eggs and there was no need to have 300,000 pullets now ready to go out to the laying flocks of this province; and if somebody has to take a rap for it, so be it.

It will be just too bad as far as I am concerned, but I can assure my hon. friend, through you, Mr. Speaker, that there will be no subsidy paid by the Province of Ontario to either the pullet growers who find them-

selves in that predicament or to those who have too many hens in their hen houses today and will be required to get rid of them. If they go for a cent apiece, so be it. They should not be there in the first place, because they have totally and effectively destroyed national marketing in this country and in this province and I want to make that abundantly clear. The assurance has been asked that Quebec will be controlling production. As far as we're concerned, Quebec is going along with production controls, at least in their way of doing it. It perhaps is not the same as we're doing it, but I think through marketing controls—they have a different formula than we. But we have insisted and we have been assured by the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency and the national marketing council and by the federal Minister of Agriculture, that the same type of marketing control and restrictions will be implemented right across Canada in all provinces.

We have a further assurance once we put our house in order. And by we, I mean Canadian egg producers; not just the Province of Ontario, but all Canadian egg producers. In other words, once we come within the provisions of national supply management and quota production, import controls will be implemented.

Someone mentioned the enormous number of eggs that have been coming in in recent months. This is of great concern to all of us. And while it can be said, by looking at statistics that are available on a week-to-week basis, that there are more eggs going out of Canada than are coming in, the sad part of it is those eggs that are going out are going out at breaker prices. But the eggs that are coming in, Mr. Speaker, are coming in at table egg prices. And the producer, the board of whom are sitting here in the gallery tonight, are having to pick up the difference. And, to me, it just doesn't make any sense or logic whatever.

I'm not throwing bricks at my federal counterpart at all—he realizes that this is a real problem. But he also realizes that to implement border controls without really any controls being implemented here within Canada, flies in the face of the trade agreements between various countries; not excluding, of course, Canada and the United States. I think we can count on that kind of production control being implemented.

The matter of establishing the share that Ontario has as far as total egg marketing in Canada is concerned has been established at just a bit over 38 per cent. I believe to be exact it's 38.1 per cent, or something like

that. The quota basis was arrived at, as I understand it, by taking a figure from the five-year average prior to the introduction of quota marketing, and that this same formula applied right across all provinces of Canada. We are naturally concerned, and it's very difficult to really know how many unregulated flocks there are in Ontario. It's estimated that there are about 2,000 such unregulated flocks, with a population of something like 650,000 hens.

It's interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the percentage of producers under 5,000 equals 45 per cent of the regulated flock owners, but it just represents 10 per cent of total production. So that we have, in effect, the vast majority of flock owners with comparatively small regulated flocks, but being responsible for a comparatively small amount of the total eggs produced in Ontario.

My friend, the member for Riverdale, made some comments that I am almost hesitant to even refer to, because they were of no significance and obviously he didn't really know what he was talking about.

Mr. Laughren: The minister is hurting.

Mr. Germa: The member for Riverdale hit the nail right on the head.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The one thing that I do want to mention, Mr. Speaker, is that he referred to the fact that there was no right of appeal. Now, surely, a man of his legal training could read legislation. I doubt he had ever read it before he came in here tonight, but he suggested that there was no right of appeal.

Mr. Speaker, of all the legislation that I have brought into this House, I have been absolutely insistent that the right of appeal be granted to any aggrieved person of any kind at any time, and I shall never depart from that philosophy. That right of appeal is included in this legislation, as it is in other sections of the Farm Products Marketing Act. It affects even tobacco growers, who also have, under section 21 of the Farm Products Marketing Act, very vigorous production controls applied against them or for them, as the case may be.

Now, my friends in the NDP were suggesting that we were introducing something here that was a first for all Canada and all the rest of it; and what a dreadful thing it was.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Where's their professional farmer?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yet the Province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, which boasted unfortunately that it had the first NDP government in Canada, was the first province to introduce production controls. I have to wonder who in the world he is talking about or who he thinks he is fooling. The rest of the comments are unworthy of mention.

My friend from Kent mentions the Quebec subsidization of egg production—

Mr. Laughren: The minister is in danger of becoming arrogant, does he know that?

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Becoming arrogant?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —the capital interest subsidization and the per dozen subsidy that we hear rumours about.

Mr. Laughren: Does he worry about becoming arrogant?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that we have no substantiated evidence that there is per dozen subsidization of eggs in the Province of Quebec. I have heard those rumours. I have asked about it and we can't substantiate it. That doesn't say it hasn't happened, that it isn't happening, but we can't substantiate it.

We do know that the Province of Quebec does pay interest subsidization on capital investment on certain farm buildings, but we in Ontario provide capital grants for the building of hen houses or other facilities. I think one should be just a bit cautious about being critical in that particular regard.

The position of the unregulated flock owners will be this—that was another question the member asked—they will be allowed to continue as they are now without paying the levy that has been assessed against the regulated flock owners but they will be required to obtain a permit to purchase the chicks either from the hatchery or from the pullet grower as the case may be. They will have to be registered but not regulated as the larger flock owners are. I can see no real problem there other than they will have to have that bit of red tape, as it were, but I think it is an understandable control we would all like to see implemented.

My friend from Sudbury—and I use that term rather loosely—

Mr. Laughren: Which? Sudbury? What has the minister got against Sudbury?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —made reference to the—

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): It's not Sudbury. It's the people who represent it.

Mr. Laughren: There's the anti-railroad member for Timiskaming.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): We had a letter about him in the *Globe and Mail*.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: He made reference to rotten eggs. I was interested to hear that reference to rotten eggs because it falls easily from the lips of the member for that area.

Mr. Laughren: The minister shouldn't get his tail in a knot.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I had to wonder, Mr. Speaker, why he made reference to something which was an unfortunate incident, as that was, which we all deplore and regret and which should not have happened. No one has defended it that I know of, including the federal Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Breithaupt: That's right. He is a good one.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have to say that I wonder why my friend, when he talked about rotten eggs, didn't talk about the incredible loss sustained by the farmers of Canada because of the demurrage fees charged against the Canadian Wheat Board because of labour unrest in this country.

He was quick to point out this rotten egg fiasco that we had but he didn't say anything about the \$17 million demurrage fees that were assessed through the Canadian Wheat Board against the farmers of western Canada because ships lay at anchor and couldn't load grain; carloads of grain were standing and couldn't be unloaded—

Mr. Martel: Whose fault is that?

Mr. Laughren: It is the fault of the anti-labour member for Timiskaming.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member knows better than that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —because of labour unrest resulting in labour strikes against the Canadian farming industry.

Our friends over there in the NDP, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: We got to them.

Mr. Martel: Who precipitated the strike?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The people in the NDP, who haven't got the foggiest notion of what agriculture and food production is all about, fail to mention—

Mr. Lawlor: He sounds like a broken record.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —that since Jan. 1 this year labour strikes have cost the Canadian farmers more than \$15 million.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: All they want to hear is that the egg marketing system has fallen at the expense of the Canadian farmer. I hope they are very proud of their support to Canadian agriculture, and let that be recorded.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Our friends in the NDP, Mr. Speaker, say they are the spokesmen for the consumer. They sure are. What would happen if eggs go back to four dozen for \$1?

Is that what the members want? Is that what they really want, because from what they say—and my friend, the member for Sudbury East nods his head in agreement. Indeed he does; that's what he wants. Let the farmers of this province know where the NDP stand, because I'll tell them, it's no wonder they haven't got a farmer over there, and they never will have.

Mr. Martel: Who is the minister playing to—the group over there?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: That's typical.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: They are all a bunch of phonies over there. That's all they are. If they were in charge, I'd like to see their concern.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They talk about protection for the consumer, Mr. Speaker. What would happen if those 2,000 producers with 5,000 hens or less—the 45 per cent with fewer than 5,000 hens—go out of business? That's what they'd like to see happen. Of course they would. They go out of business—and then what happens? It falls back in the hands of three or four large producers, and they set the price of eggs and they control it.

Mr. Martel: The minister is playing for the board and he knows it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Then the consumers, whom the NDP suggests that it is protecting,

would really be paying through the nose for eggs, and that's the truth of the whole thing.

Mr. Martel: He's grandstanding.

Mr. Laughren: Stop grandstanding.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Laughren: The minister has done a lot for them, hasn't he?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: They are incapable and they know it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure those people that the agreements that we have reached with our colleagues across Canada, with the federal minister and, I trust, with those who represent the egg marketing boards of the respective provinces in Canada, simply will provide for the implementation of very vigorous production controls in the provinces that go this route. In other provinces, we will insist—and we have the assurance of all concerned—that equal authority and vigour will be pursued there to bring egg marketing in line. We will also agree, as we have indicated at Ottawa last week, that there would be a tolerance of six per cent produced over quota up to June 1, 1975, for producers in Ontario who purchased 20-week pullets since Jan. 1, 1975.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): The same old story. I've heard it all before from the member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: He's heard it all before—the grandstanding. The minister has been grandstanding for eight years.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That would allow them to adjust to the new CEMA allotment in two stages. The second stage would be a tolerance of three per cent produced over quota up to Aug. 1, 1975, but from Aug. 1, 1975 on, all producers shall remain within quota.

Individual producers who purchased 20-week pullets prior to Jan. 1, 1975, shall abide by the new CEMA quota order by May 1, 1975. And we would hope that agreement would be approved by the Ontario Egg Producers' Marketing Board, because we think that it is fair; it's right. We have the agreement of our other sister provinces and the federal government that we can go along on that basis. They will help, in effect, to phase in the programme for those who might have, in good faith, bought pullets since Jan. 1, which are now laying.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for the favourable consideration of second reading of this bill, which I think will mean much to move for-

ward egg marketing in the Province of Ontario and in all Canada.

Mr. Martel: How did the minister ever get the consent from the provinces after that big show?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The motion is for second reading of Bill 37. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

THIRD READING

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill 37, An Act to amend the Farm Products Marketing Act.

Clerk of the House: The 23rd order, House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

(continued)

On vote 1402:

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, could I ask the minister a couple of questions?

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1402, item 2. The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): I adjourned the debate.

Mr. Chairman: I'm sorry. Now that you refresh my memory, I recall that it was the hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have a few more words in the general proposition under the vote having to do with adult offenders.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): It is obvious to whom the Minister of Agriculture and Food was playing.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): I was playing to the member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Lawlor: The article I was referring to is that in the New York Review of Books by

Garry Wills, called "Beyond Attica", a book written by a fellow in the New York Times called Tom Wickers, which is an indictment of the system as it presently stands. The thing I am getting into is the business of liaison under the secretariat of Justice, since the superminister is no longer. He has been demoted, coalesced and amalgamated into his inferior functions. I would trust that there is a good deal of relationship existing with the Attorney General's department with respect to the entrance of people into the jail system of this province.

All too many are in jail who ought not to be in jail. The whole operation of the courts is punitively oriented, and not even punitively oriented in some instances. There is the good-natured magistrate or judge, the one who thinks he is doing a great deal of benefit to the person who has been convicted before. He thinks he is doing a favour by sending him off to one of these institutions. I think he should be disabused of that particular form of ignorance as quickly as possible. In the minister's liaison and working relationships with the Attorney General, I think it should be made clear, with directives given and clear lines established as to those people who are so pathological and so deeply alienated from the society that simply for the purposes of the protection of other people around them—not pretending that we are going to confer any great graces of benefit upon them at all by incarcerating them—that simply for the protection of the public, these people would be sent there.

As for the rest, except for very serious crimes, they ought not to be in these institutions at all. Again the minister is moving out into the community group home concept in order to break down the barriers. But we'll find out perhaps later in this vote what precisely the situation at Guelph is today, what ameliorations have taken place over the past year, how much the inmate population has been reduced there and what breakdowns are being achieved.

There has been a great foofaraw in the papers in the last 24 hours over the Don Jail situation. The minister has been subjected to some pillorying in this regard. Being a new minister, he can escape the full consequences of the thing. His answer the other morning with respect to the Don Jail was indicative that he is not only thoroughly aware of the situation but that some construction, as he indicated to me, was going on. In the light of the uproar of the past few hours, I would like the minister somewhere along the line

to make a further statement, if he is prepared to do so, on the Don Jail future.

It is a running eyesore. It is a place of human pollution in our province. It has been like that. People have risen in this House time out of time to protest against it. We have received blandishing replies from the ministry, whoever the minister was, including—and I'm going to give him an honourable mention—the member for Kingston and the Islands (Mr. Apps), the minister's predecessor in office and on the whole a good minister, but so far as the Don Jail was concerned we didn't get very far under his ministry. A grand jury report has come out in the last few days and the minister knows all about it. Its contents are scathing with respect to that institution.

I really would try to put some pressure on and try to prevail upon the minister to move with greater alacrity to seize that issue by the horns, as he has really failed to do up until this time. There seems to be some kind of walking on eggs when this particular institution comes to attention. Why this should be so bypasses me, but there you are.

So there is the business of keeping people out of the jails and reformatories in the degree and the scale and the way that hasn't been done up until this time in the province. The English system seems to me somewhat more flexible, more open and more devised to preventing the recidivist type of rape that we encounter here.

Whether they put people into jails under treatment-oriented conditions or whether they do it purely from punishment, it seems to make no difference as far as the statistics are concerned. Within six years 80 per cent of them are back in again, one way or the other. What's the point, if that is the case? What kind of game are we hoodwinking ourselves with? Are we putting on a show?

I think that the whole thing—and I'll make an appeal to human psychology at this stage—the whole thing about prisons and about our approach to prisons and our realizations of what their potential or lack thereof is, is to recognize that in ourselves each one of us is a potential criminal.

It's not just a case of saying that nothing is human that is alien to me. That's true too, but the fact is, for those who set themselves apart Pharisee-like and say: "Oh, no. I couldn't possibly commit an act like that. I couldn't possibly be identified with this kind of individual. I couldn't possibly enter into the same throes as this one has suffered from"; that is the first fallacy, the thing that sets them off.

Now this minister is a humane man. I'm sure he doesn't feel that way; no holier-than-thou sanctimoniousness is involved. If we identify, if we become one with and know what we are capable of in our individual lives, the whole gamut of despair is our possibility. There are no limits to what we may or may not do given the circumstances and given the pressures that human beings have to bear.

If we come to terms and grips with it, it seems to me the whole society turns its back through fear. And what is the fear? The fear, we've learned in this psychology, is because they know it is in themselves and won't face it. They are terrified at their own iniquitous possibilities, won't face up to them, won't assess them, won't absorb them consciously. In the process of doing that we are able to transcend them, to come to terms with them; not, again, looking down our noses at everyone else. But this is the path of humility. This is the path of identity. This is the path of knowing we are one with our fellow man, the criminal maybe most of all.

This is the thing that has to be learned. And if that is meekly admitted—and it isn't in Ontario; old sanctimonious, whitewashed Ontario, where all the whited calves and the sepulchres walk about Bay St., parading their differences from other people—

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Just on Bay St?

Mr. Lawlor: Oh God, we might even find it in the wilds of Scarborough, who knows? I wouldn't care to say whether Lakeshore is possessed of any of this particular—

Mr. Roy: I hope not in Ottawa.

Mr. Lawlor: Ottawa, no. Ottawa is different; I can assure the member of that.

Mr. Deacon: One certainly wouldn't find it in Sudbury.

Mr. Lawlor: The warmheartedness of the place, the sense of human banality—

Mr. Martel: The humility.

Mr. Lawlor: —the fact that the whole place is corrupt and they know it, makes all the difference up there. With that in mind, and starting from that base—

Mr. Roy: We better get hold of this speech for future reference.

Mr. Lawlor: —then we should reverse our whole trend. The North American society being deeply puritanical did think that incarceration, the mere fact of placing people

in cells, did them a hell of a lot of good in some way; gave them an opportunity to revisit themselves. We know the consequences of that. We know the turning in upon themselves.

We know the viciousness that accrues and the vindictiveness and the business of, "I'll get my own back, by George, I'll revenge myself. Give me a few hours out of that thing and I'll be smarter the next time and they won't catch me. Look at all those beggars out there, greater offenders than I am, but they are upper middle class or they are professional men and they have learned the tools and techniques in the society, through the educational system, of being able to perform the very same functions as I do in terms of pelf, robbery and capacity without being visited with the consequences."

This is the way they look at it and there is a good deal of truth in their point of view. Therefore they ought not to be subjected to that particular regimen.

Nevertheless there must be some kind of social process, some kind of—I hate to use the word—disciplining. If there is disciplining without authority that's what I am for; all of which has something to do, I believe, with self-disciplining.

But the way must be shown. In other words, what it is is not coercion. It is not an authoritarian visitation from above. It is not telling other people, particularly adults, what to do—we can't tell the kids what to do any more anyhow, thank heavens—so that we give a man a motive; we give him a reason to do certain things or not to do them. If that reason appeals to him, I see then a whole host of things. We're deeply social people and if he thinks he can benefit or help another fellow man or a whole stratum in society by doing something socially useful, you've got your reason right there.

But to cut them off and segment and place them away in hiding so we won't have to look at them or have anything to do with them! Like those children I saw one day up in the Smiths Falls hospital. How many people ever visit those children? The minister knows whom I speak of, he's been there. Incredible. Half their difficulty is loneliness.

Jean Vanier has spoken about these things in a deeper and a more profound way, and held a session a year or so ago in Ottawa with 150 or so institutional officers, judges and social welfare workers. In his deep humanity, he too is seeking to work at this prison system. By the way, if the minister has some stuff of his over there that I haven't seen and I could use, I would be

very appreciative if he would have some of it photostated and sent across. We may never be here for another set of estimates, you know. Well, all right on that score.

Mr. Roy: We will send them to the member for Lakeshore, I can assure him. We will send them to him.

Mr. Lawlor: From this point on, I can assure you, in this debate I shall stick to the hard concrete facts of institutions, about salary scales and the business of how the trust funds are used in such nefarious institutions. But I thought those general remarks had some point and we do it much too seldom in this House. Thank you.

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. member for Lakeshore is aware that I, and I would say the vast majority of the members in my ministry, feel the same way as he does about a new approach to corrections in this province. We're delighted with the steps that have been taken so far, and believe me, we intend to pursue them further.

You spoke earlier about the liaison that should be going on between the various ministries with the reorganization of government and with the advent of the policy fields. I think perhaps one of the best ongoing examples of this type of interministerial co-operation is the committee dealing with the native offender and the justice system, which involves each of the four justice policy ministries and represents seven native organizations in the province. This committee has been meeting regularly for almost a year now. It made some good proposals to the ministers' conference which concerned the native people and criminal justice, and was held in Edmonton a few weeks ago.

Another committee which soon will be reporting is the one that deals with group homes or residential homes—group homes of various types of facilities that are being purchased by various government ministries. This committee, too, has considered the use by government of these types of facilities—the services that are being provided, the various rates that are being paid—and it is due to report very shortly.

Another regular interministry committee is that involving our ministry meeting with Government Services on a monthly basis, when both the large capital projects and minor projects which we propose or which are under way are reviewed, considered, monitored and so on. This involves not only

the ministers but the deputy ministers and senior officials in both our ministries.

Of course, the most regular interministry liaison occurs every week when all the cabinet ministers in the justice policy field meet and discuss our various problems and projects.

Mr. Lawlor: There are only three of you now. There used to be five.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, one is twins.

Mr. Martel: It depends who the one is.

Mr. Lawlor: You can all get into a telephone booth together now.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I might add, and the member has probably found this out with his own experience, that you can accomplish a lot more when you have three or four than you can when you have a dozen or two. There is no question about that.

Mr. Lawlor: That is probably true, that's right. That is why we are always opposed to the superministers. They are always in the way.

Hon. Mr. Potter: They do provide an excellent medium for sharing information on new programmes and new initiatives, and generally a good medium for general communication and liaison between the various ministers and ministries in the policy field.

I think in addition to that, as I said in my opening statement, we have had an interchange arranged with, particularly, the Ontario Provincial Police and members of the correctional staff, so that we would each learn more about what the other man's job is and appreciate the difficulties under which he is operating.

In the short time we have been operating this exchange we have found it to be quite worthwhile.

At the present time we have negotiations going on with some other countries, Holland particularly, where they are interested in exchanging personnel, possibly on a 12-month basis; which we are most interested in and they have signified they are interested in. Now it is a question of working out the details.

The member also mentioned earlier the developments at the Don Jail. I made reference to this in my opening remarks—I am sure the members would have those—in which I pointed out that the inmate population had decreased from 800 to 500, and that we now had units of 60 who operated as a unit with their correctional officers and so on.

I also made reference to the fact that we are in the process of changing a number of the cells into a larger psychiatric facility so that we will then have a 100-bed facility at Guelph. Of course, this has been made available by doing a great deal of the work ourselves and by the inmates themselves becoming involved. I might add that this is the type of work they do appreciate and they look forward to doing because they really—

Mr. Lawlor: I thought the psychiatric was being taken out completely.

Hon. Mr. Potter: At Guelph? No.

Mr. Lawlor: No, I meant the Don Jail.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Oh, no. We are talking about Guelph.

Mr. Lawlor: At Guelph. Okay.

Hon. Mr. Potter: The grand jury must have sat up at night studying it to bring in a report like that on the Don Jail. I don't see how they possibly could have found the Don Jail as bad as we have known it has been for so long. It really hasn't told us anything that we didn't already know, and I am sure the hon. members feel that way about it too. We have been doing our utmost to try to correct the situation.

Mr. Martel: The minister might try a Guy Fawkes Day down there.

Hon. Mr. Potter: We have been criticized before about staffing. Recently, within the last few months, we have added an extra 25 permanent complement to the staff. We have added an extra five complement for training purposes.

I spoke in my opening comments about the use we were making of the two camps in the northern part of the province and of the negotiations going on at the present time with the Salvation Army for the House of Concord. As the members know, the two new facilities have been started; when they are finished next year they will remove 400 inmates from the Don Jail. The House of Concord we are hoping will look after at least 60. We hope to open another dozen community resource centres in the province next year.

At the same time we are exploring other methods of easing the pressure, one of which is the development of the forensic psychiatric facility. I think the member was here when I referred to that last week. The forensic science clinic will divert between 500 and 600 short-term people from the Don Jail who are

sent in there for psychiatric examinations. We hope to have this operating very shortly. I can only reiterate what I have said in the past. No one feels any stronger about this than we do. We are moving as quickly as possible and we are prepared to use whatever facilities we can find to help ease the pressure there until we have the other facility available.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. Martel: You've got some sense of timing, Mr. Chairman. He just walked in two minutes ago.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Well, it doesn't matter. I am going to be here for a while.

Mr. Martel: Go ahead.

Mr. Ruston: What is the status of the Guelph abattoir at the present time? About a year ago, as I recall, it was out for tender. I wonder if the minister could tell us the status of that now?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Unfortunately, it was held up because of the difficulty in getting some supplies, but it is going to be in operation on May 27.

Mr. Ruston: Who is going to operate it?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Essex Packers. I announced that some months ago.

Mr. Ruston: Oh, yes. That's right.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, I am delighted. I was going to be nice to the minister this evening until I listened to the professional manure kicker, the member for Middlesex North (Mr. Stewart) as he went on his tirade and played to the gallery and the egg marketing board. What a performance! When he left, of course, all the cackling hens from that side of the House followed him out, clucking behind him and we got rid of all the farmers in one swoop—except the member for Wellington-Dufferin.

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): Where's the member for Riverdale?

Mr. Ruston: If it wasn't for the farmers you wouldn't eat, Eli.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I wonder if we can return to the estimates.

Mr. Martel: I just wanted to tell you why I am not going to be nice.

Mr. Lawlor: He's a kind of distorted Lear over there.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Martel: I thought the minister might appreciate it if we could lend him a few people from the Sudbury area who are familiar with dynamite. We could have a Guy Fawkes Day and get rid of the Don Jail for you in a hurry, if you like, with no problems. The one thing they are good at up there is using dynamite.

I really want to speak about Burwash. I was going to leave it out or comment on it briefly, but I have been kind of champing at the bit for about seven months to discuss this issue.

When the minister decided to close Burwash, I wrote some very lengthy letters to the ministry, and the deputy minister of the day replied: "Well, you can discuss this during the estimates."

We were watching the fourth largest employer in the Sudbury basin move out, and the deputy minister told us, in effect: "Well, we really can't be bothered giving you any information"—I have the letters with me—"because you can discuss that during the estimates." Well, that's what we are going to do tonight.

Some hon. members: Shame.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): What an attitude.

Mr. Martel: The closing wouldn't have been too bad, I guess, if there had been some justification for what the ministry was doing. I balance that against the fact that in 1973 the ministry was aware that there was a decline in the inmate population of the province as a result of some good programmes, such as getting more of the prisoners out on parole and so on—and no one has anything but praise for that sort of programme.

What bothered me at that time, though, was that with a knowledge of that decline, this ministry signed an agreement with the Ministry of Government Services to build a new institution in Maplehurst. That was in 1973, when the population was known to be declining, and you decided to build a new institution. That's where you lost credibility, Mr. Minister. When I learned that, the credibility stopped. The credibility of what the ministry was doing with respect to Burwash

ended there. If you were sincere, you would not have started to build a new correctional institution, only a year later to close out an existing one.

The minister's credibility is even further destroyed. One of the reasons for closing the institution—and I recall well the night we had in Sudbury, that memorable evening when Mr. Fisher was about to sue me for some of my comments in a letter and I didn't realize it was Mr. Fisher I was talking about, and he was commenting to me.

But, nonetheless, the minister indicates that the reason for closing Burwash was to get the prisoners closer to home for the rehabilitative process, and I couldn't agree more. That's an excellent reason—except when it applies to prisoners from northern Ontario. Now they can go somewhere else.

The only figures I've been able to get were for the month of November. We have to remember that Burwash is about 215 miles from Toronto. In the month of November alone five prisoners from the Sudbury area were sent to Thunder Bay. That's 700 miles. And another 21 or 22 were sent to Monteith, and that has to be 250 miles from Sudbury.

What about the rehabilitation aspects? We close Burwash so we can get the boys from southern Ontario closer to home for their rehabilitation, and I agree with that. But then we take the prisoners from the Sudbury area and we send them to places like Monteith and Thunder Bay. Before I'm finished tonight I want to know what the figures are—I'll give it to you in advance—I want to know what the figures are for prisoners who went to Monteith in the months of January, February and March. I want to know what the figures are for those who went to Thunder Bay for January, February and March.

You're not going to give them to me? Why?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I haven't got those figures for you. You knew very well I hadn't brought those figures here with me tonight.

Mr. Martel: Well, I'll be here tomorrow. In fact I might be here until at least 10:30 tonight.

Hon. Mr. Potter: You can stay here till June as far as I'm concerned.

Mr. Martel: Well you must have those figures, surely to God. I wrote you about those figures on several occasions, you must have been well aware that I would bring it up. You must have been. I gave you ample warning.

Hon. Mr. Potter: You're just kicking a dead horse.

Mr. Martel: No, it's the principle. Because there's a grand jury report which condemns you also—

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): The minister's the dead horse.

Mr. Martel: —you see, that's what bothers me.

Mr. Germa: He's finished.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Don't kid yourself.

Mr. Germa: He might as well leave right now.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I wouldn't count on it if I were you.

Mr. Germa: You're on your way out and you know it.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Not for a hell of a long time.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Martel: The minister says it's a dead horse, but I think there's an onus on the minister to justify what's happening now. You know, you can play games in correspondence and say we're doing this, but if one of the reasons for closing was that you wanted the prisoners closer to home for rehabilitation, I agree with that. I'm not suggesting you reopen that institute. In fact, we might use a little dynamite to get rid of it, too, because you're going to have to tear it down eventually. I want to know why the prisoners from Sudbury are being sent somewhere else, and that's fair enough, I think. That's one of the problems, you see.

One of the other reasons, of course, was that eight per cent of the prisoners are from northern Ontario, and we have 11 per cent of the population, apparently. One thing about it, my friend was right that in the Sudbury area we have fewer prisoners—in northern Ontario, we have fewer people involved in crime. That's to the credit of northerners.

I also want the minister to answer several other things tonight. I realize the minister's opinion is that he's not running an employment programme, and I couldn't agree with him more. He's supposedly, hopefully, rehabilitating, and I think some of the programmes indicate that we're moving out of the dark ages at last.

But what about what you've done? Surely to God you must have to justify to the tax-

payer in Ontario what you've done in some way. You have to be accountable for the expenses, and I tried to get what the expenses were. From 1970 on alone—just 1970—in speaking to some of the fairly senior personnel in Burwash, they indicated to me some of the following expenses in a four-year period. The former minister is here, of course, and he was the man who introduced some of those.

There is a gymnasium at \$1 million; it sits there empty. I believe that's the rough estimate. There are new staff quarters which cost in the neighbourhood of another \$500,000, sitting empty. By the way, I have to remind you that place is still heated and I am told it is costing \$500,000 just to keep it heated because of the central heating plant in there. You just spend \$500,000 on fuel instead of utilizing that facility for some purpose—this is from 1970 on. A sports building at Camp Bison.

The egg marketing people must have gone home; I see the Minister of Agriculture and Food back with his tail.

An hon. member: The minister of rotten eggs.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Can we stay with the estimates?

Mr. Martel: A sports building at Bison, \$40,000, the bridge at Bison, \$5,000; road surfacing—a road surfacing programme was going on the very day the minister announced the closing of the institution.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): That's why you have superministers.

Mr. Martel: They were paving the street and were announcing the closure of the institution. That makes a lot of sense. It only cost \$30,000 for that.

A new post office which the federal government built, of course. Money from the taxpayers seems to be no object to government; you just throw it around like it is going out of style.

Mr. Chairman: The Chair would like to interrupt the member for a moment to indicate that he finds his comments most interesting. However, I am not aware that there is any money budgeted in these estimates for Burwash. It has all been transferred to another ministry and I would ask you to—

Mr. Martel: No, Mr. Chairman, you are not going to play that game with me. This was the closing of an institution—

Mr. Chairman: We are talking about the expenditure of money in this estimate.

Mr. Martel: Right.

Mr. Chairman: And there is no money voted in these estimates of this ministry, in this particular vote at least, for Burwash.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, I have at least three letters, if you would like me to quote them, in which I was advised that these items would have to be discussed during the estimates of the Minister of Correctional Services. Would you like me to quote those letters for you? I have them here.

Mr. Deacon: I am sure the Chairman will understand.

Mr. Martel: They closed it when the House wasn't sitting. This is the first opportunity one has had to discuss that. The House was not sitting when it was closed.

Hon. Mr. Potter: That's what you are suggesting.

Mr. Martel: It was announced on July 18 and the House wasn't sitting.

Hon. Mr. Potter: It was announced we were closing it but it wasn't closed until late in the fall. What are you talking about?

Mr. Martel: Your estimates were over. Do you recall that?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I don't know what that's got to do with it.

Mr. Martel: I am advised that these estimates we have been—

Hon. Mr. Potter: We are just wasting time right now.

Mr. Martel: No, we are not wasting time.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): We are so.

Mr. Martel: We are talking about government spending on an institution in the Ministry of Correctional Services and if you don't want to listen you can leave. I want to find out where this money went from 1970 to now; money spent out of this ministry for that institution which was closed down overnight.

Mr. Chairman: I would like again to draw to the attention of the member that we are talking about the money being budgeted or estimated to be budgeted for this year. I would think the way the money has been spent in the past would be up to the public

accounts committee. You can question it there.

Mr. Martel: No, just a minute, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): It is a matter of policy by the minister, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Martel: I will quote, if you want—

Mr. Chairman: We already have passed the head office vote. We are on item 2.

Mr. Martel: Yes, we are on item 2, correctional services in various institutions in the province. Burwash recently was within this ministry which determined it would close it. I was advised that I would have to discuss it under the estimates of the Ministry of Correctional Services this year in a letter by the deputy minister; in fact, in two letters by the deputy minister which I am trying to locate now, with your indulgence.

Mr. Chairman: I would draw to the attention of the member that the letters do not bind the Chair or direct the Chair.

Mr. Martel: I know, but they didn't want to answer the question—

Mr. Chairman: I would urge you, sir, to be as brief as you can so we can get on with the estimates, the current estimates, not Burwash in the past.

Mr. Martel: I'm always brief, Mr. Chairman.

I was trying to find out what the taxpayer paid to have an institution closed and what we continue to pay. We're talking about having these young people taken from the Sudbury area to Timmins and to Monteith, to Thunder Bay—and what happens to the reason for closing Burwash. I was trying to show where there is a great deal of expenditure. The minister should be able to give me an overall cost of expenditure in the Burwash institution from 1970 to the present—and the big waste of money in that four-year period—only to have it closed. I don't think that's off the care, treatment and training of adult offenders, because we're sending them to Thunder Bay or sending them to Monteith.

One might ask the minister at the same time where the inmates from Parry Sound and North Bay are going until we get some other facility. I suppose some of them are coming to Toronto, maybe, or are they going to Monteith and Thunder Bay for their rehabilitation. If that's the case, how does that fit in with the minister's statement that they

were closing Burwash in order to have the inmates closer to their homes? You see, Mr. Chairman, how that all fits in?

Mr. Laughren: It is so obvious, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Martel: We will get back to the costs of destroying that programme. Inmate visiting rooms at \$350,000—that's talking about prisoners. There was a new sewage facility in there at \$1 million. Could the minister tell me, so I don't have to list all the expenditures that I've been able to dig out, what the total cost for upkeep in Burwash was from 1970 to July, 1974, when he announced the closure? Is that figure available?

Mr. Ruston: It was \$4.5 million.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of responding to the hon. member's questions about Burwash in this Legislature while we're dealing with our 1975-1976 estimates. If he wants an answer to these questions, he can have answers to them. We can give them to him, but I'm not going to give them to him at this time.

The hon. member has been making all sorts of statements about the inmates from Sudbury and the hundreds of them that are in jail there. I think he should know that on Feb. 12, 1974, there were 23 people in Burwash from the northern part of the province, out of a total of 251. Of those 23, eight were from Sudbury. Is the hon. member suggesting that we must have a jail in Sudbury just for the Sudbury people? Does he suggest that we should have one in Wawa because there was one there who had to go to jail? Does he suggest that we should have one in North Bay because there was one from North Bay who had to go to jail?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Pour it on, pour it on.

Hon. Mr. Potter: It's a damn lot of nonsense. Let's get on with the estimates.

Mr. Martel: There's the Minister of Agriculture and Food getting his kicks by saying, "Pour it on."

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Order.

Mr. Martel: The Minister of Agriculture and Food's audience has gone.

Mr. Chairman: We'll continue with the minister's estimates for the current year.

Mr. Martel: We are talking about the estimates because at the time when there were eight prisoners from Sudbury and 23 from the

north in Burwash, how many from Sudbury were in other institutions in the province? Give us that one. I'll wait for the minister to give it to us.

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, I'm not giving it to the member.

Mr. Martel: Oh, he's not giving it. In other words, when we write the minister and ask for information, he says: "No, I'm not giving it to you in correspondence." And when we ask him in the Legislature, he says: "I'm not giving it to you there either." What kind of foolish game is he playing?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, I take exception to the hon. member. He knows very well—unless he wants to get up here and lie about it—that he has never corresponded with me where I have not replied to him. If I haven't replied in a letter, I've replied to him personally.

Mr. Martel: I'm telling the minister that on two occasions I was advised by his deputy minister that all the questions relating to Burwash would be answered during the estimates of the Ministry of Correctional Services. Is that a fact or not?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I haven't any idea of what you are talking about.

Mr. Martel: You haven't any idea, but you can get up and make a barefaced statement like that.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Gilbertson: You are grandstanding and you are not getting anywhere.

Mr. Chairman: Order. As I said earlier, any letters that you may have from the ministry are not binding on the Chair. The Chair is operating this committee.

Mr. Martel: Well, you tell me, Mr. Chairman, where the hell you're supposed to get the answers then.

Mr. Chairman: Order. Let's get back to the estimates.

Mr. Martel: I am back to the estimates. The deputy minister refused to answer the questions when they were raised in correspondence to him. He said, "It will come during the estimates of Correctional Services." We are now in the estimates of Correctional Services. I'm raising the issues and the minister says, "I'm not answering." Now you tell

me, where are we supposed to get the information, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: The Chair will entertain any questions or comments on the current 1974-1975 estimates only.

Mr. Martel: That's nonsense and you know it.

Mr. Chairman: Anything in the past is to be referred to the—

Mr. Martel: The minister just got up and said that at the time they—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please, anything that refers to the past should be referred to the public accounts committee or it should be given as notice on the order paper for an answer.

Mr. Martel: Do you think the public accounts people are going to have the number of prisoners who were from Sudbury in various institutions on the dates that the ministry spoke of? Do you think I can find that out in public accounts?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please, the hon. member realizes that the chairman's ruling is not debatable. If you do not wish to challenge it, I suggest that you get back to the estimates of 1974-1975.

Mr. Martel: I'm right on the estimates. I asked the minister to provide me with the figures.

An hon. member: On what?

Mr. Martel: The figures of how many men from the Sudbury area, in October, November, December, January, February, April and up to the present, have been sent to Monteth and how many men have been sent to Thunder Bay or any other institution in the province. At the same time, I want to know how many were from the Parry Sound area and the North Bay area. The reason for closing Burwash was so that prisoners would be trained closer to home. Now if that's the case for people from southern Ontario, surely to God it applies to those prisoners from the Sudbury-North Bay area. Does the chairman agree?

Mr. Chairman: I fail to see where this has anything to do with the estimates of the spending of the ministry, and the care, treatment and training of adult offenders for 1974-1975.

Mr. Martel: What do you think I'm talking about? Where are they still going, Mr. Chairman? I want to know—

Mr. Chairman: Or 1975-1976, I'm sorry.

Mr. Martel: —about the prisoners who were sentenced today in Sudbury—today; is that now?—or will be sentenced tomorrow. Where are they going to be sent for their rehabilitation, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps if the hon. member would give the minister a chance he would answer that.

Mr. Martel: All right, I'll sit down.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Of course, Mr. Chairman, I can't give him that information tonight. It will take some time to get that together for the hon. member, but I'll certainly see that he gets it.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, you see, when I wrote him on that, the minister did not respond to it either. He did not respond to my queries as to where, in fact, these young men or young ladies might go. I've raised it in subsequent letters, because I learned where the prisoners went for just one month. Contrary to the game the minister played a few moments ago when he in fact said that only eight prisoners were from Sudbury; for the month I quoted five from Sudbury went to Thunder Bay, and 22 or 23 went to Monteth.

I just think it tremendously unfair of the minister to stand in his place and in one breath say what he did, to use as a reason for closing an institution in the Sudbury area, that we want to rehabilitate prisoners closer to home. We all agree with it, but then he doesn't provide a facility of any sort for the rehabilitation of those prisoners in the Sudbury-North Bay area, and I'd like to know what the minister has that's going to take its place.

You see, Mr. Chairman, there is a grand jury report—I'm looking for it—on that institution which recommended that Camp Bison, which lies empty, has one of the best programmes in the province. It should remain open—not housing a lot of prisoners; 200 at most. At the same time as the grand jury makes that recommendation it's phased out and we build a new institution in southern Ontario, when the prison population is declining.

You've got a facility which was good. You have a declining inmate population. You build a new institution in the south while

there is one that sits there. Here is a grand jury recommendation of Sept. 9, 1974. Let me just quote from it. It's very brief, Mr. Chairman, only a couple of paragraphs.

Burwash Farm: We as a grand jury will be the last to visit this institution to inspect and make recommendations. We want to make this final report as to our findings. The old cell blocks should be demolished [We all agree on that, Mr. Chairman. No one disagrees] as they would have to be gutted in order to be of any use to others. It amazed this group and was beyond our comprehension as to why our money was poured into this facility by the millions of dollars since 1970 and is now to be moth-balled and more of our money to be continued so it will be maintained with heat and security.

A half million dollars a year—that's the grand jury report. Now what does it say about Camp Bison? We remember our friends closed Camp Bison down and are building Maplehurst. Here's what they say about Camp Bison:

Camp Bison should be retained as a correctional centre. It may be a small facility by today's standards but at least 200 inmates could be accommodated with ease and we as a jury in talking to inmates, all repeaters, found Burwash established a reputation amongst them as a place to learn a trade, upgrade education and social services, rehabilitate their personal life, habits and mode of life. We do not find being away from relatives, families and friends as being a deciding factor in phasing out.

Tell me why it is that you fly in the face of a grand jury report, close it and build a new one, when you knew the inmate population was declining in the province. That's what I'm talking about, Mr. Chairman. You've got it there sitting open and you've got a squandering of money the like of which the province would find difficult to duplicate.

Mr. Laughren: Not for this government.

Mr. Martel: I have the other letters now—they are all in order—if you want me to quote what I've told you in order to debate it here. How do you justify your actions? I'm not talking about the main camp now. I'm talking about Camp Bison. Here is what they say about the other thing, Mr. Chairman:

The modern gym, large enough to have CFL teams play their games, and fully equipped, should be made use of.

It sits empty and you continue to build and pay for Maplehurst. You continue to send prisoners from various parts of northern Ontario anywhere from 250 to 700 miles away from home to rehabilitate.

Then last week the minister has an ad in the newspaper to close out Portage Lake. I understand that might be changed now. One of the guards in Portage Lake had moved from Burwash to Portage Lake and now is moving on, if that decision isn't altered. Not bad, two moves in six months. Not bad that everything that costs money sits there idly.

Not bad that one man at the institution, an employee living in Burwash, committed suicide by hanging himself when he learned that the institution was going to close. He had been there for 28 years. He told his family he would never move and went down to the basement and hanged himself.

Not bad that I-don't-know-how-many men got cleaned by the phoney programme of the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Snow) on having the same appraiser appraise it for the government.

You stand condemned, Mr. Minister, not because some of what you were doing wasn't right, but that you made it one fell swoop and that you built somewhere else and closed out an institution which sits there. Which brings me to several other minor points. What are you going to do with it now? It's costing half a million dollars.

Interestingly, I spoke to the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) today, and I said, "Tell me, Mr. Treasurer, what are you going to do with Burwash?" He said, "That's not my responsibility." When they first closed it, it was the Treasurer's responsibility. Everything had to be directed to the then Treasurer (Mr. White). Now the present Treasurer says, "No, it's not mine. It belongs to—I think it might be Allan Grossman now who might have something to do with it."

Mr. Laughren: That guy? He doesn't look as if he knows much about it.

Mr. Martel: Doesn't look as if he knows much about it either, so the Treasurer hasn't told him yet.

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): I have been out of jail now for about four years.

Mr. Martel: What are we doing with it? Has the ministry got any plans?

That reminds me that the federal government, of course, is building a new institution north of Barrie and I understand the people

of Barrie don't want it. It would be close to your riding, Mr. Chairman. I understand that the people are opposed to it. There have been petitions and what not to this government and to the federal government suggesting they use the facility which is already there—Burwash.

Again, I'm told from someone who was partially in on the negotiations between the Ontario government and, I guess, Warren Allmand's branch, that the federal people were of a mind to buy it, but when the crunch came and a price was asked, the provincial government demanded too much. The minister shakes his head; hopefully he will deny it.

Mr. Laughren: Right or wrong.

Mr. Martel: Right or wrong. My information, from a lawyer, is that Ontario asked too much.

Now maybe that's wrong, but it seems to me that rather than squander the taxpayers' money and build yet another institution and spend another \$7 million or \$8 million near Barrie, one should get down to serious business with the federal government and do some very serious negotiating with respect to Burwash, or one then should turn it into some other facility for the use of the people of the Sudbury area.

The Minister of Health (Mr. Miller) might establish a Downsview there for rehabilitation. They might establish a crippled kids' centre, or an institution for the mentally retarded instead of Smiths Falls for the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Brunelle). Something, rather than see it lie empty; something with a social service attachment to it.

Mr. Laughren: Trade you for the Sudbury nursing home.

Mr. Martel: Yes, instead of putting all the hundred mentally retarded kids in Gaston Demers nursing home, you might in fact put the hundred mentally retarded in homes at Burwash. The minister doesn't agree with me, of course.

Mr. Laughren: What a farce that Sudbury nursing home is.

Mr. Martel: They have 100 kids on one floor: one ward. I visited it.

Mr. Laughren: You guys; politics can do anything.

Mr. Germa: Gaston's making money, though.

Mr. Martel: You might put it to a use. I understand the university has asked for some of the property for its recreation programme. I understand Cambrian College has asked for some of the property for its shops, for the apprenticeships, so the young people wouldn't have to go to Sault Ste. Marie or come to Toronto. It could be used for the mentally retarded, the physically-handicapped adults, when there is nothing in the Sudbury area for them.

You could develop that into a total government complex if you were sincere about providing services which are not available to the north. But you can't even find out which minister is responsible. It is not the Minister of Government Services; it is not the Minister of Correctional Services; it is no one. But we continue to pay to have it operational.

An hon. member: It is the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Mr. Martel: It might be the Minister of Agriculture and Food. He is going to lay some eggs there.

Maybe the minister will tell me how he can justify the closing of Camp Bison and the building of Maplehurst. We will start there.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier I am not going to get into a discussion of the closing of Burwash. This was accomplished some time ago. I don't see what it has to do with these estimates at all.

Certainly, as far as Maplehurst is concerned, it is a different type of facility altogether. Burwash, like Guelph, was a medium security institution mostly for recidivists and there were very few individuals from Sudbury who would be committed and sent there unless they were recidivists.

This hasn't got anything to do with it and I can't see the point in arguing again why Burwash was closed. It's a fait accompli. I will be glad to give the member any information he wants on the statistics he has asked for but I can't do it this evening.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, that does disappoint me because what the minister is attempting to do, of course—without the statistics tonight we can't come back to it. It will carry and then we can go away and maybe discuss it in next year's estimates.

Mr. Laughren: It's called stonewalling.

Mr. Martel: Yes. What is the difference with Maplehurst then? If Burwash was minimum security and for recidivists, what is

Maplehurst? Medium? Why could not one have established Bison to do the same function? Surely Bison could have carried on the same function as Maplehurst?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Camp Bison itself was. There is no question about it. There was a good part of the camp that could be used if it was needed. We don't need it any longer and that is why we were able to take what inmates we had from Burwash and put them in Guelph and other places with less security.

The Maplehurst facility replaces Mimico, which had to be replaced, and it is a correctional centre. The individuals who go there would not be recidivists. They wouldn't require the same degree of security that they require at Guelph, for instance.

Mr. Martel: Okay. What I am trying to get at is I don't know how many prisoners leave the Sudbury, North Bay, Parry Sound triangle—let's look at it that way—or where they go. Surely, if they are being transferred for 250 to 700 miles, what are the plans—maybe we can attack from that point of view. What are the plans for retraining those people close to their homes? This was the reason for phasing out Burwash—or one of the reasons. That is surely a legitimate question.

Hon. Mr. Potter: The member is aware we have established the CRCs. You have one now in Sudbury, one in Timmins and one in North Bay. You are also aware, because I have discussed it with you, of the possibility of opening more CRCs in that part of the province. Let's face it, I should refer you back to your leader in 1969. I will tell you what he said.

Mr. Martel: I know what he said.

Hon. Mr. Potter: You know what he said. He said, "It is not necessary in the year 1969 to perpetuate the absurdity of Burwash as a correctional service."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How about that?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Then he went on to say,

It attests to the paucity of thinking on the part of government that the only kind of centre that can be envisaged is this particular conglomerate, which works against the residents and works against the people who serve them.

Mr. Martel: Wait a minute.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Now you have the nerve to get up here and say why did I close it? Last week the member for Lakeshore stood up in this House and said, "Mr. Minister, I

am glad you closed it. Why don't you do the same thing with Millbrook?"

And I said: "Yes, and I suppose you people will get up there and then complain about us closing Millbrook."

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, I was in on that debate, if you will recall. How that came about, of course, was that the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development was letting his friends in with their graders; one Mr. Fielding. That's how that argument came about. I recall that debate well.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You convinced us.

Mr. Martel: No, I didn't convince you. The minister is playing on words again and he's playing games. I am not talking about the old institution. I am not talking about that fort or the bastille. I am not talking about that at all; and the minister is well aware of what I am talking about when I talk about Bison. I am not talking about the sort of place that the old institution at Burwash was, and he knows it—he well knows it. So don't suggest that we are talking over here about keeping a place like the old bastille alive. No one has suggested that at any time. And let's make that abundantly clear. But you are not suggesting to the House that Bison and Portage Lake are in the same category as Burwash. Is the minister suggesting to the House that there is no difference between Portage Lake and Bison, when comparing it to the old institution at Burwash itself?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I am not suggesting anything, Mr. Chairman. I don't know how Portage Lake got into this.

Mr. Martel: Well, it is part of that series of camps.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Portage Lake is certainly still operating, and I expect it will be operating for a good long time. I just don't see any point in continuing this argument. I have told the hon. member that the figures that he has asked for have been tabled. Other people have got them. If he wants them, he can certainly have them. I am not trying to hide anything, but I can't see the point in going on and arguing and arguing and arguing about why the facility was closed out, when it was no longer needed.

Mr. Martel: Well, Mr. Chairman, the minister knows that just last week his ministry advertised for someone to take over Portage Lake. That's why it was drawn in.

Hon. Mr. Potter: We didn't advertise for somebody to take over Portage Lake. We advertised to see if anybody was interested in operating it on a contract—

Mr. Martel: What the hell is the difference?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Just a minute. We are looking for interest. We have two at the present time, and there was no way of comparing it to find out just how efficient or how economical it was. And we have been looking at the idea of whether or not we should consider putting one out on contract in the private sector so we would be able to compare it with another. The hon. member knows that, because I have discussed it with him. I don't know how he has the nerve to stand up here and pretend he doesn't know what's going on.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, it's interesting. The minister jumped up in his chair, and said: "That's not true, we are not." And in the next breath said: "We have advertised to see if somebody wants to take it over so we can make a comparison."

Hon. Mr. Potter: Just a minute. You said we were closing it out. I understood you to say that. It is not being closed out. There's no intention of closing it out.

Mr. Martel: You are going to turn it over to private enterprise.

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, I didn't even say we were going to turn it over. I said we had requested to hear from anyone who might be interested, so that we could review it and decide whether we would or not.

Mr. Martel: Well, you know you are cutting it pretty thin.

Mr. Lawlor: Playing games.

Mr. Martel: You are playing on words and you know it. Because you asked the question: "How did Portage Lake get into it?" And the only reason that Portage Lake got into it, Mr. Minister, was that if you had your way, you would get out of Portage Lake as well. Are you not also getting out of the one on the other side of the Parry Sound area? The other DARE programme? Are you not getting out of it too?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, that's the next vote. That's not this vote.

Mr. Martel: I am just showing you where you are closing out. Most of it is in northern Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I wouldn't count on it if I were you.

Mr. Martel: No, no. I wouldn't count on it. It's in a good Tory riding. I wouldn't count on it either, but it's interesting. You play games with words.

Hon. Mr. Potter: No games at all. It is just that you don't want to listen.

Mr. Martel: No. I don't want to be taken in. There's a big difference you know. There's a big difference.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Take him in.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I don't know who the hell would want to take you in, to tell you the truth.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Take him in to the Don.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, I think the minister should have to answer about the costs. They were in his bailiwick. In estimates we study the costs projected for the coming year and the public accounts for last year; that's how one goes about looking at estimates. Of course, the ministry can't justify its actions. There are so many things about Burwash that it can't justify, but most of all it's the grand jury report.

However, I hope this minister might have some influence in the cabinet to get some use out of this facility, rather than continuing to watch money go up the stack in terms of fuel and security people looking after it. He was very quick to get it closed; it might be helpful if he was as quick to get it reopened for some useful function—and not necessarily in the field of correctional services; I've suggested half a dozen possible uses.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Chairman, could the minister tell us what type of industrial programme he has at the Maplehurst institution now? Or what type of industrial programme is he planning or putting into effect there?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Several smaller industries were interested, and we're still negotiating with them. How we're going to make out when we finally open is hard to say because of the unemployment situation today. There's also the fact that so many who were interested earlier when we started are now finding they're having to cut back a little on production and they're beginning to lose some of their interest.

Mr. Ruston: Are you jobbing out things to industry? Is that what you said?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Is that what you're referring to, jobbing out? Or the industries that are going to work in there?

Mr. Ruston: Either one or the other.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, for instance, we are contracting with Parnell Foods Ltd. to do the catering for the industry. Is that what you're referring to? Or are you talking about the small industries that were interested in going in there and operating, like the abattoir at Guelph?

Mr. Ruston: I'm more interested in that, yes.

Hon. Mr. Potter: We've been negotiating with several small industries, but at the present time we haven't got anything concrete yet.

Mr. Ruston: Could the minister tell me approximately how much it cost in the past year to rebuild the abattoir at Guelph in terms of changing it around and modernizing it? Do you know how much that cost?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I haven't got the exact figure. I think it was in the vicinity of half a million dollars. It's one of those deals in which we set the rent—we lease the facilities and the equipment to them, and we recover it in the rent over a period of years.

Mr. Ruston: I suppose the minister is aware that—

Hon. Mr. Potter: It was \$800,000, and it's repaid at 12½ per cent interest.

Mr. Ruston: Speaking of grand jury reports, I noticed the one in Windsor had a brief discussion with the administrator, and they were informed there were no outside recreational facilities—that is, there were some in the summertime but none at all in the winter. In their recommendations they are suggesting that the Ministry of Correctional Services consider acquiring the old county building, which adjoins the present correctional institution and is connected by a tunnel. Has the minister given this recommendation any consideration?

Hon. Mr. Potter: At the present time we haven't. I think the hon. member is probably aware that we get a large number of grand jury reports. There are very few that we hear about, because most of them are quite complimentary. Unfortunately, some of the

grand jury reports we get are not very well reported, as was evidenced recently with one on the Vanier Centre.

I noticed all the newspapers were quite anxious to jump on the bandwagon and print the report which was damning the centre. A few days later one of the local newspapers came out and ridiculed the report and said it couldn't understand how it was written in the first place. It said it didn't do this by going to the institute to find out what was wrong; it went to lawyers, to social workers, to people who have been going to the centre on a daily basis and they denied anything that was written in the grand jury report.

As a result of that there was an editorial in the Brampton paper—I think it was—saying the same thing and that they hoped the rest of the papers would pick it up. Of course, the other papers didn't do that; they never pick those things up.

Mr. Ruston: That's par for the course.

Hon. Mr. Potter: We have told them about the one you are speaking about, that we are interested in the building. When it becomes vacant we will certainly be glad to discuss it with them.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. Laughren: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I won't discuss the penology aspect at Burwash because my inclinations are toward the phasing-out of penal institutions for non-violent crimes. I won't get into that about Burwash. But there is something which does bother me about what this ministry did and it seemed to me there were a couple of things that went wrong in the phasing out of it.

One was the way in which they handled the staff transfers and, despite the assurances of the ministry, there were people, particularly in the instructional area, who did not get the kind of choices they were assured they would get. I have a specific example of that.

The other thing that bothers me is that the decision to close it was made not too long after the Ontario cabinet came to Sudbury in a blaze of glory with an awareness Ontario campaign. They met in the Sudbury area—I think they had them elsewhere as well—and then proceeded to wipe out, as my colleague says, the fourth largest employer in the Sudbury area. If they did see there was a need to phase out that institution for reasons of penal reform that is one argument I could live with and I don't have the expertise to question that.

What really bothered me about it was the tremendous loss of potential. To this day it sits there idle and there is one thing that I personally would like to see it used for and that's a rehabilitation centre for the Workmen's Compensation Board. I am glad the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development is here because that falls within his jurisdiction. I think there is a large number of people from the Sudbury area, let alone the rest of northern Ontario, who come to the Downsview centre for rehabilitation. They spend a lot of time there away from their families and surely there should be a rehabilitation centre established in the Sudbury area.

There is not going to be one at the new hospital. We were led to believe at one time—I don't think we were deliberately misled—that there was going to be a rehabilitation centre there. There isn't, not one that is going to be able to cope with Compensation Board problems. The argument the Compensation Board uses, Mr. Chairman, is that it is too highly specialized and you shouldn't duplicate the facilities they have at Downsview. I am not suggesting they duplicate all the facilities, the specialized facilities. I don't think that is what most of the people who go to Downsview require anyway; they require different levels of rehabilitation.

Surely, there is no better thing that those facilities could be used for? You have the tremendous gymnasium and you have the houses there. There are enough office facilities so that you can decentralize the Compensation Board perhaps in other areas as well and I would urge you as strongly as I know how to give that serious consideration. The minister was involved with health before; he knows some of the problems with rehabilitation.

I would also urge the Ministry of Labour or the provincial secretary to take a look at the possibilities there. I think it would be a very positive move. It would make a big difference to the injured workmen in the area and I suspect there are enough injured workers from the Sudbury area alone to make such an investment worthwhile. If you have any power left in the decision as to what happens to those facilities, I sure hope you don't allow it to be turned into some kind of industrial park which we hear rumours about occasionally. I would urge you to consider letting it go to the Workmen's Compensation Board and they could make it into a northern Ontario rehabilitation centre.

Mr. Martel: You even might land in a helicopter next time.

Mr. Chairman: Shall item 2 carry?

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): No, Mr. Chairman, the minister wants to reply.

Mr. Chairman: Is it the pleasure of the committee—

Mr. Foulds: Let the minister reply.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, if I could have a minute, I just want to reply to the statement about the relocation of staff from Burwash. Actually, I was very proud of the job that was done by our personnel director and the members of the staff for that relocation; they worked very closely with the Civil Service Commission and the unions at the time. The unions were very generous in their praise of my staff and the way they handled the situation. As a matter of fact, the commission has used this particular project as a model of what can be done in relocating the members of the staff.

Mr. Laughren: Instructional staff.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I'm surprised to hear that—

Mr. Laughren: There are exceptions.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Of course, I suppose there are always going to be exceptions, no matter what happens.

Mr. Laughren: There shouldn't be.

Hon. Mr. Potter: There shouldn't be, but this world being what it is, I don't think there is any way that everybody is going to be happy about everything.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the House I would like to inform the members that tomorrow morning we will call the private bills standing for second reading, and there is a substantial addition to that list. I believe that

assent will be given later tomorrow, and we'll proceed then with the consideration of the estimates of the Ministry of Correctional Services. Should we conclude that item, we will proceed to items 16 and 17 standing on the order paper. On Monday we will proceed further to the taxing bills, as called pre-

viously, standing in the name of the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Meen).

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:35 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 17, 1975

Third readings	933
Farm Products Marketing Amendment Act, Mr. Stewart, second reading	933
Third reading	945
Estimates, Ministry of Correctional Services, Mr. Potter, continued	945
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	961



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Friday, April 18, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, APRIL 18, 1975

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention a group of students from the Westview Centennial Secondary School in Yorkview, a school located near the corner of Highway 400 and Finch Ave. They're here with their teachers today and I am sure the House would be glad to welcome them.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce in the west gallery a group of some 35 students from Dufferin Heights Jr. High School, accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Foote. There was a group here from Dufferin Heights last week and they found the activity so intriguing that another group is back to see us this morning. We welcome them.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I hope you will join me in welcoming to the chamber this morning a group of almost 100 students from Ecole Secondaire Rayside, in the great riding of Nickel Belt. They are accompanied by and under the supervision of their teacher, Mr. Roger Chenier.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

TAX REBATES FOR MANAGED FORESTS

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, the recent budget speech included the announcement of a programme to provide property tax relief for owners of managed forests in this province. Later today I will move first reading of a bill to amend the Forestry Act which will enable the establishment of this programme.

At this time, I would like to outline briefly the proposed programme to the House.

It is proposed that the rebate would be 50 per cent of the property taxes on a managed forest, the same principle as the rebate being repaid since 1973 to Ontario farmers whose lands are being used to produce farm products. It is the aim of the government to provide an incentive for private woodlot owners

to manage their forests so as to attain the greatest possible yield of wood and wood products from their lands. It is also expected that proper management of private woodlots under this programme would then provide those other benefits of a managed forest—healthy wildlife habitat, the conservation of water resources, the prevention of erosion, recreational benefits and a pleasing landscape.

There are approximately seven million acres of small forest holdings in this province. Our concern is for the productivity of these acres to gain economic and social benefit not only for the individual owner but also for the people of Ontario.

We estimate that these forest lands now produce about 100 million cu ft of wood annually. But, under full management, it should be possible to produce twice as much. We believe that this managed forest tax rebate programme, along with other forestry services provided by my ministry, will help to obtain this objective.

It is proposed that this tax rebate programme would be retroactive to Jan. 1, 1973. There is a good reason for making this programme retroactive. When the farm tax reduction programme was revised in 1973, approximately 1,750 tree farmers applied but did not qualify under that programme's guidelines. And it is believed that several thousand other tree farmers did not apply under the farm tax rebate programme because they felt they would not qualify. Consequently, it is proposed to deal with these applications submitted in 1973 and with the new applications submitted since that time.

The programme will be of special interest to any person in Ontario owning a managed forest not assessed as part of a farm.

No other province in Canada and, we believe, no other jurisdiction on the North American continent has ever taken such a progressive step to encourage effective management of privately owned forest lands.

Under this programme, the Ministry of Natural Resources would set the forest land management criteria, and the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs will administer the tax rebates, as it

does the farm tax programme in co-operation with the Ministry of Agriculture and Food.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to table this statement and to propose a programme which will further encourage the wise management of our privately owned forests.

Hon. J. White (Minister without Portfolio): First in the world.

ASBESTOS PROBLEM

Hon. J. P. MacBeth (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I announced a change in policy by the Workmen's Compensation Board in connection with lung cancer among asbestos workers.

I have been advised by the Hon. Michael Starr, the chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board, that in principle the board accepts the existence of a lung cancer hazard among Ontario coke-oven workers.

The criteria for acceptance of lung cancer claims from coke-oven workers have been defined, and the case of a coke-oven worker from Algoma Steel has been considered meritorious and has been accepted in full.

Since all coke-oven workers are not equally at risk, claims submitted to the board for lung cancer will be treated on an individual basis and the merit of each evaluated according to the job performed and the length of exposure involved. Thank you.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Well, that is how they have always done it—one by one.

Mr. Speaker: May I suggest to the hon. minister that he send his statement up to Hansard because his neighbour had his hand over the mike and I am sure it wasn't being picked up upstairs.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: All right.

Mr. Lewis: Those two always know what the other is doing.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: That's almost censorship.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): He doesn't want the workers to find out.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Energy has a statement.

BRUCE HEAVY WATER PLANT

Hon. D. R. Timbrell (Minister of Energy): Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature will

recall that on June 1, 1973, the government announced approval in principle of Ontario Hydro's proposed generation development programme for 1977-1982. Authorization was given to Ontario Hydro to proceed with the more urgent items of this programme when the then Minister of Energy (Mr. McKeough), announced in July, 1974, the approval of Wesleyville and Pickering "B" generating stations and the construction of a second and third heavy water plant at the Bruce nuclear power development.

Mr. Speaker, today I wish to announce that this government has taken a further step in the development of the provincial power system and the security of supply of electricity for the needs of this province by approving the construction by Ontario Hydro of a fourth heavy water plant at Bruce. By committing construction of the plant now, it will be possible to begin producing heavy water early in 1980, in time to contribute to the heavy water needs of the second generating station now under construction at Pickering.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

The member for Downsview.

STORE HOURS

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General: Could the Attorney General tell us whether he has any more information about legislation relating to store hours than he was able to impart to those people present at the recent cabinet meeting in Kingston?

Hon. J. T. Clement (Provincial Secretary for Justice and Attorney General): No, I have not, Mr. Speaker.

I responded to a brief submitted by the chamber of commerce in Kingston on Wednesday of this week. The brief was well prepared. It suggested that the matter of store hours during the week, or uniform store hours, if I may use that phrase, and the matter of Sunday closings be defined as one matter. I responded by saying that as I viewed it it could not be regarded as one matter but as two separate items and that is the approach I have been following.

I also advised the gentleman who made the brief on behalf of the chamber of certain correspondence which I had forwarded to my colleague in Ottawa, the federal Minister of Justice, relating to the Lord's Day Act. I have had some discussion with the federal

minister about the Lord's Day Act of Canada, particularly the penalty sections.

I also made a response dealing with so-called uniform store hours and the result of that dialogue has been, I think, reported in the press.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, while what the minister says is very interesting, is he able to tell the House and the people of Ontario whether or not we are going to see any action relating to store hours, perhaps along the lines of whatever recommendations there might have been in his colleague's green paper—some of it was produced some time ago—or in any other way? The green paper didn't seem to have much in mind but does the Attorney General have anything in mind on this important problem?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Yes, I do. The frustration of the matter, Mr. Speaker, seems to be that there is no consensus or common need. The very problem, of course, is created by the fact that in many instances municipalities although adjacent to each other geographically cannot resolve their differences. Therefore they have sought advice and legislation from this government, in an effort to resolve those differences which they as neighbours cannot resolve and we have to spread our wisdom over 900 different municipalities of this province.

Quite frankly, I am having a difficult time trying to resolve this matter in a fashion which is equitable and realistic, bearing in mind all the differences in geography, economics and social conditions. I do hope to be able to come forward with a recommendation to government, hopefully this session, insofar as the weekdays are concerned. I would be a little stronger when it comes to that—

Mr. Singer: Would it be a green paper?

Hon. Mr. Clement: I would hope to bring this one forward on white paper.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

SCHOOL BUS DRIVER ELIGIBILITY

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Did he observe the comment about a licensed school bus driver who has a record of some 13 traffic offences and does he have an opinion about that? Should that lady be allowed to be a school bus driver?

Hon. J. R. Rhodes (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, I won't necessarily give a personal opinion but I can tell you that the lady in question currently holds a straight class 1 chauffeur's licence. She does not hold a class 2 school bus endorsement licence at this time. Were she to apply for such a licence, she would have to submit to a driving test conducted in a school bus and the school bus written test, in addition to which she would have to provide a satisfactory medical certificate and satisfy the ministry's visual requirements. Her past operating record would be considered in reviewing her application and under certain circumstances it could lead to refusal of a licence—a class 2 licence, that is—to drive a school bus.

In the past we have refused such licences to persons who have a current points total of six which means they are at the warning letter stage in the demerit point system. It would appear from what is in the article that the lady has a total of eight points and that she has been suspended in the past for getting 15 or more. I would suggest that despite the fact that Metro Licensing Commission may have issued this licence she still has to qualify within the meaning of the Act and have the examination in order to qualify to drive a school bus in this province.

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): It doesn't look like the odds are on her side.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, will the minister assure us that this will be followed up to make sure she does have all the proper qualifications if she is, in fact, allowed to drive a school bus?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, sir. She will be required to pass the tests that are required of all persons who wish to drive a school bus in this province.

Mr. Lewis: A further supplementary, if I may: Is the minister quite sure of the facts? Because the story says that beginning almost immediately she will start driving handicapped children in Metropolitan Toronto. And, indeed, the story varies with that of the minister on the number of points presently on her record as well. Might it not be worth the ministry—given this kind of story—initiating contact with the Metro Licensing Commission and trying to resolve it before something happens inadvertently?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that I didn't ad lib the comments I made.

Mr. Lewis: No, I'm sure the minister didn't.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The ministry is quite ready and already going into this particular area.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): We know the minister was reading it.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): The minister had the question set up.

Mr. Lewis: The minister only ad libs when he discovers the wheel.

INTERMEDIATE CAPACITY TRANSIT SYSTEM

Mr. Singer: I have another question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Has he as yet been able to put together a complete costing of the Krauss-Maffei experiment to the people of Ontario, including the costing of the commission? And has he reviewed his suggestion to my colleague, the member for York-Forest Hill (Mr. Givens), that if he wanted that cost he'd have to write a letter to somebody?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I said in the House earlier this week that I would, in fact, put those figures together, as was suggested, or the components. My position with the question from the member for York-Forest-Hill is exactly the same. That is an appointed commission. They're not civil servants and, therefore, the information should come from the chairman of the board of that commission, duly appointed to operate that particular operation.

Mr. Singer: More particularly, in regard to that commission, since the commission refused to give that information during the discussion of the estimates, should the minister not make it his business to provide that information for those members of the House who are concerned about it?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, with the greatest of respect, I don't believe that the commission refused to give that information. You may recall, Mr. Speaker, at the time of the estimates, those moneys that had been allocated for the Ontario Transportation Development Corp. project were removed from the estimates and, therefore, there was no matter to be discussed.

HOUSE PRICES

Mr. Singer: A question of the Minister of Housing, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister explain the reasoning behind his statement apparently made during his speech last night that the price of houses will go down? Does that relate to the economic forecast of the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), or has the minister his own secret formula? And in view of what everyone else seems to think, that it's going up, can the minister explain how he can fly in the face of everyone else's opinion and make speeches like that?

Mr. Deans: The member just doesn't understand.

Mr. Martel: It's easy for the minister. The member for Downsview just doesn't understand. What's the matter with him?

Hon. D. R. Irvine (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear the actual results of my speech in Oshawa last night, but if the interpretation was that I said—

Mr. T. P. Reid: (Rainy River): They are all voting Liberal.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —that I expected housing to go down, I expect it will if we have the supply of housing which had been indicated to me will come on the market.

Mr. Deans: Oh, right.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: The market will be, in my opinion, quite adequately supplied in the third and fourth quarters of this calendar year, and also in the fiscal year.

Mr. Deans: The minister really is a disaster.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I would expect that the short term results will be that the housing—well, we know right now that some of the houses that have been listed, expensive houses and so on, have gone down. The home of the Minister of Urban Affairs was listed for \$225,000 and sold for \$200,000.

Mr. Singer: Oh, that should help!

Hon. Mr. Irvine: The leader of the NDP may have some problems selling his home for \$150,000; maybe he'll get only \$125,000. It's possible.

Mr. Lewis: One can never tell.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): One can always give one's home away.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: But I expect that high-priced housing will go down.

Mr. Lewis: I'll let the minister know.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Will he let me know? It would be helpful to my survey, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: I don't want the minister to weep.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —to find out how the NDP leader does make it in the sale of his home.

Mr. Lewis: Good, I'll be glad to assist him.

Mr. Singer: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: If by chance Mr. Turner, the federal Minister of Finance, is correct in his prediction about the economics of Canada during the balance of this year, and the Ontario Treasurer is wrong, would that affect the minister's prognostication about the price of houses?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: It is very seldom that the Ontario Treasurer is wrong, and it's quite often that Mr. Turner is.

Mr. Lewis: I would stop there if I were the minister.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: As a matter of fact, I would like to stop there, because I don't think the question deserves much more of an answer.

Mr. Lewis: He can't. It is irresistible. He has to go on.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Downsview understands full well that the future of housing depends on the overall economic climate in Canada, as well as in Ontario in particular. We expect Ontario to have an adequate supply of housing. I again say to you, Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity, that I believe housing will come down if the supply is there.

Mr. Singer: A final question.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary, the member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Since one can't live in a housing start and would have to wait until that house is completed is the minister aware of the fact that last year the number of completions in the province increased, but many people held off buying because of the high mortgage rates? Is he aware that those people will be coming into the market this year, or are hoping to get in, if mortgage rates ease off, and that the number of completed houses in urban Ontario will be down by about 20,000—from about

86,000 to somewhere around 65,000 or 66,000? Does the minister really feel that the law of supply and demand will stop acting and that the price will still go down, despite the very sharp drop in completions one can expect this year?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware that starts are not the final answer to the price of housing. We certainly agree with the hon. member that there haven't been as many completions as we had anticipated to meet the demand for housing throughout all of Ontario. But I again say to him that it is very important that we do proceed with as many housing starts as possible. When the holders of vacant new or used homes find that there is a very large number of housing starts on the market, they are going to think twice about keeping their inventory at the price they have it at that time.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

QUEBEC BUDGET

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a very short question of the Premier.

Has the Premier thought of sending a study mission to the Province of Quebec to find out how it can get by with a budget deficit of only \$300 million and yet produce a budget that apparently is going to satisfy all of the citizens of that province?

Mr. Lewis: Oh, it is a great government in Quebec; a great Liberal government.

Hon. Mr. Crossman: Why doesn't he talk about the housing they have invested in?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I know how interested the member for Downsview is in these matters. Rather than the government's sending a study commission, perhaps he would like to devote this weekend and maybe Monday and Tuesday to making a critical analysis of it and come back here and report to the House.

Mr. Reid: Does he get \$250 a day for it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would be delighted to see him spend four or five days in the Province of Quebec. I think he would thoroughly enjoy it.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West?

Mr. Lewis: I will go. I will go at half the level of a royal commissioner, as a matter of fact. I want to come back to that.

Mr. Bullbrook: That would make two New Democrats in Quebec.

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact, the member has increased us by 100 per cent. Where has the Minister of Health gone, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: I can't answer that question.

An hon. member: He got sick.

Mr. Lewis: Typical. Everything's psychosomatic with the Minister of Health.

Mr. Speaker: Can the member get on with other questions?

HEALTH AND SAFETY HAZARDS AT ELLIOT LAKE

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Health, who is here now, has he yet seen the most recent dust readings at Rio Algom and Denison, which show that at Rio Algom 67 per cent of the readings are above the permissible level set by his ministry and the Ministry of Natural Resources, and at Denison some 75 per cent of the readings are above the permissible level, many of them at levels of hazard which are quite frightening? In view of the minister's responses previously in the House, when is the initiative to be taken to correct this?

Hon. F. S. Miller (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, without knowing the date on the reports the hon. member has—

Mr. Lewis: February-March.

Hon. Mr. Miller: —I have seen reports in that general range done by private people, the companies'—

Mr. Lewis: No, these are the readings that the Ministry of Natural Resources lists itself.

Hon. Mr. Miller: All right, fine. I haven't seen the actual figures. I have been kept aware of the fact that they were high. As to the latter part of the question, the action, I hope, will be very soon.

Mr. Martel: How soon is very soon?

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Minister of Health a supplementary? The Minister of Natural Resources on Dec. 10, 1974—now more than four months ago—promised an immediate initiative on the dust level report which the Minister of Health tabled. Is this a redefinition of the word immediate? Can

the minister indicate to us what his intentions are and what kinds of responses he intends to provide?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, in all honesty, I can't, until we are ready to make a statement. I would suggest that the definition of the word "immediate," since it is not mine, be asked of the person making it.

HEALTH AND SAFETY HAZARDS AT ELLIOT LAKE

Mr. Lewis: That is a good question. Can I ask the Minister of Natural Resources what he meant by an immediate action on the part of his ministry to the dangerous dust levels in the report tabled by the Minister of Health, which was the response the Minister of Natural Resources gave more than four months ago now to this matter in Elliot Lake?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the statements of the Minister of Health. The government will be making a statement very, very shortly on the whole matter of occupational health and the matter to which I referred.

Mr. Lewis: When the minister says very, very shortly, does it correspond to his view of the word immediate? How does he define very, very shortly? Do we expect it next week, May, June or when?

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): If not sooner.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I would say, Mr. Speaker, within a week or two.

Mr. Lewis: A week or two?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes.

Mr. Martel: A supplementary question: Why doesn't the minister force the company to purchase the individual packs being utilized in Sweden to guarantee the health and safety of the men who are exposed to these high dust counts?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I didn't hear the first part of the question.

Mr. Martel: The individual packs being used in Sweden to protect the men from excessive dust counts and so on—why doesn't the minister force the mining companies to purchase those as an interim measure until the problem of ventilation can be resolved?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, on that particular point I'm not aware where it lies, but I can assure the House that in all areas of mine safety, occupational health and environment in the mines themselves, either through a specific type of equipment or regulatory controls, a greater amount of inspection and recording is going on now. We will be addressing ourselves to that very shortly.

Mr. Speaker: Actually that question had nothing to do with the definition of immediate as I understand it.

Mr. Martel: Immediate—the packs can be bought for them tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: That is not supplementary to it. The member for Sudbury East can make it a new question. There will be ample time. Are there any further questions of the member for Scarborough West?

HOUSING PLANS FOR DURHAM REGION

Mr. Lewis: May I ask of the Minister of Housing, since he initiated, through OHAP, the development in the Durham region of the so-called Courtice concept—which will allegedly bring a population of 45,000 people into the Courtice area—can he indicate whether the ministry has also informed all the citizens what its intentions are so that public hearings and public review are a regular part of the process?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I had a meeting last week with the mayor of Newcastle, some of his council and their appointed staff in regard to future housing starts this year and for a much longer term than that—for the next 10 years maybe. The Courtice area is one we discussed plus the Newcastle and Bowmanville areas.

What we, as a ministry, have done to help this particular study to be finalized is we have approved further funds for the municipality of Newcastle. We've asked that the people have full input into the possibility of the housing being started this year and next year and so on. I think, as the Ministry of Housing, we have fully communicated with the elected people and have asked them to make sure that the people in the area respond on how they wish to see the housing starts. I think the figure of 45,000 is much too high. It's a long-term figure.

Mr. Lewis: It's being used everywhere.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: It's being used and shouldn't be, I think, at this time. This is

what I implied to the members of council and the mayor—I felt the people should be aware that the figure is much lower than that. If the figure is checked in the year 2000 it might be 45,000 but certainly not in the next 10 years.

Mr. Lewis: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

PORTRAYAL OF VIOLENCE BY COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY

Mr. Lewis: I believe the Premier is about, if I could ask him a question. I think I saw him disappear behind the door; I'm sorry to do this—I don't mean to.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Scarborough West have another question?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I do.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): The Premier is like Puck. What does he do behind there?

Mr. Martel: What are they giving away back there?

Mr. Lewis: The ministers are all serving the fourth estate back there. The Premier has been scrambling to dance to the pipes of the media more alertly in the last two or three weeks that I've ever seen him. I don't begrudge it.

Mr. Singer: This time it's Ottawa calling.

Mr. Speaker: Could we have the question now please?

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Premier if he has seen some of the documentation in the studies, "The Early Window; The Effects of Television on Children and Youth," the study by Goranson at York University on "Media Violence and Aggressive Behaviour," the study which is provided by the Surgeon General of the United States on "The Consequences of Violence in Television on Young and Adult Behaviour," the study of Eron and Huesmann on "The Learning of Aggression in Children" as it emerges through the media; and the immense range of material—both Canadian and non-Canadian—all of which will be repeated by the LaMarsh commission? Does he not think, in retrospect, that he would save the people of Ontario an immense amount of money if he abandoned his intention to proceed with the commission?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is any question that if there were no commission there would not be that expenditure of money. I mean the answer to that is very simple. I agree if there were no commission, there would be no expenditure.

Mr. Reid: Supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask, by supplementary; since the commission—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Well, it is an unerring observation.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: All right, he is devastating. The Premier cut right through to the core, I can see that. I won't quarrel with him. The shortest point—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't think the member needs a supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: I have a supplementary though. I have a supplementary.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Of course, I knew he'd have a supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, since the commission will invariably be repeating all of the information now on the public record, Canadian and non-Canadian, why is this government going to spend several hundred thousand dollars of Ontario money for a purpose which is useless, which will have no useful object?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, of course, I just don't happen to agree that it will have no useful purpose. I will say to the hon. member, he can say what he likes. He can say that there is some political motivation.

Mr. Deans: It will be politically useful.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I've talked about this in one form or another for the last six months or a year.

Mr. Lewis: Not some—entirely, totally.

Hon. Mr. Davis: All right, so he says it's political, that's fine. I just tell the member the response I've had in the last four or five days from many parents and others has been most encouraging.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The NDP leader doesn't do things politically, does he?

Mr. Lewis: Everybody treats it with scorn.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know the material is there, but nothing so far has happened with it—

Mr. Lewis: Nobody takes it seriously, it is an object of ridicule everywhere.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and I'm very confident that this commission will focus public attention, will come up with recommendations that will lead to something that is meaningful. If he doesn't like it, the NDP leader can make all the speeches around the province he wants against it—

Mr. Lewis: Oh come on, it is of no consequence. Why doesn't he go to the CRTC personally? Two hundred and fifty dollars a day can solve a lot of problems in Ontario. He is not concerned because he—

Hon. Mr. Davis: —but I tell the leader of the New Democratic Party that he is on the wrong track. The people of the Province of Ontario are concerned and they are in support of this commission. They are very much in support of it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think when one person is speaking that—

Hon. Mr. Davis: They are.

Mr. Lewis: They are not, they are sceptical; their eyebrows are raised.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He tries to make them sceptical because he is a cynic on this issue.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest that when one person is speaking that another person has no right to be interrupting. Is the question finished?

Mr. Lewis: No, I have a question.

Mr. Breithaupt: If this is the wrong issue, tell us what the right one is.

Mr. Lewis: That's right; just wait. I have been called a cynic.

Hon. Mr. Davis: On this issue.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I am a man of boundless optimism; my hope runs out only when it comes to the Premier.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary, the member for Rainy River.

Hon. Mr. Clement: The NDP leader is not going to make it; is that what he means?

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Premier give us an estimate of how much he thinks this commission will cost by the time it does finish its work, if it ever does? Can he give us an estimate on the cost?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I obviously have more confidence in the chairman of this commission than the hon. member does, when he asks whether we will ever finish.

Mr. Reid: The people want to know what it is costing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have every confidence that the commissioner has the ability to bring this royal commission to a conclusion. I have set a time limit.

Mr. Singer: In the fullness of time; in the fullness of time.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's right, I have set a time limit.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's right, I think she has great talent. I know the people across the House don't share that. I think she has; I think she'll do it very well.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They forgot she was their truth squad; a very truthful woman. They know that.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Ottawa Centre with a final supplementary on this question.

Mr. Breithaupt: She has a squad to help her.

Mr. Cassidy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister explain why it is that since the introduction of television in Ontario in the 1950s, and his period as a Minister of Education, and the raising of his own children, at no time led him to say a recallable public word about violence on television until the polls this spring told him that this was an issue that might be exploited for the election?

An hon. member: Ah, get off it.

Mr. Lewis: Even now his words aren't real.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to become provocative on a Friday morning,

and I will not say that the hon. member either is ill-informed, doesn't read, doesn't listen and has not attended every function I have attended, but I have made observations over the years about the impact of television on young people, both in a positive and negative sense.

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): He has.

Mr. Breithaupt: Turn to channel 4.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have referred to violence, I have referred to permissiveness, I have referred to lack of authority, I have referred to matters of alcohol many, many years ago. And this matter relating to the polls, with great respect, is like so many of his judgments—just totally erroneous.

Mr. Lewis: Has the Premier?

Mr. Foulds: Is that in the speech?

Mr. Lewis: Nobody recalls him saying those things.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't often call on members in the gallery, but some of them have heard me refer to this well before any recent polls.

Mr. Lewis: I can't remember that—and I have been here 12 years.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if the member is not interested in violence and its potential, why doesn't he say so? Why doesn't he say so?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia with his question.

Mr. Bullbrook: I want to say that anybody who participates in this question period can't be bereft of an interest in violence.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know one fellow who speaks with some expertise.

Mr. Bullbrook: That—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Wait until tonight and tomorrow night.

Mr. Bullbrook: The Premier said he wasn't going tonight.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'll be there tomorrow night.

Mr. Bullbrook: All right. I'll be there too.

Hon. Mr. Clement: I'll be there both nights.

Mr. Bullbrook: As a matter of knowledge, Mr. Speaker, the byplay is that the hon. Attorney General, the hon. Premier and myself share our 20th anniversary of graduation from law school tomorrow night.

Mr. Singer: I think it's time all three of them went back.

BRUCE HEAVY WATER PLANT

Mr. Bullbrook: I'd like to direct a question to either the Minister of the Environment or the Minister of Energy, to whomever it is more appropriate in connection with the announcement this morning by the Minister of Energy, hoping to voice a deep personal concern.

Could one of the ministers advise what liaison or studies have been undertaken by Hydro and the Ministry of the Environment in connection with the environmental impact of this fourth phase of the heavy water development at Bruce? And, if I might add, would it be possible for us to secure some unequivocal assurance for the people in south-western Ontario enjoying Lake Huron that there will not be an adverse environmental impact, and many position papers or studies be made available to us?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Well, Mr. Speaker, as the member knows, there has been a considerable amount of work done on the environmental aspects of the heavy water development at Bruce. The first plant has been in service now for several years, the second and third plants were authorized last year, and the fourth plant was announced today.

It is my understanding, and this precedes my time in this ministry, that there were some difficulties in the early stages, as we are all well aware, but they have been corrected, not only in the first plant but in the engineering for the second and third.

As for environmental assessment, there has been a great deal of co-operation between Hydro and the Ministry of the Environment. I'll be glad to get as much material as possible for the member on the environmental aspects of this project.

BRUCE HEAVY WATER PLANT

Mr. Bullbrook: Do I understand then that the minister and his colleague, the Minister of the Environment, are both satisfied that the additional output of hot water, for example, will not adversely affect the ecology of Lake Huron?

Hon. W. Newman (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to answer that question. We are always concerned about any temperature change in water, as is the Minister of Natural Resources; that is one benefit of the reorganized structure of government—we do work very closely together on these matters. Certainly we are satisfied environmentally on that point, but we are continually monitoring not only that plant, but other plants, to check water temperature changes and to see what will happen. We are keeping an eye on it on a regular basis and we work in co-operation with the Ministries of Energy and Natural Resources on this matter.

Mr. Bullbrook: Just one supplementary: Do I correctly understand the response of the Minister of Energy, that I will be able to have some documentation as to the liaison in connection with this matter?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I will get information on the environmental aspects on this project for the hon. member.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has much study been given to utilizing the waste heat to increase the temperature of the ground nearby for market gardening purposes or some other use so that in effect we make use of that waste heat to stretch out the growing season in that area? That has been talked about, and I wonder if any research has been done on that.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, there has been some work done on that. As the scientists say, I'm not sure what the state of the art is at this point, but I will be glad to get a report on it. The hon. member for Sarnia mentioned warm water discharges from nuclear plants, and there are other possibilities as far as recreation is concerned, such as warm water beaches and that sort of thing.

As for the agricultural applications, I will be glad to get the member whatever material is available at this time.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Colleges and Universities has the answer to a previous question.

ALLEGED BIAS IN RYERSON EXAMINATIONS

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) asked me for a report on the discussions going on about the Ryerson land surveys.

Mr. Lewis: He is not here.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would like to give a progress report inasmuch as I may not be here by 2 o'clock on Monday. I think, Mr. Speaker, if I give this, it should be helpful. There is a further meeting going on today which I'll refer to.

Representatives of Ryerson, including a student, and the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors met on April 10 with officials of my ministry and the surveyor general on the Ministry of Natural Resources. The meeting identified the various issues that need to be resolved.

The board of examiners of the Association of Ontario Land Surveyors is meeting today, Friday, to develop a mechanism that will be used to appraise the Ryerson programme. They are then expected to meet with Ryerson to discuss this proposal before deciding on the appraisal mechanism.

Once this critical question with long-term implications is dealt with, officials will again meet with Ryerson and AOLS to discuss such short-term issues as the dates and places of AOLS examinations, information to students, treatment of interim Ryerson graduates that is, between 1972 and the conclusion of the appraisal—and the question of students who took and failed the examination just recently. Ryerson and the AOLS are autonomous in their respective areas. We hope it will be possible for them to resolve this question to the satisfaction of all concerned.

My ministry and Natural Resources are monitoring the current developments and will assist in any way possible. I will give a further report to the hon. member when I hear the results of the discussions today.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY REVIEW PANEL

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): I have a question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. To what extent are the efforts of the construction industry review panel to achieve contracts and help negotiations in the construction industry for this coming year being hampered by the Construction Labour Relations Association of Ontario in its statements around the province that various contracts that have already been signed are inflationary, too high above the cost that the industry can afford, and so on?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I have no way of assessing that.

Mr. Bounsall: Supplementary Mr. Speaker: With respect to the operation of the construction industry review panel, why has the proposal of both management and labour on that committee with respect to a construction standards Act, on which they're all agreed, not come forward before us in legislation? Why is it bottled up in that committee?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure I even know what proposal the member for Windsor West is referring to.

Mr. Bounsall: Well, why doesn't the minister find out?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron.

FITNESS OF FARMERS TO SERVE IN LEGISLATURE

Mr. J. Riddell (Huron): I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food, if I could have his attention for a minute, Mr. Speaker.

In view of the length of time it has taken to improve urban-rural relationships in Ontario, would he take it upon himself to enlighten the member for St. David (Mrs. Scrivener) who allegedly made the statement that in her appraisal of opposition members as potential members of the governing body in Ontario the member for Huron-Bruce, although he is a nice guy, is just another farmer?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That part was wrong.

Mr. Riddell: Would the minister enlighten his colleagues that farmers perform a most useful function in society, requiring the utmost skill and knowledge, and that they—

Mr. Speaker: Order, place your question.

Mr. Riddell: —do have a place in the Ontario Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am sure the member for St. David didn't say that.

Mr. Speaker: Is the minister answering the question?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): It doesn't deserve a reply.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Peel South.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

Mr. Lewis: Well, surely the member for St. David will be reprimanded by someone?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member for Peel South. Place your question.

Mr. Lewis: What about a public humbling?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the leader of the New Democratic Party reprimand his members?

Mr. Lewis: I reprimand all the time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: How successful has he been with the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman)?

Mr. Lewis: I have been extremely successful with the member for High Park. He isn't even here.

AIRPORT ROAD FACILITIES

Mr. Kennedy: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications, if he is listening. In the light of the announcements with respect to the expansion of Malton Airport and the commencement of Pickering, could he inform the House as to whether there have been discussions with respect to the need for highway and traffic approach modifications? The question is in two or three parts. Have there been discussions on the cost sharing? Also, with respect to the traffic projections, the article states 12 million and then 15 million passengers. If I recall correctly—

Mr. Reid: No speech.

Some hon. members: Question.

Mr. Martel: Give us the question.

Mr. Kennedy: Those fellows can cool it. They have been making speeches all morning instead of asking questions.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the member get on with his question, please.

Mr. Kennedy: Those projections that were identified by SANA went into many millions more than 12 or 15. Does this mean the difference or does the minister have information as to whether the difference is going to be lifted from Pickering on one runway?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, first of all I can say as far as the announcement is

concerned, it did not come as a surprise. Quite frankly, we have had this information for some time in the ministry; we have waited until the federal agency decided to make a public announcement of it.

We are concerned about the amounts of money which will be required to provide the sort of traffic facilities to handle the ground traffic which will be created at Malton Airport with the expansion programme. We also have some concerns about the speed up required of the long-range highway proposals and ground transportation facilities that would be required to serve the proposed Pickering development.

The figure we have been looking at is a potential 15 million passengers at Malton. We have some concern about that not only from the ground transportation viewpoint but from the point of increasing that traffic by 50 per cent when it is fairly well common knowledge that only one runway at Malton can be used on many occasions.

We are having discussions with the federal Ministry of Transport to determine exactly what the plans are as they relate to Malton and to the one strip development it has announced at Pickering.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister use his good offices to confirm with the Ministry of Transport in Ottawa that no further extension of the runways at Malton is made?

An hon. member: It is going to be made.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I believe the member knows that is the position we have taken. We do not wish to see any expansion of Malton's runway facilities at all. There have been land-use changes which have taken place in the Malton Airport area, as each member knows, as a result of the announcement that there would be another airport built. I think it would be grossly unfair to the citizens who moved into that area, into what would become the flight path. Our position is unchanged. We are opposed to any further extension of the runway facilities at Malton.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, I take it then that the minister is saying he will use his good offices to make certain that no further expansion will take place at Malton?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, Mr. Speaker. What I am saying is that I have already used my good offices to do that.

Mr. Braithwaite: Will the minister continue to do so?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: With complete dedication.

Hon. Mr. Crossman: Without the help of the member for Etobicoke out there.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth. This is a new question, I presume?

PARADISE HOMES

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Housing.

What sort of advice should I give my constituent who acquired a HOME lot in 1973, who has repeatedly brought to the attention of Ontario Housing Corp., Central Mortgage and Housing Corp. and the builder some major faults in the construction which mean there is leaking water in the living room, bedroom, kitchen and basement? In spite of all of these efforts—including having signed a petition which I brought to the ministry's attention some months ago, along with his neighbour's, about the problems with this particular builder, Paradise Homes—he has been unable to this date in 1975 to get one single problem fixed.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the member for Wentworth bringing this to my attention again.

Mr. Deans: Again, yes.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: It was brought to my attention before. Would the member be kind enough to give me the name of the person he is referring to, plus the lot number, and I will look into it for the member.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question: Given that this citizen, together with a number of others, had to deal with Paradise Homes, and went to Ontario Housing Corp., who inspected the properties and told Paradise to fix them up; and that Paradise brought their tools, stuck them in somebody's basement and never came back; what is the minister going to do about Paradise Homes? What is he going to do about Claren homes? What is he going to do about Settlement Corp.? What is he going to do to get them to build a house that is reasonably substantial and that people can live in without having to worry about their belongings getting ruined?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has brought other names to my attention before with regard to similar defects. I think the answer to what he has

brought to our attention today is that we should have a warranty policy. We are working towards that, and the federal government is going to bring in one—

Mr. Deans: The federal government again!

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Let me finish, please. The federal government has said it will have a warranty policy which may not be in effect for 18 months or possibly two years; I don't know how long. But I hope that my colleague who is responsible for this in Ontario will have a warranty policy for Ontario; I am working to that end, and I hope we will not have the kind of problems the member has outlined.

Mr. Deans: May I ask one brief supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker: It should be brief. There are three or four members who wish to ask questions.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, as far as inspections are concerned, and the defects mentioned by the member, I want to make sure that sort of thing doesn't happen in the future and I will be most pleased to look into it. I don't want to have such matters happening in the future by any means.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: No more supplementaries on this question. The member for Kitchener is next.

Mr. Deans: Why do they get a 12-month guarantee and nothing happens?

SENIOR CITIZENS' CARE

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development: With respect to recent reports concerning some senior citizens, who by illness or confusion are unable to take care of themselves in their own homes and therefore cause not only a health hazard to themselves but concern to their neighbours, I am wondering if the minister would consider, as a matter of policy co-ordination, some decision whereby the people of the province would know that the medical officer of health in a community or some particular person is the one to whom reports of these problems could be sent so that some form of kindly investigation could be made to make sure that these persons, perhaps through illness or confusion, are not in serious condition. I particularly refer to two recent cases in the

Kitchener-Waterloo area that have come to my attention.

Hon. M. Birch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most public health units do have that kind of co-ordination within their own communities, but I certainly will be very happy to pass this along to the Minister of Health and perhaps through his office alert all public health units throughout the province to provide this service.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Stormont.

BILINGUAL SERVICES

Mr. G. Samis (Stormont): M. l'Orateur, j'aimerais poser une question à la secrétaire pour le Développement social. Can she tell me if she has taken any action on a recommendation by her advisory council on multiculturalism to the effect that bilingual services at the provincial level should be expanded in areas where the French population is 25 per cent or more?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Just recently our social policy field met with the Franco-Ontarian association of Ontario. This was discussed and recommendations are being considered at the moment.

Mr. Samis: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can I ask if the secretary is satisfied with the degree of bilingual services at the present?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I think and I believe that great strides are being made in this area.

Mr. Cassidy: Backwards.

Mr. Laughren: What kind of an answer is that?

PICKEREL FISHING

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. Is the minister aware of the pickerel carnage on the Thames River, where tons of fish apparently are being taken from the river illegally? What plans does the minister have to curtail this type of activity; and will he provide additional conservation officers to keep this in check?

Mr. Lewis: What did the member call it? Pickerel carnage?

Mr. Breithaupt: It's a sauce.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I am very much aware of that particular problem. I have to admit that it is an annual one in that area—

Mr. Lewis: The annual genocide of the pickerel.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I bring down the average. I never catch anything.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Each year we attempt to enlarge our law enforcement branch.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Why not get more conservation officers?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: This year we have increased the number of our conservation officers by 25. There will be one or two additional conservation officers assigned to the Chatham area. In addition to this, we will be putting in extra forces from other areas; we will bring them in there. We will also make use of our deputy conservation officers, who have been very helpful in assisting the conservation officers in that area.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. George.

DON VALLEY PARKWAY

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. In view of the fact that the minister has been reported as stating there will have to be additional work done on the Don Valley Parkway, is he prepared at this time to advise this House as to what work he is contemplating? Does it now include a change in the ingress at Bloor St.? What information has he from Metro Toronto as to their proposals for the beginning of what may be the crosstown expressway?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, first of all, in the article to which the hon. member is referring, I did not state that the work would be done. I said that it possibly may be required. In all fairness, part of the information that I've gathered was as a result of a conversation I had with the hon. member regarding her experience with the parkway, in which she drew to my attention certain problems that were existing and would be further aggravated within the Don Valley area. I have had some preliminary discussions on it, but nothing is definite at all. We're simply looking at what may be done; but nothing at all has been definitely decided.

Again, I appreciated the input from the hon. member; it's given me an insight.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege; yesterday in this Legislature I tried to submit a petition to the Queen related to support for the strikers in the township of Norfolk with 1,000 signatures. I have consulted with the Clerk of the House in this matter, and find that, unfortunately, it's almost impossible to petition the Queen without the aid of a very skilled lawyer to direct it. However, the people in the area know what they want to say and, therefore, on a matter of privilege, wish to send this petition, signed by 1,050 people in the township of Norfolk supporting the strikers, to the Minister of Transportation and Communications on behalf of the government.

Mr. Lewis: The Queen is aware of the gravity.

Mr. Ferrier: The minister is trembling in his seat over there.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. Lewis: Why was the Tory nomination in Grey-Bruce two nights ago such a shambles?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: They were fighting publicly. Tory carnage, they call it.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): I know nothing about it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Scarborough West, I have asked—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): They were advertising on the cover.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. One moment, the member for Haldimand-Norfolk.

Mr. J. N. Allan (Haldimand-Norfolk): Mr. Speaker, I would like you to welcome 60 students from the senior public school in Dunnville, with four of their teachers, Mrs. Midler, Mrs. King, Mr. Spears and Mr. Nyomato, in the west gallery.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, subject to what your ruling may be, I don't know whether I'm on a point of order or a point of privilege, but point of view is probably the right one.

From the petition I received from the hon. member, I believe it has been delivered to the wrong minister to be effective. It relates to receiving the same collective agreement as the road employees of the region, the township of Delhi, the town of Simcoe and the city of Nanticoke.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is not an official petition. The member can deliver it to whatever minister he wishes. It has not been approved by the Clerk's table.

Orders of the day.

TOWN OF SEAFORTH ACT

Mr. Riddell moves second reading of Bill Pr2, An Act respecting the Town of Seaforth.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill Pr2, An Act respecting the Town of Seaforth.

CITY OF BRANTFORD ACT

Mr. Beckett moves second reading of Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the City of Brantford.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the City of Brantford.

QUINN LUMBER AND BUILDERS' SUPPLY CO. LTD. ACT

Hon. Mr. Winkler, on behalf of Mr. Walker, moves second reading of Bill Pr7, An Act respecting Quinn Lumber and Builders' Supply Co. Ltd.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill Pr7, An Act respecting Quinn Lumber and Builders' Supply Co. Ltd.

BOROUGH OF ETOBICOKE ACT

Hon. Mr. Winkler, on behalf of Mr. Leluk, moves second reading of Bill Pr8, An Act respecting the Borough of Etobicoke.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill Pr8, An Act respecting the Borough of Etobicoke.

BOROUGH OF ETOBICOKE ACT

Hon. Mr. Winkler, on behalf of Mr. Leluk, moves second reading of Bill Pr9, An Act respecting the Borough of Etobicoke.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill Pr9, An Act respecting the Borough of Etobicoke.

BOROUGH OF YORK ACT

Hon. Mr. Winkler, on behalf of Mr. Leluk, moves second reading of Bill Pr10, An Act respecting the Borough of York Act.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: On second reading, the member for Windsor West.

Mr. Bounsall: On second reading of this bill, I just want to make a very brief comment to the House that there is one section of this bill that I wish to draw to the attention of all the members. It is a very interesting section and a step forward. The Borough of York has said to its long-term employees who are about to retire that, where the Municipal Act allows them to have a maximum only of six months' payment in lieu of not having taken sick credit, if they have sick credit beyond that six months, which heretofore they could not take, by the passage of this bill they will also get two-thirds of everything beyond six months that is to their credit.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, this is a great step forward for hard-working, dedicated employees of municipalities who do not have to use and do not take in any other way their sick leave credits and have more than six months coming to them to their credit upon

their retirement. I would recommend to the House and to the minister concerned that legislation of this type be extended to employees of all municipalities in the province.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill Pr10, An Act respecting the Borough of York.

BOROUGH OF NORTH YORK ACT

Hon. Mr. Winkler, on behalf of Mr. Bales, moves second reading of Bill Pr15, An Act respecting the Borough of North York.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill Pr15, An Act respecting the Borough of North York.

CITY OF BRANTFORD ACT

Hon. Mr. Winkler, on behalf of Mr. Beckett, moves second reading of Bill Pr17, An Act respecting the City of Brantford.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill Pr17, An Act respecting the City of Brantford.

CITY OF KINGSTON ACT

Hon. Mr. Winkler, on behalf of Mr. Apps, moves second reading of Bill Pr18, An Act respecting the City of Kingston.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill Pr18, An Act respecting the City of Kingston.

BOROUGH OF SCARBOROUGH ACT

Hon. Mr. Winkler, on behalf of Mr. Drea, moves second reading of Bill Pr22, An Act respecting the Borough of Scarborough.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill Pr22, An Act respecting the Borough of Scarborough.

HURON COLLEGE ACT

Hon. Mr. Winkler, on behalf of Mr. Walker, moves second reading of Bill Pr23, An Act respecting Huron College.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

The following bill was given third reading upon motion.

Bill Pr23, An Act respecting Huron College.

CITY OF SAULT STE. MARIE ACT

Mr. Gilbertson moves second reading of Bill Pr27, An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill Pr27, An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of the House I wonder if we could revert to the introduction of bills.

Mr. Speaker: Do we have that consent?

Agreed.

FORESTRY AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Bernier moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Forestry Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, earlier this morning I made a statement in respect to a tax rebate programme for owners of managed forests and referred to the enabling legislation in this regard. This bill will enable the establishment of programmes for the encouragement of forestry in Ontario. It also contains a routine provision to define the words "minister" and "ministry" as used in the Forestry Act.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 20th order, House in committee of supply.

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): Mr. Chairman, before you proceed with the estimates, might I ask your indulgence to extend the welcome of the House to students from Caradoc North School, the teachers from that school and parents who are with them from the county of Middlesex. I would ask the members to join with me in welcoming them.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

(continued)

On vote 1402:

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore on which vote?

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): I have a couple of questions—I take it that it's vote 1402, not item 2, you are talking about.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1402, item 2, the second item.

Mr. Lawlor: Is this the proper place to discuss the business of probationary services?

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Correctional Services): Item 3.

Mr. Lawlor: Item 3?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Item 3 under this vote.

Mr. Lawlor: May I just make a brief statement of recognition under this particular heading? I think it's worthwhile in this House once in a while to give credit to those institutions in society which take areas of care upon themselves; often voluntarily and without compensation; it's not really sub-delegation, because they are constituted and autonomous, they are on their own. They are often more effective and perform better than the governments, with their heavy-handed technocracies.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): That's strange coming from a New Democrat.

Mr. Lawlor: The whole problem was to make it human, for heaven's sake.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Lawlor: I'm speaking in this context about the John Howard Society of Ontario and of Canada and, of course, the Elizabeth Fry Society. I particularly want to acknowledge publicly, and on the record, and to thank the John Howard Society for the bulletins they send to us regularly through the mail.

They don't ask us necessarily to subscribe—Lord, if in this House we had to subscribe to every institution that is good enough to send us its literature gratis, then we would need a pay raise indeed. I think of the conservation groups and various naturalist organizations that send us material.

In the particular context of the John Howard Society, last evening, prior to speaking on this matter and on this area of the vote, I was looking at an excellent piece of work in the May, 1974, issue of the newsletter of the society. It goes over the Law Reform Commission of Canada's recommendations having to do with sentencing and disposition of offences, but it is also critical of your own area in terms of what happens subsequent thereto, much like my remarks of last evening as to your liaison with the Attorney General of the province (Mr. Clement), and particularly with the Solicitor General, who is handling the police problems of this province, all of them devolving upon the head of a single soul. He tells me it is a much easier job than it was to be the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, believe it or not. So you can see what a light burden justice really is.

The newsletter attacks the criminal adversary process, as such, which is coming under fire and under scrutiny. Ancient as it may be in English law, I think it is having to undergo very considerable revision in terms of co-operation between counsel, and with the judges at the various levels of our courts, in order to reach some kind of concordance rather than a spirit of conflict and division, which seems to be the mode. It is a contentious, acrimonious spirit which divides; I suppose it is trying to conquer something, but all it does is defeat itself.

In any event, the business of the restitution and compensation factor should be enforced and given an added twist—this minister can make his contribution in this area—rather than incarceration. The business of conciliation procedures and settlements, even within the criminal process, has to be broached. All are new, vital ideas coming from the federal Law Reform Commission in the area of the administration of the court and its relationship with the various types of jails we've got around this province.

That's one small job they did, but every one of their reports contains very vital things. This particular issue and others go some length into the parole structure, about which you are making representations at the federal level because of that quagmire, that mess you've got in terms of administration. With-

in the next vote we can get on to that central issue of control.

Before I sit down, I want to give some credit to your own organization for the newsletter that comes out from the Ministry of Correctional Services and keeps us up to date. It's all self-serving, all very bland, all in favour of the minister. They put the picture of the various dignitaries and panjandruns in this process in it. But I suppose if you don't give yourself a few accolades in this life, nobody else is likely to—that was Bernard Shaw's feeling about it.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Certainly in Correctional Services.

Mr. Lawlor: And you know there's a good deal of truth to it. I mean, we tend to get lost in the shuffle so we have to have the aggression to push ourselves forward in life and so we publish a ministry newsletter. But in between the lines and in between the accolades, there are often nuggets, not of gold, but maybe nuggets of magnesium here and there. They keep us up to date as to what is going on, and anything of that kind is gratefully received and not let go into the wastepaper basket. I save them from year to year and they are very valuable.

On the care and treatment, I have a specific question. How many people, for what period of time, have been placed in the "hole" in your various reformatories—just in the reformatory system, since I trust there is no "hole" in training school. Could you give me statistics on that? You know what I mean by the "hole"?

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Solitary confinement.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Oh, in solitary confinement. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to hear the comments of the hon. member from Lakeshore concerning the volunteer agencies. I stressed in my opening remarks that we are very appreciative of the organizations and the individuals who are involved in these voluntary agencies. With this ministry we have over 2,100 volunteers. They include not only the John Howard Society and Elizabeth Fry Society, but they also include the Alienated Youths of Canada, a committee on native organizations, the Fortune Society of Canada, and of course, there's—

Mr. Lawlor: The Fortune Society—that is the Windsor.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes. And of course there are a great many individuals who assist as

voluntary probation officers and so on with us; and quite frankly we find that they are very effective. We just couldn't get along without them. In many cases we find that the volunteer probation officer can work more closely with an individual than one of our full-time probation officers, because there is a certain stigma attached to being an official. When they are in a non-official capacity they can accomplish a great deal more. We are indebted to these organizations for encouraging individuals to participate in the programme.

The information you have asked—

Mr. Lawlor: And they are not patsies to you—would you agree with that? They put it to you pretty good.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Oh, I would say very much so. And I would say the same thing for our various review boards and committees that work for us—they are no patsies to anybody. They are there to do a job and they are going to do it, and they bring this to our attention.

Mr. Lawlor: People in your position have to be kept on their toes.

Hon. Mr. Potter: But I also am delighted to hear the hon. member's comments of our newsletter. I have always felt that we have a very good staff. I've told you this before. By far, the majority of the members of my staff are dedicated people and they are determined to do their utmost to see that we do develop our programmes and continue to explore methods of improving them.

As far as the information you had requested about solitary is concerned, I'll get that for you and give it to you later.

Mr. Chairman: May I just draw to the attention of the committee we seem to be varying a little bit from the particular item. I think that should have been discussed under item 4, community services. However, perhaps we can come back to the various items and deal with them in a little more orderly fashion.

Mr. Lawlor: What! Is the "hole" a community service?

Mr. Chairman: We were talking about community services for adults, vote 4. You were talking about the John Howard Society, where we are supporting them financially. However, I think the hon. member for Wellington South wished to comment on vote 2 before we carry vote 2.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the opportunity to put on public record the function that I had the opportunity to attend last Saturday at the Guelph Correctional Centre, and that was the formation of the Jaycee organization. I believe it was the first in any provincial institution. I would like to pay tribute to the superintendent, Mr. Keane, and to the young man who was active in the project, Mr. Angelo Mior.

I think on top of that it pays great tribute to members of your staff—your deputy minister, and I believe Mr. Hughes and Mr. Fox were there—who give their time after hours in order to help these young people who wish to participate in such an organization. When they leave that institution, they will have at least an insight into how some of the organizations operate outside. I think it's a good programme and I sincerely hope that we are giving encouragement to volunteer organizations.

I think you paid tribute in your report but I just couldn't let this occasion pass without paying tribute to those people involved.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the minister indicated before but does he have the answer to my question in regard to contract employees that I asked previously? Maybe you will recall that the other day I asked you how many contract employees you had and you said you would get that information for me.

Hon. Mr. Potter: In this vote?

Mr. Reid: No, in vote 1401. You are also going to provide me with some information in regard to the people on your information staff. Perhaps if one of your officials could make a note of it, you could let me have that later.

I would like to ask the minister my perennial question. Has his ministry or the Ministry of Government Services purchased land for the construction of a new provincial jail in Fort Frances? The minister is aware that it was built, I believe, in 1904-1905 and that it has no facilities for separating male and female inmates. The town of Fort Frances is building a new town hall almost adjacent to the present structure. The minister's predecessor indicated to me a few years ago that he realizes the need and indeed would go forward with the new jail. Have you the land and can you tell me if you're prepared to announce the construction of a new facility?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, I was in Fort Frances just a few weeks ago. This particular project is the first among our 15 priorities for major capital construction. Preliminary design work has been completed, the land is available and working drawings will be done when money for the construction is made available. We haven't proceeded with the working drawings yet.

Mr. Reid: I gather that the money isn't in this year's budget.

Hon. Mr. Potter: It is not in this year's budget. In this year, there are four facilities: London, Hamilton and east and west Toronto.

Mr. Reid: But it will be number one in the next year's budget?

Hon. Mr. Potter: It will be number one in the next 15 priorities.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, I have just one thing on item 2. Could you give me an insight into this? You have an institution at Brampton for adult offenders. I understand it's highly selective. In other words, the ministry selects in a very special way individuals from out of the reformatory system to attend this particular institution. It's an assessment one in some ways. What I'm really trying to get to is, can you give me a picture of it? It's fairly new. It's highly integrated and it's supposed to be somewhat visionary. These are the frontiers of a new programme. Could we hear more about that?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, it is an assessment centre. There is a 50-bed assessment centre and there is a 150-bed treatment facility there for all young people who have received sentences of nine months or more. They are there to be assessed to decide what type of institution is best suited to their needs. Then they carry on from there.

Mr. Lawlor: How long are they there?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Usually it is about a one-month assessment at the assessment centre and then the treatment facility is a 150-bed treatment facility for special cases. Usually they are there six months to a year or a year and a half.

Mr. Lawlor: What is the process of assessment? How is it done? Why is it such a special type of place?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I could go into great detail on how it is done, I suppose. It is

divided into five treatment units. It is all in this correctional—

Mr. Lawlor: And it is not being detracted—the equipment?

Hon. Mr. Potter:—in the adult male institutions, the correctional programmes. It is all in there if you care to read it.

Mr. Lawlor: All right.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury East on item 2.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Can I ask the minister, on vote 2, what follow up does the ministry do with respect to prisoners and what is happening to them once they have left the institution and are in, let's say a halfway house? They are paroled and maybe they go to a halfway house. In the Sudbury area, and this problem has been drawn to my attention, we will get men into a halfway house who are going to school or something like that. Frequently they don't have quite enough funds and I know that the federal parole officers have gone to the local welfare officer and asked for funding called special assistance so that books and clothing could be bought to keep the men in school. It is much better paying out that way to make sure he succeeds. Getting him back into jail is going to cost about \$13,000 a year to look after him.

They won't help. They absolutely refuse to give special assistance, even though someone from either the federal parole office or the provincial will make the advance to the welfare officer and say: "Could you give \$25 or \$30 a month special assistance?" Their answer is: "No." I realize the allocation of the funding comes from another ministry but I am asking this minister if he would talk to his confrere, the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Brunelle).

It is to our advantage to have that young man or that young woman succeed by having the necessary school equipment, the proper clothing as opposed to going back into the institution where they would become a great burden on society and really don't make any headway. I would ask the minister if he would look into that?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, as the member knows, we have in Sudbury a community resource centre, which is not a halfway house. A community resource centre is for an individual who is still serving a sentence. We don't have that problem because we have some of them in our community resource centres who are going to

school and we do provide the necessary books, clothing and other services which are needed.

When it comes to a halfway house, that's for an individual who has been discharged from our facility and is no longer our responsibility. This comes under Community and Social Services. I don't know what problems the feds have been having, as the member has suggested. Certainly I would be glad to discuss that particular problem.

Again, we are getting into an area which is a little bit past us. We have been attempting through our group homes and our resource centres to see—and we do, in fact—that the services are available; that the necessary equipment and supplies are available for the individuals to continue with their studies or to assist them in obtaining employment and carrying on in the outside world. But I certainly will look at that.

Mr. Martel: The only reason I ask this—and I realize this is slightly out of his jurisdiction—is I am more concerned with the fact that these men get the same chance. For society as a whole it is a lot cheaper to put in \$35 or \$40 when they are in a halfway house rather than have them in a federal institution. They could go into a regular room and board situation rather than a halfway house and they could get general welfare and it is going to cost the province \$150 or \$160. They go to a halfway house where their chances of succeeding are better but they need a little bit of special assistance and it is turned down.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I don't know whether the member is aware, but in Thunder Bay there is one particular centre which is operated by Brother Robbie, an Oblate brother, which is the type of facility the member is talking about. We were interested, and thought perhaps he would be interested, in running a resource centre for us but he is much more interested in helping them after they are discharged than when they are still serving part of their sentence. He is working very closely with us in the Thunder Bay area. I have talked to him recently, within the last month, and hopefully he is going to exert some influence to get a similar service facility spread across various areas of the north; this would be a big help, I am sure.

One of the reasons for the resource centres was to try to make it easier for the inmate to work his way back into the community. Sometimes, if you rush them too fast or if they go straight back without going through a resource centre there is a problem. There is

no question about it, because every time they turn around they are faced with the same problem. While a great many industries are very co-operative today and are working with us in trying to employ these ex-inmates, there are also far too many who won't even look at them when they hear they have committed a crime. As I have said to some of these, the only difference between the two of you is that he got caught, and so many of these things are minor things that they get caught on.

Mr. Chairman: Does item 2 carry?

Mr. Lawlor: Just one thing, could you give me, without delaying the estimates, a breakdown of the staff at the Ontario Correctional Institute; what their designations are and what they do?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I am sorry, I didn't catch the question.

Mr. Lawlor: In the minister's report for 1974 it pretty well says precisely the same thing as this little brochure that has been given to us just recently on the Ontario correctional institute. I would like more details about it—the staff breakdown and the various functions performed by that staff—so that I get a full picture of what the services are. I don't have to have it right now. I just want it for future reference.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Do you want me to send it over to you?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Okay.

Mr. Chairman: Shall item 2 carry?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, if I may have a minute. I had a request from one of the members to repeat what I said about the abattoir at Guelph. As we announced earlier, the proposition here was that a private firm would come in and we would contract with them to take over the operation of the abattoir. They would hire inmate labour, pay the going rate and hopefully employ them after they were discharged.

We ran into one or two difficulties in getting the equipment that was necessary for the changeover, but we have it now. The abattoir will be operating under this new plan by May 27. They are, in fact, living up to their contract.

The question was asked yesterday about how much money we put into equipment and I replied then that we had spent \$800,000 on equipment. The company that has contracted

to operate the plant is paying it back at an annual rate of 12.5 per cent interest. Does that answer your question?

Mr. Chairman: Does item 2 carry?

Mr. Lawlor: On Guelph, now that you remind me, as an ongoing feature of these estimates, for many years, we have continued to zero in on Guelph as that prime place where young first offenders have sought to be segregated from an old criminal clientele and given a chance in their own milieu and so on, but the whole intent there we felt was overwhelmed and pretty well disabused by the fact that it was too large, and over the years the various reform institution ministers have cut it back and back. What progress have you made in the past year in this regard and what are your plans?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I think I already answered that a day or two ago—it was either yesterday or the day before—when I told you in the estimates that we reduced the inmate population from 800 to 500 and that we had divided the institution up into units of 60, which are self-contained units. Each unit has a permanent staff which works with the individuals. They get to know them much better and they can do a lot more counselling than they did before. I also told you that because of the changes we had made we were able to dispose of some of the cells and develop our psychiatric unit from 30 to 100, so that's the whole thing.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, I heard about the psychiatric unit.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I know at one time you and one of your colleagues visited Guelph. I would be delighted if you would care to go back again and see for yourself, because having seen it before and seeing it now it is two different institutions. It is pretty hard to describe.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, Keane had come in at the time.

Hon. Mr. Potter: He has done a tremendous job. It is really worth seeing and I would invite you to come and see it.

Mr. Chairman: Does item 2 carry? Carried.

Item 3, the Ontario Board of Parole. Any discussion under this item?

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Chairman, this of course has been something I have been interested in. I have been interested more since Ontario has not in the past had control over people sentenced in provincial institutions. Can the minister give us any information as to how progressive his discussions have been in Ottawa as to obtaining this jurisdiction back from Ottawa for parolees and people sentenced to two years less a day? Does the minister have any new information on that?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Ottawa tells us that the new Act is written in draft form, and they hope to have it done this session. Now, I can't go any further than that.

Mr. Ruston: Will this, as far as you know, give you full control over all people in your institutions?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, it will.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: In your report for 1974 you say that probation and aftercare services were integrated in January; and at the same time, the area dealing with adults only was renamed probation parole services. Why doesn't it appear that way in the estimates? "The combined service ensures clients the continuity of care that was not possible under the previous separate administration." Then you go on to say that many officers have been trained in the wider aspects of the matter and the volunteer services are involved in this regard too.

May I just refer to an article in the community education series, "Turning the Inside Out—Or Limiting the Use of Imprisonment," by Richard V. Ericson, department of sociology, University of Alberta? In one sentence he says:

In general, probation is at least as effective as imprisonment in terms of preventing recidivism. Wilkins conducted a three-year follow-up of a small group of persons placed on probation, and a group of persons with similar characteristics who were given mostly institutional sentences. There was no significant difference in re-conviction rates between these two groups.

It's an elaborate article covering many areas; not only probation, but parole services too. While the probationary aspect of the matter is more in the realm of the courts than anything to do with you, nevertheless, again, that's where weight should fall. There is this

incredible cost to the public purse; you could keep somebody down at the Four Seasons, living in the bridal suite and eating filet mignon three times a day for what it costs you to keep a single inmate in the prison system.

You've tried to alleviate that and sustain the community otherwise by your release programme and your temporary absence, and that sort of thing. But if probation, and more in your field parole, were more extensively used, were given a greater ambit, not so conservatively and tightly held, and the prison system used as simply a conduit pipe with an enormous flow through it—if it's going to have to exist at all—then I think, on the whole, great good would be accomplished.

In the area of probation, I know you expanded your staff in this particular regard. How many people are operative there at the present time, and what is their caseload? Have you got a figure, a criterion for the number of people that will be handled by these services?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the hon. member would be happy to learn that at the present time we have approximately 17,000 adults under our care. Of these 17,000, 16,454 are under the supervision of probation and parole officers in the community. So that by far the vast majority are taken care of through this system, instead of being institutionalized.

We have a high caseload. The caseload is much higher than we would like to have it, but we did increase our staff.

We have 240 probation officers, 114 clerical and 39 administrative. The caseload per officer averages 70 and in addition to that they average five or six pre-sentence reports for the courts.

Mr. Lawlor: Five or six pre-sentence reports per month?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Five or six per month, yes.

Mr. Chairman: Shall item 3 carry?

Mr. Lawlor: I take it that in the course of these negotiations with the federal government, because of your conflicting jurisdictions, the theory of the indefinite sentence is part of the review and that particularly iniquitous institution is being amended—deleted, I trust?

I am making no breach of confidence, I am sure and I trust, on this. I have written you about a Mrs. Rae Thomas and she is, in

my opinion, a woman of considerable worth, merit, weight and capability. Your reply to my letter was July 30, 1974. The chief objection to this Indian woman who wishes to engage in probation or parole services in Toronto with respect to the Indian community is that she hasn't got the necessary education qualification, that is a BA. I would ask you to speak to the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. Auld), who, following Ivan Illich, considers these things very questionable indeed; that as we emerge into some kind of civilization the fetish of degrees will no longer be the criterion by which you either get jobs or don't get jobs, but on personal capabilities, background and characteristics.

I bring her case up not because I am specially pleading on her behalf; she is unemployed still and your department has interviewed her and given her a good reception but she hasn't been hired. I do have to wonder why with the situation as it is for Indians in Metropolitan Toronto and, I suppose, in other metropolitan regions of Ontario. The total number of full-blooded Indians in Canada is 270,000. Those living on reserves, 170,000; those who live on Crown lands, 23,100; and those who live off reserves, 76,900. Of the 76,900, approximately 60,000 live in Toronto.

If you go down to the corridors like Theseus seeking to find the Minotaur—he is usually sitting on a bench down at the old city hall—you will see a striking number of Indian people in the corridors and in the courts. They do enter our society from a completely different value system; I think in many ways their value system is far superior to ours.

If you have a culture in which you sleep when you are tired and eat when you are hungry, and not eat all the time and never sleep at all if you can get away with it, I would think the first has something to be said for it. It is somewhat more in rhythm with the stars and you may even hear a little of the singing that goes on up there. All you can hear is cacophony down here.

In any event, the 60,000 Indians in Metropolitan Toronto, as I understand the situation, have no attendants. You have five officers spread throughout different parts of Ontario—five people in the probation service; two in Sarnia, somebody in Petrolia, two in northern Ontario and none in Toronto. That's where the bulk of the segregated, floating—and somewhat desperate in some circumstances—Indian population is to be found.

Why haven't you such a person? Whether it is this woman—and I have asked you to look at her credentials carefully—or somebody else, they sure need someone of Indian ancestry to operate in this area; someone with understanding of their style of life in a deeper way than you and I can possibly understand it working here in the Metropolitan Toronto area. Why isn't that in existence?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I'm not familiar, Mr. Chairman, with this specific instance. I don't recall it at the present time, but I can assure the hon. member that we do make every effort to employ these individuals, if not as a full-time probation officer, certainly part-time. I'll certainly look into this particular case, as the member has suggested, and find out what the story is.

We're anxious to get not only native Indians but also representatives from other ethnic groups. It's not always easy to do because in many cases, as I mentioned earlier, as volunteers they're acceptable to their own community but as officials representatives of a government agency they're not as well received. We run into this difficulty, but I'll certainly look into that for the hon. member.

A moment ago I said that we had 17,000 adults under our care in any one day. Actually, the figure should be approximately 22,000, of whom 16,000 are on probation.

Mr. Lawlor: How about the wider issue, though, of the attention paid through probation-parole aftercare service in Toronto with respect to the Indian population? What are the minister's thoughts about that? Apparently there is a real gap in your ministry and in your operations in this regard. In terms of saving the taxpayer money rather than having people paraded through the courts—the volume in the courts is appalling and the cost again is just out of this world—I would think that to hire a few people in this regard would be a saving measure over against the total social cost.

Hon. Mr. Potter: There is, as the hon. member is probably aware, the Canadian Indian centre with which we work very closely. They have representatives in this area. They make court appearances and they also attend our OCI training school at Brampton. We work very closely with them in this matter.

Mr. Lawlor: That may be nice. That's like Salvation Army officers found in courtrooms, and they do a stewardlike job. But you should have people right on your own staff of that

extraction and that understanding; I'm seeking to prevail upon you this morning to really give that some consideration. I think it would pay off.

Mr. Chairman: Does item 3 carry? Item 3 agreed to. Item 4? Item 4 agreed to.

Vote 1402 agreed to.

On vote 1403:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Chairman, as I think the minister is aware, I have a number of comments to make on this particular section. I have been in touch with people around the province who are showing a great deal of concern about training schools and what the ministry is doing about them. I want to put some material onto the record today, and I want to urge very seriously that drastic and immediate action be taken by the ministry to close down either every training school in the province or to close them down at the rate of one a month until we're down to two or three which might have certain redeeming features that might enable them to be integrated in a new system of helping out young offenders under the age of 16 or the age of 18.

Mr. Chairman, I might start by saying that back in March I wrote to the ministry and asked the minister what his policy was in regard to training schools. I'll put this answer on the record to begin with. The minister said:

In the matter of long-range programme planning for the children or adolescents in our care, I think that the changes in our juvenile programmes over the past few years are the best evidence of the direction which we have taken and will continue.

Diversion of potential wards at the point of court appearance and after intensive assessment at our reception and assessment centre at Oakville has placed an increasing number of children in community-based programmes. The number of children placed on probation supervision continues to increase. Time spent in training school has decreased markedly over the past few years as programmes have been intensified. Catchment area and co-educational programming permitting children to be supervised closer to their own home area, is advancing well. Clearly then, our programmes continue to become more effective in distinguishing the individual programme most suited to a youngster's needs while he or she is with us. We do not

expect that the need for residential facilities, as represented by the training school, will be entirely replaced by foster home, group home and special therapeutic treatment units over the next few years. However, our efforts to further develop individualized programmes which maintain children in or near their home community will continue.

I trust that these comments may be helpful to you.

Well, helpful as they may be, Mr. Chairman, they are quite misleading; that is one of the reasons I wanted to raise this in the Legislature today.

If I can take a few key words out of his letter, the minister first talks about the changes in our juvenile programmes. Second, he indicates that an increasing number of children are being placed in community-based programmes and, by implication, that the numbers and the importance of the training schools is diminishing. Third, he says that time spent in training school has decreased markedly. Then he says one or two other things as well.

Mr. Chairman, I want to start by talking about the ministry's own programme, and I'll take statistics for the period from 1971 to the most recent statistics, for March, 1974, to see in fact whether this new philosophy is taking hold. I believe that there is kind of an imperative in the institutions to maintain the training schools at the present level, that there is simply a kind of unstoppable urge to put kids into training schools at the expense of creating facilities for them in the community. Let's see whether things have really changed at all.

In 1968, there were 1,250 kids in residence or on the school roll—and I'm not sure of the difference, if there is one, between those two terms. In 1971, that had risen to 1,379. In 1973, it had risen to 1,463; and up to March, 1974, it had dropped a bit to 1,321. In those periods there were between 2,000 and 2,700 kids on placement, but under the responsibility of the training school system.

The total number of children who were within the system, either in residence or on placement, was 3,228 in 1968, rising to around 4,140 in 1971 and 1973, and then it dropped back slightly to 3,800 in 1974. In other words, there has not been a substantial diversion of people away from the training school system as a whole. In the last year for which figures are available there has been an apparent drop of around 100 in the training school population of people in residence, but that is the most. There is certainly no

indication of bold or radical changes in the programme.

Next, the change in length of stay: The minister says, "The time spent in training school has decreased markedly over the past few years as programmes have been intensified." The facts: In 1971, according to the minister's report, Brookside School for boys had an average length of stay of eight months; in 1974 that had actually gone down to seven months. However, at Grandview School for girls it had gone up from 6.3 months to 7.1 months. At Sprucedale School for boys the average length of stay had gone up from 7.6 months to nine months. At Kawartha School for girls the length of stay had gone up from 4.5 months to 6.2 months. At White Oaks Village, for young boys, the length of stay was pretty much the same—21.5 months in 1971 and 21 months in 1974. Pine Ridge School for boys was very much the same at 6.2 months in 1971 and six months in 1974.

Those were selected at random; I wasn't trying to see a trend either way, but it looks to me as though the figures indicated pretty conclusively that there has been no appreciable difference or change in the average length of stay of kids in training schools between 1971 and 1974, a period when the minister has been told there has been a sharp drop in the length of stay.

Next, one of the ways in which you judge the system, it seems to me, is to look at what it does with the people who are under its charge to see what happens to them and learn what kind of a record it has. As the minister is well aware, any training school system has got a lot of failures; Ontario's is no exception. That is one of the reasons I believe that it's time the training schools were closed and we moved to care in the community.

The statistical sections of the annual reports also give some information on the termination of wards. As the minister knows, once a kid is brought into a training school, even if he's only eight or nine and even if he is brought in for having committed no offence at all but having been seen as being unmanageable, it is up to some kind of a training school board to decide how long that child will be kept under the responsibility of the training school.

The abuse of children's civil rights is enormous. The figures indicate just how ineffective the training school system has been in helping kids to stand on their own feet, to reintegrate with their family or in some other way to look after themselves rather

than being a responsibility of the state. I suggest that the institutionalization that is reflected in the figures is not a failure of the children, it's a failure of the system which we have here in the province.

In 1971, there were 1,253 terminations of wardships within the training school system. The figures are very similar for 1973 and 1974. In 1974, there were 1,377 terminations. It's very interesting, Mr. Chairman, that the major reason people pass out of training school wardships is the fact that they grow older. In 1971, in fact, 621 kids had their wardships terminated because the training schools had no longer any legal hold over them. They reached the age of 18. Half of the kids who were terminated that year did so only because they passed out of the power of the training school system, not because it had been able to do anything for them.

The pattern is no different since 1973 or 1974. In 1974, slightly more than half—763 out of 1,377 kids—had their wardships terminated because they reached the age of 18. I've just had given to me the 1970 report, and I suspect the picture in 1971 will be very little different. In 1970, there were 1,000 wardships terminated and 500—exactly half—were terminated because the kids reached the age of 18, not because the system had done anything for them.

You'd think that training schools would be effective with some children and that one way that would be reflected would be that their adjustment was considered satisfactory, to use the words that are used by the board. Once again, the proportions have not changed at all from 1970 or 1971. In 1971, 259 or approximately 20 per cent of the kids whose wardships were terminated were terminated because their adjustment was considered satisfactory. In 1974, that figure was 249. It was down a bit and as a percentage it was down to about 18 per cent of the terminations in that year.

Four or five kids a year joined the armed forces and were deemed to have been rehabilitated by the system. Twenty or 30 in each of these three years moved from Ontario. A half a dozen or so become irretrievably lost. Presumably they run away or disappear and are never found again.

It's interesting that in 1971 only 14 kids were transferred to the responsibility of another agency and by 1974 that was down to only four children. We have a network of Children's Aid Societies right across this province. They have a great deal of skill and competence. They have a lot of trained staff and so on. One would have thought that the

Children's Aid Society in particular would have been capable of taking responsibility for many of the kids in training schools who were out in the community, either with their families or else who are in foster homes. But not a bit of it. The system was very jealous about its kids and allowed only four to be transferred to another agency in 1974.

In 1974, an interesting new category of 11 kids had their wardships quashed, possibly a reflection that children in training schools do have certain civil rights.

Then you come to the crunch, Mr. Chairman, and you come to the real evidence of the failure of the training school system. Once you've taken away all these categories, then you have the real graduates of the system. In 1971, 187 wardships were terminated because the kids were put on probation to an adult court and another 104 wardships were terminated because the kids then—presumably 16, 17 or 18, I don't know what age they were—were sentenced to an adult institution. That is a total of 291 kids. In 1973, it was 227 on probation, 104 sentenced to an adult institution; and in 1974, it was 228 put on probation to an adult court and 86 sentenced to an adult institution.

A total of 304 kids; more kids graduated to probation or prison than were let out of the system because they were deemed to have adjusted satisfactorily and gotten over the problems that brought them into training school in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, if there is any evidence you need that schools don't work, that's it right there. As my friends who have looked into it tell me, there is a subculture which has been created in the training school system of the Province of Ontario and the training schools are precisely that. They are part of the career path for a delinquent youngster who wants to engage in a career in crime.

In the same way that my 11-year-old son will, I hope, finish his elementary school and go on to high school and then decide to go to university or learn a skill, or something like that, youngsters who have had a brush with the law or a brush with Children's Aid at the ages of nine, or 10 or 11, move on by the time that they are in their pre-teens or early teens to training school.

Kids who were psychologically a bit on edge become permanently marked by the experience in training school. They receive courses from their peers in criminality, in criminal practice, in criminal techniques. If they are girls, they learn what they can do if they want to be delinquent sexually

as adults. If they are boys and want to engage in shoplifting and that kind of thing, they learn the names of criminal contacts in the communities to which they will return. They learn how you approach a fence. They make contacts and friendships at that stage of training school which I would suspect are quite adequate in many cases to sustain them for a lifetime.

I don't know what school the minister went to, but the minister knows the kind of value, for anybody in normal society, of childhood friendships. In a small town you grew up with a Joe and Jim and Bill and Mary. And then Joe becomes the local plumber and Bill is a bit of an ne'er-do-well, and Mary gets on the council, and so on. You grew up with these people, and a network of friendship and trust and mutual support is built up. We know about the old-boy networks of schools like the private schools of this province; and it is the same with people when they go on to university.

Well, if you want to look at this particular subculture, Mr. Chairman, those kinds of life-long friendships and links begin to get formed during the months or years that kids spend in training schools. The ones who go on into criminality, and it's obvious that a very substantial portion do, they then graduate and are perfected. They get their secondary education in reformatories, then they go on to their post-graduate education in prisons, and always with contacts with the same number of people.

There is a network of communications out there: "How's Joe?" "How's Billy?" "How's Mary?" It really isn't very much different than the old-school network which we find, say with the Conservative Party; and even, dare I say it, occasionally in the NDP or in any other institution.

The sociologists would recognize it as such. These institutions have many of the attributes of training schools for crime. I want to say that all of the evidence that I have seen now indicates that, despite the well-meaning efforts that have been made, that the training schools are not working and that other techniques ought to be used in order to help kids who have problems with delinquency.

The figures show—and I think the study will be accepted by the officials, who I see are listening with some interest—that 34 per cent of kids who leave the training schools are convicted of an offence within a year and a half of their leaving it; and 48 per cent of the kids are either returned to

training school or are incarcerated elsewhere within a year or so of their initial release.

I want to think about those figures just a minute. Bear in mind that half of the kids who go into training schools are not convicted of an offence and are not put in because of—section 9, I guess it is, of the Training Schools Act—they are put in because they are deemed to be unmanageable. They are not criminals at the time they go in.

Bear in mind as well—

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): How do they get there if they are not?

Mr. Cassidy: The member had better read section 8 of the Training Schools Act.

Mr. G. Nixon: How did they get there? They were convicted, that's why.

Mr. Cassidy: The member asked—. They were convicted!

Mr. Lawlor: No, don't you know they are not convicted? The minister is changing that.

Mr. Cassidy: I hope the member talks to the minister about that and finds out that half of the kids—

Mr. Chairman: Order, order.

Mr. G. Nixon: Whose kids?

Mr. Lawlor: The member for Dovercourt had better stay out of this.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Okay. The member for Dovercourt asks 'whose kids,' and I will tell him whose kids. It's the kids of working class people.

Mr. Chairman: If the member for Dovercourt wants to ask a question he can ask the minister the question.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, you tell that to the member—

Mr. Chairman: I will.

Mr. Cassidy: I am answering some questions that were raised during the course of the heckling, Mr. Chairman.

The kids who go into training school are kids who grow up in ridings like Dovercourt and Ottawa Centre. They are kids whose families are at a disadvantage. They come from poor backgrounds; they haven't got the kind of support of a middle class

milieu, which many of the children of the Conservative Party and its supporters happen to enjoy. There is rank discrimination about that.

Section 8 of the Training Schools Act says that:

Upon the application of any person, a judge may order in writing that a [kid] under 16 years of age at the time the order is made be sent to a training school when the judge is satisfied that . . . the parent or guardian of the child is unable to control the child or to provide for his social, emotional or educational needs . . . the care of the child by any other agency of child welfare would be insufficient or impracticable; and

(c) that the child needs the training and treatment available at a training school,

and the order shall state the facts upon which the decision is based.

On that basis, Mr. Chairman, half of the committals to training school are made.

But when you look at what comes out at the other end, bear in mind in the first place the kids don't just stay in training school for six or seven months. The length of stay in a training school system is much longer than that, because half of the kids who come out come out only because they have reached the age of 18. That means that at a minimum, half of the kids in the training school system are in it for two years or more, because you can't get committed beyond the age of 16.

The next point is that the minister knows and the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. Clement) will tell him, that the chances of getting caught for a crime aren't that high here in the province. I don't know what proportion of people get caught for criminal acts. I think if you are speeding they say it is one in 7,000, which is probably a good thing because otherwise most of the members of the Legislature would be doing time or paying fines for—

Mr. Chairman: I think the member should retract those statements.

Mr. Cassidy: All right. I retract that, Mr. Chairman.

The point I am making is that it has been known that even members of this Legislature have committed illegal acts.

Mr. Lawlor: I agree. Most of us go so slow it wouldn't be possible. Most of us would be in jail for going slow.

Mr. Cassidy: Now Mr. Chairman, we are talking about what happens to kids within 18 months of getting out of training school.

Forty-eight per cent of them get back in and a third of them are convicted of an offence. Now if a third are convicted of an offence and only half of them when they went in had ever committed a criminal act—or rather, had been convicted for a criminal act—well, you begin to raise some questions.

If you think that many of those who were not convicted of an offence could well have committed one because of the fact that the justice system doesn't catch many of its offenders, then you have got to say that these schools are aiding in criminality, rather than curing it.

I would like to put a couple of cases onto the record, Mr. Chairman, just to indicate the kinds of situations that bother me about the training school. Here's one.

Here is a girl named Phyllis K.—I will disguise the names—who was committed to training school at the age of 12 under the recommendation of the Children's Aid Society. Since committed to training school she has been foster-placed, group-placed, returned to training school—and was one of the first girls to complete the DARE programme. She ran from her last foster placement in the Peterborough area and was finally located at her mother's home in Oxford county. As she was over 17 years of age, she was allowed to remain there. She has been involved with an ex-penitentiary inmate and is now believed to be living common law. I guess there is certainly a possibility that she moves in circles of people who are ex-cons and there is a possibility of some criminal activity there. I don't know.

But, then when you look at the observation about the facts behind this case you ask: What on earth was this girl doing ever having been sent to training school in the first place?

Velma's parents are deaf-mutes. Her parents separated, and her mother is living common law with another deaf man. This kid can hear and can talk but has obviously got extraordinary problems because of the family situation into which she had the bad fortune to happen to be born.

She is a bright kid who has been severely damaged by training school. This child, says the report, should have been foster-placed in a good home. Training school has not helped her. In fact, it has permanently damaged a kid who needed the resources of the community, who was crying out, I presume, just desperately for help when at 11 or 12

the CAS locally decided that they couldn't handle her and so all of the authorities conspired to put her into training school and make the problem far worse, rather than helping a kid who had every right, like every other child, to a normal childhood and a normal adulthood.

Here's another kid. His name is John. He comes from a respectable family. He had had problems at home and at school. He was known to the juvenile courts and was committed to training school under section 8 of the Act on the recommendations of his parents and the Children's Aid Society.

He graduated home, to use the euphemisms of the institution, in 1973 and was returned to Glendale within a month. Then he went to DARE and was placed in a ministry group home in Sudbury. He came back to his parents' home again. Then he was returned to training school again within two months after severely beating up another youth, kicking him in the face. He graduated back. He is still getting psychological help.

His progress continues to be pitiful. He has failed to keep three jobs. There have been instances of drinking and drug abuse. He has been convicted of theft and is under suspicion for two breaking and entry incidents. When he was brought into court for committal before he was committed to training school, the Children's Aid Society said they had no suitable foster home for him. Well, you can see what has happened since, Mr. Chairman. He has been in and out. His criminality is obviously increasing and one has to say the training school would seem to have reinforced his criminal tendency.

Let's come to another point, Mr. Chairman. According to the figures that I have from the study by the Family Planning Federation of Canada, approximately three-quarters of the girls who are committed to training school are committed because they are deemed to be unmanageable, rather than because of conviction for an offence. They say, and I have no reason to doubt them, that in the case of girls sent to training schools, unmanageable behaviour can almost always be translated as sexual promiscuity. We don't send boys to training school because they are deemed to be promiscuous. We find other means of dealing with them or of solving that problem, if and where there is a problem. We do send them in the case of a girl.

Juvenile court judges, acting in their role as parent or protector, obviously act on their hang-ups, one might say. They feel, if

a girl is promiscuous or is seen to be promiscuous she therefore must be labelled to be a delinquent, punished, and protected from her sexual impulses at the expense of her personal liberty.

These girls are legally too young to receive contraceptive devices from a doctor without parental permission. They are almost never exposed to adequate information and guidance in the school. They are working-class girls, because if they are middle-class girls, other means are found to either accommodate their problem or their activity, or to hide it, or disguise it. We spend \$10,000 or more to incarcerate girls and to lead them into a pattern of criminality rather than coping with the problem and rather, among other things, than giving them access to contraceptive devices that may cost \$1 or \$2 a month.

What kind of self-defeating activity is that and what kind of discrimination is that against young women or girls that they go to training school if they are promiscuous, but young boys are not put into training school for the same reason?

Here is another one, Mr. Chairman. Mary was committed to training school under the recommendation of the Children's Aid Society. She has a history of promiscuity. Since committal to training school, she was placed in a ministry group home in London and then in a foster home. She became pregnant and gave birth while at the ministry group home. She ran from the foster home and was returned to training school. She was then placed in a ministry group home in Peterborough and later transferred to a group home in London.

You start with a history of promiscuity but then you say what happened with this particular girl, Mary? Mary's home life was tragic. There are good grounds for believing there was an incestuous relationship with the father. The mother is described as promiscuous. Mary needed a good foster home placement. If the girl has had advances made to her by her father and if the role model of her mother is one of promiscuity, there are obviously severe problems within that particular family. But putting the kid into training school is an assumption of criminality and has obviously led to problems which, once again, may either take years to sort out or may never get sorted out.

Here's another girl, Jane. Jane first appeared in family court late in 1974 on the recommendation of the Children's Aid Society and her mother. She was placed in

the detention home in Hamilton as the Children's Aid said they had no foster home for her. She was placed in a good foster home before Christmas by the court, which is what should have been done, but the CAS flatly refused to give her foster home care. After two months the foster parents had to give up and Jane was committed to training school. At Oakville Assessment Centre she has been recommended for early foster home placement.

Susan, the record shows, is an intelligent kid who has been the victim of her parents' maladjustment for years. They have separated. At the age of nine she was the victim of attempted rape. The child was actually committed to training school because of the deliberate opposition of the CAS to have her remain in the community.

There's a suggestion running through this, Mr. Chairman, that it isn't just the training school system which is at fault. It is our entire treatment of so-called young offenders and the Children's Aid Society may be a co-conspirator with the training school system in a number of cases.

Fortunately, in this case, the assessment centre is seeking a foster home for the kid. That's where she should have gone in the first place. She shouldn't have had to pass even a month or two in the Oakville Assessment Centre.

I want to talk now a bit about what happens with kids when they get into training school. One of the problems—the ministry, I'm sure, will want to comment on this—is that there is simply not an adequate effort to find foster homes across the province. I believe the ministry says there are 300 foster home places across the province. Three hundred and that's all. William Brewer was fired from the ministry because he refused adamantly to send kids to training school. Gerry O'Sullivan, a respected worker with the ministry, who had been with them for seven or nine years, estimates that 75 per cent of the 1,300 kids now in training schools are there because no one has taken the trouble to find an alternative for the children.

Both of these ministry staff people were able to dig up foster home placements but both of them ran into entrenched opposition on the part of the ministry and the training school system.

I am told that at Glendale School for Girls a girl is entitled to leave after she has accumulated something like 750 bonus points, I think it is. It is a kind of a Skinneresque system to try to improve behaviour there. It takes about 12 months to get up to the 750

points. They are meant to start looking for foster home placement or other forms of community care by the time the kid has 250 points and has completed the first of three stages.

There are girls there who have the 750 points and who obviously should never have been sent to training school in the first place. They are docile, well behaved and are not a behaviour problem. If you can talk about rehabilitation, they are totally rehabilitated because they probably didn't need to go there in the first place. They have now chalked up 1,000 or 1,200 points—I'm told even more—and have been there for a year or a year and a half or more, waiting until a suitable foster home placement is found for them. The reason for that is surely the failure of the ministry to find adequate kinds of outside care in the community for them. The ministry's reaction is simply to get vindictive with employees who dare to speak out.

I read with great interest the document on training schools in Ontario which came around a few days ago. When I looked at it, I thought, "My God, I would love my kid to go there. The services are great. It would be like sending my kid to St. Andrew's or Ridley." The training schools obviously must do a fantastic job, and I'm surprised that people aren't sort of knocking the doors down to get their children in because of the breadth and depth of the programmes and that kind of thing.

Mr. Lawlor: The recidivism was very great.

Mr. Cassidy: Well, they don't talk about recidivism.

Mr. Lawlor: They are most anxious to get back.

Mr. Cassidy: That's true. There has not been a single comment in any of the ministry material that I have seen about the recidivism rate. Despite all the statistics that are published, you don't publish facts and figures about recidivism. Neither do you talk about runaways, and yet a school like Glendale has runaways at the rate of two or three per day, even though it is an institution with a certain amount of security. The two or three runaways per day in an institution like that are kids who like the system so much, who find that what is actually implemented there is so great that they do their best to get away.

This is one of the places where the training school system encourages criminality. Let's face it: When a kid runs away,

he hasn't got any particular means of support. If a girl has been sexually active and she needs a bit of dough, well there is one way that she can get the money, and I am told that has happened on occasion. If a boy has been hearing from his friends about how you rip off a tobacco store or do a second-storey job when you need a bit of dough, he is going to do that in order to get a bit of money to get back to the community where he came from and get away from the training school.

If, as I believe, the training schools make kids irrational and make them frustrated beyond the point of belief, then they are liable to lash out. The fact is that kids can't be that dangerous because I am told about 400 of them in the system are run-aways at any one time. That figure sounds a bit high, and the minister can comment on that, but several hundred kids are run-aways at any particular time; and if they are not caught within the first five or six hours of running away, then it may take several days before they are brought in.

If they are really dangerous, then why is security so lax? On the other hand, if they aren't really dangerous, then why can't we have care in the community for these kids, rather than incarcerating them within a training school?

I hope the minister might say, during the course of this discussion, how many run-aways there are per year because it sure isn't said during the course of the report.

Mr. Chairman, there are concrete cells in the maximum security section of Glendale that are used to incarcerate girls who have run afoul of the disciplinary system in that particular place. And either there or at Bowmanville, I am not sure which, the mandatory 48-hour limit on solitary confinement has been broken consistently, and kids have been kept in those institutions, I am told, for up to 10 days at a time in solitary confinement. When they are in solitary they may be brought out for an hour or so of exercise in order to maintain a fiction that the rules are being obeyed, but in fact the rules are being flouted.

When I talked to people who had worked at Grandview and compared what they said with what is said in the report, then some of the credibility of the ministry's glowing accounts of its programmes began to dis-integrate in my mind. Take this:

Upon a girl's transfer to Grandview, staff work with her individually to devise a number of projected goals, based on the assessment profile which accompanied

her from the reception and assessment centre. All staff are made aware of these goals so that support for the girl can be maintained at all times.

Well, Mr. Chairman, it is the supervisory staff who have the main contact with the girls in each of the six or so units that exist at Glendale. No conferences are held with the supervisory staff to acquaint them with what the treatment programme is for those particular kids. There is no effort made to communicate with those supervisors to let them know what the professionals want to do with that particular kid.

If there is a programme for each particular girl then most of the people who come into contact with those girls have no knowledge of it. I suggest that that is probably the case at most of the training schools across the province.

I'm reading from the report again:

A family therapy programme is in operation at Grandview, which offers counselling for an individual child together with their parents whenever this is considered necessary.

That may or may not be, but then it goes on to say:

A house on the school grounds provides a homelike setting in which to conduct the therapy sessions and affords an opportunity for staff to observe the interaction between the girl and her family.

There is a house on the grounds at Glendale. It's used for storage of materials or equipment, I understand. In the year or 1½ years that the people who I was talking to had been at Glendale as staff persons, that house was never used for that kind of family therapy. Then it says:

There are various treatment approaches under the direction of a psychiatrist and carried out by professional staff, such as milieu therapy, relationship therapy, counselling, individual psychotherapy, alteration of self image and behaviour modification. Group therapy and family therapy are used whenever necessary to help the girls achieve their desired goals.

Mr. Lawlor: Sounds terrific.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right. But if you want to know what milieu therapy is, it means that you change your milieu from living at home to living in a training school. And if that's meant to help, then so be it. But that is all that milieu therapy means, although a lot of jargon is used. But, once again, I question

the substance that prevails behind the jargon. Let's face it, too much of the time what the training school is trying to do is to impose a traditional, semi-military kind of structured environment on a kid. They want the kid to shape-up and to conform to middle-class patterns of behaviour, even though the kid is probably going to be a working-class kid.

They impose very tough sanctions on the child. Those tough sanctions extend to the use of solitary confinement. In solitary confinement by day, there is no furniture in the maximum security isolation cells. At night there may or may not be a blanket, or a mattress. There is nothing else. I ask the House, Mr. Chairman: What does that do for the self-respect of a girl or of a boy when they are put in isolation and used in that way?

I hope the minister might tell us during the course of this debate how many days kids were put into solitary confinement in the training school system over the past year. What proportion of the 1,300 residents will actually be put into solitary confinement during the course of their stay in training school? How many days on average per annum will each child spend in solitary confinement? What other sanctions are used in a punitive kind of way which destroys the child, rather than helping to build him up?

Let's face it, Mr. Chairman, institutional life does tend to destroy people. If the child is confronted by a system which says, "We want you to shape up. We want you to conform to our norms," and if the child is rebellious and doesn't like that kind of confrontation, which is often the case, then the child is going to turn to the norms of his peers, and the norms of his peers are going to be criminal norms—as can be seen from the record of recidivism and of convictions of kids who graduate from training school. It's worse than that.

In their frustration and anger, kids who go to training school as a matter of pattern, as a matter of record, as a matter of habit and, in large numbers, mutilate themselves, Mr. Chairman. And that is one way that they have, one of the few ways they have of defying the system.

The report by Lambert and Birkenmayer of 1972 reported that self-mutilation is carried out by 10 per cent of training school inmates. The people I have talked to say that there are reasons why there is gross under-reporting of self-mutilation—that this figure is quite low—particularly among girls; that many cases of self-mutilation have reported to medical staff and most likely are not re-

corded. They suggest that it is probably more like 40 per cent rather than 10 per cent.

Self-mutilation ranges from minor tattooing, to friction burns, to the fairly serious gouging of arms, legs and the genitals with broken glass, razor blades and so forth. There are no definitive theories as to why this practice is so common in training schools, but it is reported as happening in almost all institutions of this type.

The time when this mutilation takes place in particular is when kids are in solitary or are experiencing a harsh denial of privileges. It is a reaction to their atmosphere. It shows the effect of the training schools on their personalities, and it is obvious that the kids are emerging physically scarred through self-mutilation, as well as psychologically scarred from their experience in the training school milieu.

Next, Mr. Chairman, I mentioned—I'm sorry, I must have meant at Grandview that the bare cells are used for maximum security—I mentioned this use of social isolation. I'd like to know which Ontario training schools still use social isolation as a means of control, because as far as we know all, or all apart from the DARE camps, do. What humanitarian or rehabilitative reasons does detention or social isolation serve? I'd like to know that as well, because we suspect that there are no humanitarian rehabilitative reasons, but there are very definite punitive reasons.

Donald Weitz was a psychologist who worked at Bowmanville from 1965 to 1968 and studied the use of social isolation at the Pine Ridges school at that time. He is in complete disagreement with the training school programme and left the ministry as a consequence of arriving at that conclusion and now advocates the abolition of the training school system. So that's his bias.

But his study showed that the major reasons for the use of solitary confinement were attempts or threats to go absent without leave, insolence and fighting. He concluded that the main reasons for the use of solitary confinement were not by any means humanitarian or rehabilitative ones, but are ones of punitive control, enforced obedience and vengeance.

Can the minister show that this situation is no longer applicable to any of our training schools? I'd like some information from him on this.

The study at Bowmanville showed that solitary confinement was being used more

rather than less, that the length of stay ranged up to 10 days and that approximately 25 per cent of the school population at Bowmanville experienced some time in solitary confinement every month. Admittedly, those figures may be a few years old. The minister may have some new information to put on the table, but that information has not been put on right now because of the fact that there has been such an effort to gild the lily and say what a great job the training schools are doing.

Many social scientists point out that segregation and isolation constitutes a direct assault on the psychological health, individuality, sense of identity or self-worth of the patient or the inmate. It leads to severe states of regression or infantilism, which makes the inmate feel, think and act like a confused, helpless, lost and worthless child. I'm putting this on the record and people will be studying this debate at some point.

I'd be interested in the minister's reactions and responses, because what I'm saying is that the techniques that are still being used in the training schools are not only useless but they are also counterproductive. If you stigmatize kids, if you institutionalize them, if you give them a sense of self-debasement, if you deprive them sensorially, you can and do create profound disturbances in sensory, motor and intellectual as well as social behaviour.

All of these things are even more likely to create irreversible psychological damage when you carry them out on adolescent boys and girls in the formative years from 13 to 16 or 17 or 18. During that period in adolescence the young person's sense of identity is undergoing many and extremely rapid changes. These changes in the young person's loyalties are commitments to various lifestyles, and can be healthy if guided and supported by understanding and trustworthy adults and grounded in socially supportive environments.

When you forcibly isolate kids from their natural environment, training school officials and correctional officers are failing to support the necessary growth in these boys' or girls' personal identity and, in fact, they are directly undermining it. It is also creating a situation where instead of creating relationships of trust with the professional staff and the supervisory staff, which one would have thought were part of the therapeutic setting, of a treatment setting, you directly violate it.

How on earth can a kid relate with an adult in a kind of constructive, positive,

warm, human way and how can a kid be helped to go back into the community if that adult is using social isolation in bare jail cells, or the equivalent, as a means of control on that particular kid?

I want to know whether there is a single individual in this Legislature who would take his 13- or 14-year-old boy or girl to an empty room in the basement of his or her house, with a small window, a concrete floor, an ordinary wall, nothing to read, nothing to do, quite possibly nothing to sit on except the bare floor, and would leave them there even for an hour, let alone a morning, a day, two days or up to 10 days. I can't think that any of us would do that. None of us would do it.

I think a system which relies on solitary confinement as a means of dealing with kids is absolutely appalling, particularly when you remember that half the kids going in were not convicted of any offence but were simply deemed to be unmanageable within their own home environment.

Kids who are committed to training schools come almost exclusively from poor and minority group families. This is another reason why I am saying that the training schools should be shut and alternatives in the community should be found. These are working class kids and if you come from a middle class family you are not going to get in. It's not that these kids necessarily commit more illegal acts; it's because support systems are not available within their communities as they are for children of more affluent and influential groups.

Lambert and Birkenmayer said that 97 per cent of training school inmates came from poor working-class, or unemployed families. The poor kids report, which was published this year by the national Council of Welfare, on children and poverty in Canada, said:

To be born poor is to face a greater likelihood you will be judged a delinquent in adolescence and, if so, a greater likelihood you will be sent to a correctional institution.

[They went on to say]:

The probability of a poor child being placed in alternate care is more than 10 times as great as the probability for a non-poor child.

The ministry says it has no choice as to whom it accepts into the training school. In other words, the ministry is not responsible for the family courts.

That has a certain amount of validity if you work in a cocoon but the Ministry of Correctional Services is part of the justice system of the province. It's part of the system of dealing with young offenders, with kids with delinquent problems, with kids who are disturbed. It seems to me that the ministry ought to be taking a very present and current interest, through the justice secretariat, and any other way it can, in what is happening in the family courts.

It is also my view that if the ministry were providing alternative facilities or were encouraging the Ministry of Community and Social Services to provide alternative kinds of care in the community, family court judges would not feel compelled to send kids to training schools and probation officers would not feel helpless. There would be more ability to resist Children's Aid Society workers if they tried to force a kid into training school rather than find alternate care in the community.

The system is ineffective and in many cases you might even have a lower recidivism rate if you simply left the kids in the community as they are. One of the things that child care workers I have talked to have been shocked about is that when they have delinquent kids aged 11 or 12, with problems, who, eventually, through some other agency or for some other reason gets sent to training school, they see a child for whom they have some hope of recuperation, some hope that they can deflect him from a criminal kind of career. But when the kid comes back from training school, that's curtains. The kid has been hardened into a pattern of criminality which may be life-long but certainly will last right through the adolescent years.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Aren't you going to let anybody else have a chance to say something on this?

Mr. Cassidy: Yes, I wanted to put this on the record.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): He is the smartest of them all.

Mr. Cassidy: This debate can go on. We have lots of time for estimates.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Cassidy: It is an important enough question and it's worth more than just an hour and a half.

Mr. Deacon: It's important, but—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Cassidy: Sociologist W. E. Mann in 1968 found that a large proportion of boys in training schools pick up a goodly number of law-breaking tricks and begin to accept certain elements of the criminal way of life as motivating forces in their lives. Lambert and Birkenmayer said for the ministry:

The emphasis on educational programmes in existence at the time the wards were in training school did not facilitate intervention in the pattern of problems in behaviour. Findings indicate that previous patterns of adjustment were not changed for a significant number of wards.

I have mentioned the recidivism rate. Dr. Botterell's inquiry into the health care system in the ministry said:

In the course of interviewing inmates in jails and adult correctional institutions he encountered a large number of ex-students of training schools. The committee is impressed that real hazards related to future recidivism accompany a stay in training school.

It is also recommended, and I think this is significant, that very vigorous health screening be available in order to discover any medical reason at all to prevent a child's stay in training school. In other words, if you can't keep them out through the probation system or the family court system, then find a medical reason to keep the kid out of training school, because it's bound not to help them. A Swedish study in fact quotes:

The main reason why treatment of individuals in isolated environments has proved to be a failure lies in the fact that the real problems are to be found in the interaction between the individual and the environment and the social structure to which he has to adapt, and vice versa.

Mr. Chairman, that brings me fairly close to an end to the comments that I want to make. I think we can come to some of the specific point later. I would hope that the ministry would say just what are the costs of training school care right now.

The latest figure I have is \$42.50 per diem. I believe that that has gone up quite substantially since then, with the increase in costs, and that it compares with costs that range from below \$20 for group homes and that are generally in the \$20 to \$30 range to costs of \$7 to \$15 a day for non-resident care, where there is an outreach agency like

Ottawa's youth services bureau helping a kid who is living in or near his home.

At \$42.50 a day, we're talking about \$16,000 per annum in a system of justice and social services which can't even find an extra \$50 a month in order to help relieve some of the pressure on families from which some of these delinquency problems happen to come.

Mr. Chairman, if I can come back to the ministry's report on training schools for a minute, I mentioned section 8. I would like to know when the ministry plans to carry out its intention to eliminate section 8 and whether that means that the population in training schools will drop very sharply. I would like to know, secondly, what plans the minister has for its training schools as a whole. The word I have had is that the ministry is so bent on regionalization that it is simply unwilling to look at the fundamental reforms we are talking about, which are to close the system down.

The ministry well knows it is possible to close the system down. It has now been done in British Columbia, it has been done in Massachusetts, it's being considered or implemented in other western provinces. The ministry also knows that the Province of Ontario is forgoing somewhere between \$10 million and \$15 million per annum in funds that will be available under the Canada Assistance Plan because of the refusal to put this kind of juvenile care under the Ministry of Community and Social Services. That adamant refusal is hard to understand in a government which is so constantly banging on the doors of Ottawa for more funds.

It seems to us that it would be much more positive if care in the community and in group homes and extended care in foster homes could be encouraged, if most care of kids who are potentially delinquent or actually delinquent could be carried out in the community and if it could be taken away from the Ministry of Correctional Services.

I would suggest specifically, Mr. Chairman, that since there are a dozen training schools in the province we talk of a programme of closing them down one a month starting, let's say, in June of this year. Close them down one a month until you're down to none or until you're down to the two or three training schools, like the project DARE, which don't fit in a traditional mould and which provide the kind of service that could be complementary to care in the community. DARE is not bad. I congratulate the ministry on it, but right now when a kid graduates from DARE, there's nothing left in the

community to provide him with the continuing support that he or she may need.

Well, there it is, Mr. Chairman. The system right now is discriminatory. It's ineffective and it costs a heck of a lot of money. Half of the kids who come into it are back in training school or have some other kind of problem with the law within 18 months. It is completely unsuccessful in transferring responsibility for kids to other agencies within the community.

I believe the ministry should take very seriously the climate of opinion in Ontario now which is increasingly accepting the fact that the training schools should be closed. This jurisdiction prides itself on being progressive. I think we should look very carefully at what has been done in other jurisdictions and we should act with a sense of urgency. You are failing right now. You have got to take another tack; and the sooner the better for the sake of the kids who are within the system.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Ottawa Centre, as we have just heard, is calling for the abolition of our training schools. Just last year the member for Port Arthur was concerned because I wasn't going ahead and opening a training school in Port Arthur, which he wanted very badly out there.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Very inconsistent.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I cannot help but wonder how many different points of view we might get from the other members in the NDP caucus if they were here today. We have only two in the House, so it is hardly fair to say they represent the whole caucus.

The hon. member has mentioned the fact that two other jurisdictions, Massachusetts and British Columbia, have closed their training schools—and they did. But Massachusetts is again opening a facility which corresponds to a training school. And just about a month ago we got a telephone call from a judge in British Columbia to say, "I have a child on an airplane on his way to Ontario, and I want you to look after him, because we have no facility out here to do it." We had to turn him around and send him back. I understand that since then British Columbia has made contractual arrangements with one or two states in the US to look after their children for them who need to be in this type of facility. And, of course, then they can say, "We don't have one in our province."

I think we must remember that the child who enters the training school has usually run the gamut of all the social services and agencies in the community. I am the last one to try to suggest or even to think myself that the programme we have is the ultimate. It is far from it. It needs to be improved on tremendously and because of our concern. It is because of our concern that we have developed a new approach in this ministry by myself and my predecessor over the past few years.

Reference was made to some of the facilities, and the hon. member spoke particularly about Glendale. He described in detail the very unsatisfactory conditions at the Glendale school for girls. Glendale has never been a school for girls. There has never been a school for girls. There has never been a girl in Glendale. And Glendale, as a matter of fact, was closed last year.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Don't tell me he doesn't know the difference?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Glendale was closed as a training school for boys last year, and since last September has been a correctional centre for adults.

Mr. Cassidy: I apologize. Grandview is the school that I referred to. It is in Cambridge and it is a school for girls.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, I am sorry, but the hon. member spoke about Glendale when he was talking.

Mr. Cassidy: Okay, I was speaking about Grandview, and perhaps you can answer that question.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Section 8, as the hon. member knows, is the section that I, as well as many other people, have been concerned with for a long time.

When I introduced my estimates I stated that at this session I will bring in the amendment to section 8 that I expect the House will be unanimous in supporting—removing section 8 from the Act. When this happens, I am sure there will be a fair number of children who will then be dealt with by other programmes, which must be set up before we can implement the programme, because they do have to be assisted.

It is all very well to say they can do well with the Children's Aid Society and why haven't we discharged more to the care of the Children's Aid Society—but I must point out that one-third of all of those who come to us, come to us from the Children's Aid

Society. So, that isn't the answer. It would be nice to be able to say we must put them in foster homes. Give me the foster homes—we'll put them there.

Mr. Cassidy: They are there. They are there.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Don't tell me. Don't tell me. It's the same old story.

Mr. Cassidy: You are not looking for them; that is the problem with foster homes.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, I listened to him for a whole hour. Now, I am asking him to listen to me. I know it is difficult to keep his mouth shut, but surely he can for just a few minutes.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister will continue.

Hon. Mr. Potter: A question was raised about the quiet rooms. And, it is true we call them quiet rooms. It is a room where they must put a child under certain circumstances, and this is done strictly for a limited time. These are children who have problems; assaulting other children or perhaps harming themselves. Sometimes it is for their own security that they must be kept separate from the others.

The policy of the ministry is that they may not be held for more than 48 hours, and then it is only on the authority of the superintendent. And, if there is an exceptional case that he wants to keep more than 48 hours, then he has to get the approval of the regional administrator. Sometimes, for security reasons, it is necessary to isolate children who are awaiting a court hearing and who are considered security risks. When that's the case, there is always someone available to see that they are all right.

There were fewer than a dozen instances of 48-hour segregation in the past year, and each time a ward was held in a detention centre, it is necessary for the superintendent to prepare a report for us, giving the reasons for the admission to the detention, a record of the times when the ward was checked by the staff, when he was fed, when he was showered, the time of release and so on.

The group mentioned by the hon. member, who have been most anxious to see the abolition of training schools, have met with officials of my ministry. As a matter of fact, even as late as yesterday they admitted that there is a percentage of these children that

must have some types of facility because they can't be handled in a private home.

Mr. Cassidy: There are group homes.

Hon. Mr. Potter: They can't be handled in group homes, believe me. I am sure you are perfectly familiar with Brown Homes, who operate quite a few homes for us and for other ministries, and even they have the occasional case that they can't handle and we must have some way of dealing with it.

But I would like to ask the hon. member, when he is being so destructive of the programmes that are in operation in the province—

Mr. Havrot: As usual.

Hon. Mr. Potter: —if he has actually ever been in them himself. Has he seen them? Does he know what's going on? I would be delighted to arrange a tour for him so that he can see for himself, first hand, the programmes that are there and the dedication of those who have the responsibility of teaching these individuals. Perhaps then he wouldn't be quite so critical. Those are about the only comments I have to make, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for St. George.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself to what I feel to be one of the serious matters in this ministry, and that is the lack of range of service.

I am not prepared to stand here and say that there should be no training schools. I will give you an example of the kind of things I have faced; perhaps then the member for Ottawa Centre will understand something of the problems.

Say you have a boy, 15 years of age, who has engineered an armed robbery with two of his friends, complete with stocking masks and sawed-off shotguns, and the suggestion is that the judge in that court should place that boy in a home in the community. That boy had not been before the courts before—in fact, I must say he was not actually sent to training school on that occasion simply because his two confederates, having been heard by another judge, were placed on probation, one of them having been on probation before. It was felt that if the judge were to send that child to a training school for a first offence, if you like, it might create damage. But I will tell you that boy did go to training school because he made an attack on a man of 34, with the mental age of four, and almost killed him.

Unless you are going to have some kind of range of service, then I would think judges are going to ask that these cases be traversed to the adult court, and I don't know what that will achieve with a young person. There is no doubt at all that the training schools are not very successful in rehabilitation. And, certainly, an awful lot of work has to go into trying to help to rehabilitate these children. But I for one would prefer that they should not, at that age, be placed in an adult reformatory or, in fact, a penitentiary, as could happen to them.

So I would feel that this kind of a centre must be maintained. I had hoped that Oakville would have been perhaps more useful than it may appear to have been, but certainly the children who were sent there were given, initially at least, a great deal of consideration because Dr. Chamberlain was the one setting it up from the court in Toronto. I think that, however, they have not had the staff that should have been provided in this time, and I trust that something will be done about that.

In the report you have stated that you are eliminating section 8. I don't think there is a person in this system who doesn't applaud that. However, I have to issue a caution, because these children are children who cannot be handled in the normal course in a group home and, as you have said, they are usually brought before the courts by the Children's Aid Society, which has been trying to work with them in a group home.

Now I want to know what provision you are making to support those kids and to help them when you take them away from the training school system. This is one of the things that I find very difficult with this government, and that is, they so often jump into something without adequate planning behind it to give support to children, in this case, who are caught in this kind of bind.

I would also point out that so far as girls are concerned, the ones that I have seen who have gone to training schools have not been in a position of learning from others. They have been there before and they know the whole gamut of the sex performances, as a rule.

Mr. Cassidy: But the training school confirms that pattern, though.

Mrs. Campbell: Well, as I say, I think it has to be understood that under section 8 a child cannot be sent to training school unless that child has been with agencies, all of whom agree they cannot help that child.

Now, I agree that someone has to take that responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I guess it's about time for me to move the adjournment of this debate. Sorry I couldn't get farther today.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: I beg to inform the House that in the name of Her Majesty the Queen the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor has been pleased to assent to certain bills in her chambers.

ROYAL ASSENT

Clerk of the House: The following are the titles of the bills to which Her Honour has assented:

Bill 28, An Act to provide for the Payment of Grants to First Time Home Buyers.

Bill 29, An Act to authorize the Raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Bill 37, An Act to amend the Farm Products Marketing Act.

Bill 40, An Act to provide for the Payment of Conditional Grants.

Bill 41, An Act to amend the Municipal Act.

Bill Pr2, An Act respecting the Town of Seaforth.

Bill Pr3, An Act respecting the City of Brantford.

Bill Pr7, An Act respecting Quinn Lumber and Builders' Supply Co. Ltd.

Bill Pr8, An Act respecting the Borough of Etobicoke.

Bill Pr10, An Act respecting the Borough of York.

Bill Pr9, An Act respecting the Borough of Etobicoke.

Bill Pr15, An Act respecting the Borough of North York.

Bill Pr17, An Act respecting the City of Brantford.

Bill Pr18, An Act respecting the City of Kingston.

Bill Pr22, An Act respecting the Borough of Scarborough.

Bill Pr23, An Act respecting Huron College.

Bill Pr27, An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the House I would like to say that on Monday we will proceed to the consideration of the tax bills. If members would care to write down the numbers of the orders they are as follows—not necessarily in the order I read them—8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and items 15 and 17 following that. However, when we move to committee of the whole House there is a bill standing there, item 2. I shall call that as well.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, April 18, 1975

Tax rebates for managed forests, statement by Mr. Bernier	965
Asbestos problem, statement by Mr. MacBeth	966
Bruce heavy water plant, statement by Mr. Timbrell	966
Store hours, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Singer	966
School bus driver eligibility, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Singer, Mr. Lewis	967
Intermediate capacity transit system, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Singer	968
House prices, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Singer, Mr. Cassidy	968
Quebec budget, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Singer	969
Health and safety hazards at Elliot Lake, questions of Mr. Miller: Mr. Lewis	970
Health and safety hazards at Elliot Lake, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Martel	970
Housing plans for Durham region, question of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Lewis	971
Portrayal of violence by communications industry, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Reid	971
Bruce heavy water plant, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. Deacon	974
Bruce heavy water plant, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Bullbrook	974
Alleged bias in Ryerson examinations, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Gaunt	974
Construction industry review panel, questions of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Bounsall	975
Fitness of farmers to serve in Legislature, question of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Riddell	975
Airport road facilities, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Braithwaite	976
Paradise Homes, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Deans	977
Senior citizens' care, question of Mrs. Birch: Mr. Breithaupt	977
Bilingual services, questions of Mrs. Birch: Mr. Samis	978
Pickercel fishing, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. B. Newman	978
Don Valley Parkway, question of Mr. Rhodes: Mrs. Campbell	978
Town of Seaforth Act, Mr. Riddell, second reading	979
Third reading	979

City of Brantford Act, Mr. Beckett, second reading	979
Third reading	979
Quinn Lumber and Builders' Supply Co. Ltd. Act, Mr. Walker, second reading	979
Third reading	979
Borough of Etobicoke Act, Mr. Leluk, second reading	980
Third reading	980
Borough of Etobicoke Act, Mr. Leluk, second reading	980
Third reading	980
Borough of York Act, Mr. Leluk, second reading	980
Third reading	980
Borough of North York Act, Mr. Bales, second reading	980
Third reading	980
City of Brantford Act, Mr. Beckett, second reading	980
Third reading	980
City of Kingston Act, Mr. Apps, second reading	980
Third reading	980
Borough of Scarborough Act, Mr. Drea, second reading	980
Third reading	980
Huron College Act, Mr. Walker, second reading	981
Third reading	981
City of Sault Ste. Marie Act, Mr. Gilbertson, second reading	981
Third reading	981
Forestry Amendment Act, Mr. Bernier, first reading	981
Estimates, Ministry of Correctional Services, Mr. Potter, continued	981
Royal assent to certain bills, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor	1002
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	1002



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, April 21, 1975
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 21, 1975

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Hon. W. Newman (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I hope the Legislature will join me in welcoming some 70 students from Henry St. High School in Whitby with their teacher Mr. Greening. This is a group of distinguished, capable young people coming from the riding of Ontario South.

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege to make a statement regarding a news item in the Globe and Mail concerning Quinn Truck Lines Ltd.

I only did what I was elected to do—endeavour to help those who request my assistance, regardless of politics. In the Quinn Truck Lines case, my main concern was for continued employment, not only for people who live in my riding but for others as well.

In my 24 years of representing the people of the great Welland riding, I have never even considered going over a cabinet minister's head to see the Prime Minister on any matter.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): That's it? Trudeau would be glad of that.

ESTIMATES

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, I have a message from the Honourable Lieutenant Governor signed by her own hand.

Mr. Speaker: By her own hand. Pauline M. McGibbon, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1976, and recommends them to the legislative assembly, Toronto, on April 21, 1975.

Statements by the ministry.

HOME BUYER GRANT

Hon. A. K. Meen (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, the Act to provide for the payment of grants to first-time home buyers re-

ceived royal assent last Friday. An initial supply of 3,000 application forms is now available. Today, I have distributed a package of 20 of these application forms to each of the members of the House.

Application forms are available to the public by writing to the Ministry of Revenue, Ontario Home Buyers Grant, Queen's Park, Toronto, M7A 2C9. Also, individuals in the Metro Toronto area may phone 965-8470 for information. Outside Metro, callers may dial the operator and ask for Zenith 8-2000.

Provisional applications and an explanatory letter have already gone to law firms and real estate officers across the province, and the finalized application forms with an explanation of changes in the form will be sent out as soon as possible. By early next week, bulk shipments of the application forms will be available to lawyers and realtors upon request.

Within two weeks, an information kit will be available for distribution on request. This kit will include a booklet explaining the programme, an application form and a return envelope.

Should my colleagues wish to have further information, I would ask them to call Mr. Nestor Yurchuk, director of the guaranteed income and tax credit branch of my ministry at 965-0111.

OCCUPATIONAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH COUNCIL

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Mr. Speaker, this government is initiating a new approach to protect Ontario workers and residents from occupational and environmental health hazards caused by industrial activities.

Recognizing that employers, workers, unions, community groups and government are all responsible in achieving successful protective and preventive measures, we are establishing an advisory council on occupational and environmental health matters.

This body will provide the formal mechanism for industry, labour and other interested parties to advise government on health hazards, as well as to recommend new policies and programmes. It will assist govern-

ment in defining how health safeguards can be engineered into plants at the design stage. It will also be a central reference source for public information about all aspects of occupational and environmental health.

The success of effective occupational and environmental health measures depends on the co-operation and support of responsible non-government groups. Employers have a direct responsibility for ensuring and maintaining proper health standards, for monitoring their own industrial emissions, and for training and education at the plant level as well as on an industry-wide basis. Labour has a direct interest in the provision of occupational health education, the encouragement of workers in accepting health standards and procedures, and the right to participate meaningfully in the development of the acceptable safeguards.

The Minister of Health (Mr. Miller), to whom the advisory council will report, will be announcing further details on the structure, membership and responsibilities of the advisory council on occupational and environmental health, to ensure that it is a strong voice in future programmes.

The government is also moving more aggressively to strengthen its own activities in occupational and environmental health. Greater emphasis will be placed on the prevention of known health hazards through the setting of guidelines and the search for unknown health hazards in industrial processes.

The focal point for the setting of standards and for research as it applies to human health will be the Ministry of Health, specifically the occupational health protection branch. The Ministry of Health will have clearly delineated responsibilities to assure that standards are properly applied.

The decision to assign standard-setting and applied research to the Ministry of Health clarifies which ministry is primarily responsible for determining the effects of industrial emissions on human physiology, although the Ministry of Health will, of course, consult with other agencies.

We are examining our future needs for professionally trained people in industrial medicine and industrial hygiene. Obviously, sufficient competent and knowledgeable trained staff are essential to the success of the expanded system of occupational and environmental health.

An important new development is that the Ministry of Health will publish every year its guidelines on in-plant emissions and out-of-plant ambient conditions. This annual disclosure of information will mean that industry

and labour are fully aware of applicable standards. It should also increase public availability of health standards information. Ministries and government agencies will incorporate these official standards in appropriate legislation and regulations.

The Ministry of Labour, in concert with the Ministry of Health, will continue to conduct reviews to ensure that adequate measures are being taken to protect the health of the workers.

And, Mr. Speaker, we intend to strengthen the government's inspection, monitoring and enforcement of health standards within all industrial plants.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): What about the mines?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Labour Safety Act and the Mining Act will, if warranted, be broadened through legislative amendments as necessary to include health safeguards in new plants before they are completed.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): It is certainly warranted.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I might add that responsibility for inspecting, monitoring and enforcing health standards outside the plant remains with the Ministry of the Environment.

We recognize that health hazards from industrial processes often take a long time to show up in humans—as long as 20 to 30 years in some cases. This raises difficulties in tracing former workers who may be the victims of previously unidentified in-plant health hazards. Furthermore, the mobility of workers makes it difficult to establish industry liability for health problems that emerge many years later. We want to ensure that no worker's claim for compensation is weakened by job mobility and choice of work. Therefore, we are examining ways of requiring employers in specified industries—including mining, chemicals, and other companies currently using known hazardous substances—to keep exposure records on employees, the type of work performed, employment location in the plant and the equipment used.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): That's like putting Dracula in charge of the blood bank!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, in view of this consolidated new approach to occupational and environmental health, we will be examining the existing compensation benefits for individuals. It is anticipated that the com-

mission of inquiry into the health and safety of working conditions, and the working environment in mines, will have some constructive recommendations in this regard.

The new occupational and environmental health system I have outlined today will clearly define ministries' functions in the total prevention and protection programme. It will also mobilize a much more effective inspecting and enforcement process.

Mr. Lewis: I think it's applaudable, but I'm not sure. It's about time. It's been a long haul.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Just before we continue, I recognize the member for Fort William.

Mr. J. H. Jessiman (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, through you, I would like to introduce a class of 30 students from McKellar Park Central School in Thunder Bay south, and their teacher and three adults who are visiting with us in the west gallery today.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Mills.

Mr. D. A. Bales (York Mills): Mr. Speaker, may I join in the same type of situation and introduce the students from Zion Heights secondary school to the Legislature today.

Mr. H. C. Parrott (Oxford): May I introduce from Ingersoll a group of ladies visiting the Legislature from that community, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: May I specially request from all hon. members in the future to please have their introductions ready if possible immediately after prayers.

FLOOD CONTROL MEASURES

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, as members of this House are aware, we experienced a flood crisis over this past weekend in southwestern Ontario. I would like to inform you on the situation, Mr. Speaker, and what steps were taken by those concerned, including my own ministry, as well as to advise you on the outlook throughout the province for further spring flooding.

The happy news is that, in general, flood damage was relatively light over the weekend. However, I do fully appreciate the difficulties some residents have suffered, especially those living close to the flood plain areas.

The intense storm that moved across southern Ontario Friday night poured down from one to 1.5 in. of rain in most areas, with a few locations getting as much as 2 in. This rainfall combined with the melting of the heavy snow packs in the snowbelt area in Grey, Dufferin and Wellington counties, and the combination made for some very high levels indeed on some rivers.

And yet, the co-ordinated effect of pre-planning for flood control, awareness of flood-prone areas, alerting of conservation authority staff and municipal officials involved, as well as the co-operation of the general public and ensuring availability of equipment, all played a major part in keeping flood damage to the minimum. On some rivers, the flows were the highest recorded in more than 20 years, with the—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): They were lucky it didn't rain all weekend, as was predicted.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Weren't we all lucky it didn't rain all weekend?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. minister will continue his statement.

Mr. Deans: That is the only thing that saved them. They were lucky it didn't rain, as was predicted.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Purveyors of gloom, that's what the NDP are. Disasters and gloom; that's what they feed on.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That's quite right.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, on some rivers the flows were the highest recorded in more than 20 years, with the Nith River recording an all-time high level. The result was moderate to severe flooding along such streams and rivers as the Maitland, Saugeen, North Sydenham, Beaver, Nottawasaga, Grand and North Thames.

Those centres which had flooding problems included Montrose, Bridgeport, New Hamburg, Ayr and Paris on the Grand; St. Marys on the Thames; Listowel, Wingham and Harriston on the Maitland; and Walkerton, Mount Forest and Paisley on the Saugeen.

The major damage problem seems to be the flooding of house basements and the first-floor level of factories built on the flood plain.

On the Saugeen River, two small old mill dams were washed out at Neustadt and Teeswater, and the bridge on Highway 6 at

Mount Forest was closed because of undercutting of one of the abutments.

Further and much more severe damage was prevented because these steps were taken in advance:

My ministry warned all conservation authorities earlier this year about the impending seasonal crisis situation.

When the storm which struck Friday afternoon was seen heading this way, my ministry alerted conservation authorities and municipal officials—so the flood danger was well anticipated by all responsible parties.

At 4 p.m. that day, a warning for southern Ontario was issued to the news media advising a careful flood watch to be maintained by all people living alongside streams and rivers. This warning was also being accompanied on local radio stations by weather warnings of predicted heavy rain, to fully warn all those persons and officials concerned.

At 4 a.m. Saturday morning, April 19, a flood forecast was again issued by my ministry to the news media, particularly radio, advising that rivers and streams throughout southern Ontario from Lake Huron eastward to the Ottawa Valley, were rising rapidly because of the previous night's heavy rain. The forecast also predicted the flooding along the Maitland, Saugeen, Beaver, North Thames and Grand Rivers in western Ontario as well as the South Nation River in the Ottawa Valley.

The result of this organized warning was that many volunteers as well as officials were on the watch and ready to cope with serious flooding if it were to occur. Happily, it did not in most places.

I would like to congratulate all those who worked together to confront the flood danger. It was a weekend which showed how better prepared we are than in the past in parts of our province where flooding is prone to occur.

As for the outlook for the immediate future, Mr. Speaker, this is the situation according to the conservation authorities branch experts:

In southwestern Ontario, the flood water has reached the Great Lakes or is approaching them, or has subsided throughout the area. Because no precipitation is expected in the next few days, flows on all rivers are expected to return to normal quite soon.

In the central and northern parts of the province, however, the situation is different. The still heavy snow-packs in those areas absorbed the rainfall of Friday's storm, and were followed by temperatures much below

freezing after the storm, so the melt has not happened yet. My ministry's officials are keeping a close watch on potential danger areas in those parts, and problems could occur when weather conditions bring on melting of the snowpack.

The only exception would be the small stream on the north shore of Lake Ontario, which had big flows but no major floods during this past weekend, and, as in southwestern Ontario, problems are not anticipated there in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, this concludes my report on the flood situation in the province.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions. The Leader of the Opposition.

FLOOD DAMAGE ASSISTANCE

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Natural Resources if he can assure the residents of those communities that suffered flood damage over the weekend that the assistance programme that was approved a year ago will be in force this year, at least that level of assistance, so that the people in communities such as Plattsville and Ayr can be assured they are going to have the same kind of assistance for home damage and business damage?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out in my statement, there was a minimum amount of damage done. When I receive a full report from all those areas where flooding did occur, then I will certainly take it to the government for that decision.

Mr. Deans: That depends on who you are.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Is the minister trying to tell us there wasn't sufficient damage to warrant a programme; that there will be no assistance?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I haven't a full report on the extent of the damage. I am waiting for that now.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary, the member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Can I ask the minister whether he's talking in terms of a minimum amount because there weren't a sufficient number of people who suffered damages? Or does he mean that individuals, who suffered damage just as severe as they did last year, will therefore not be able to recover from it?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, the members are very much aware of the assistance programme we have where disaster occurs—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It ought to be automatic.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes—and when we get a full report on the details of the damage that is occurring, then we'll make a decision and follow the plans that we've used in the past.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Just don't go back to the Minister of Agriculture and Food's formula of a dollar for a dollar.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: When does the minister anticipate receiving that report? What time frame are we talking about with respect to the report?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I would hope to have that within a matter of the next few days.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions, from the Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. Deans: Can I ask a supplementary question? I have one other supplementary. Is it possible there is going to be some kind of overall government programme to try to eliminate the problem, rather than have this recurring year after year? And does the minister realize that if the rain had continued on Saturday, the flooding would have been far more severe?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the hon. member is not totally aware of the magnitude of this particular problem of controlling flood plains in southern Ontario—

Mr. Deans: I sure am.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It's a mammoth undertaking. It's something we've been working on for dozens of years, and we still haven't got it corralled. It's going to take a long time yet to have it fully under control and it's going to take massive amounts of money.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Lewis: Did the minister say "corral"? He is corraling the floods, is he? Does he think of himself as Canute?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): He's going to pass a statute that there will be no more rains.

QUINN ENTERPRISES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask the Minister of Revenue if he can explain why his ministry approved the renewal of the fuel tax permit for Quinn Enterprises and Quinn Truck Lines when they were in arrears in their payments under the Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act to the amount of approximately \$200,000. Was there political interference that indicated the ministry should approve such a renewal under these rather strange circumstances?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, I would never for one minute suggest there was any kind of political interference. Certainly there were factors to be considered when I looked at the question of the maintenance of the licence.

Mr. Lewis: What does that mean, political factors?

Hon. Mr. Meen: The preservation of jobs. To simply shut down that company, which would have happened if the licence had been terminated, would have done two things. I'm advised it would have thrown upwards of 35, and perhaps more, employees out of work.

Secondly, if the businesses were then closed up—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): The ministry would never get paid.

Hon. Mr. Meen: —it would be more difficult for it to be disposed of as a going concern. Therefore, I felt it was in the best interests of the province, as well as of the employees, that at least with the proposed refinancing arrangements that were put to me over the months, there should be some kind of extension of time given to the operator—

Mr. Lewis: Pretty weak.

Mr. Lawlor: How long did the minister give them to pay?

Hon. Mr. Meen: —in order to give him time to complete the refinancing and to pay off the liabilities, which included those to the Ministry of Revenue.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: As a supplementary, if I may: Is the minister aware that a number of other companies have applied for PCVs to take over that business on a phased basis, and in each case they have been opposed by Quinn and the applications have been turned

down on the basis of the opposition coming from that source? Would the minister not agree that government policy could have transferred this trucking business to other lines, rather than permitting this ridiculous situation to go on? How is he going to get the money back?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware that other applications for PCVs were opposed by Quinn Truck Lines. My understanding was that Mr. Quinn himself had an application before the Board of Transport Commissioners for approval of certain PCV licensing, pursuant to which it was expected, his mortgage financing would then be approved by the lenders he had lined up, if I can use a colloquial expression.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, if I may—

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Scarborough West has a supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary: When the minister entered into the refinancing arrangements, was he not concerned about the position of the Quinn companies financially and the various court judgements? Just from simple curiosity, what prompted him to undertake the refinancing? What prompted him to allow the effective remission of the tax, which he must have suspected he would never collect given the financial situation he was faced with? The second thing, did the government of Ontario hold any mortgage?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker the government of Ontario holds two warrants which one simply issues under the Act. We didn't go to court for those warrants. Those warrants were issued pursuant to provisions of the Act and applied to the Quinn Truck Line property, to the real estate itself.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Did it come ahead of the first mortgage?

Hon. Mr. Meen: With those moneys being exigible under the warrants, I suppose we could have closed them up right then. But that was not in the best interests of all concerned, as I saw it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It was not in the best interest of Quinn.

Mr. Lewis: People certainly are not given this consideration in most other cases.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Meen: What was arranged was that in addition to those warrants on the Quinn Truck Line properties, the ministry

took a mortgage to secure a very substantial part. In fact, it was a mortgage to secure the total amount of the liability existing at the time it was arranged. That involved some \$113,000, not only on the Quinn Truck Lines properties but on personally-owned property of Mr. Quinn, another 90 acres or so. So that not only did we have the warrants on the properties of the Quinn Truck Lines, we had a mortgage at nine per cent.

Mr. Shulman: Is it a first mortgage or a secondary mortgage?

Hon. Mr. Meen: It is a secondary mortgage, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Shulman: It is worth nothing then.

Mr. Lewis: A secondary mortgage they have?

Hon. Mr. Meen: A secondary mortgage for nine per cent, due one year from that time—with the expectation that it would indeed enlarge the security of the ministry pending the ultimate refinancing as was expressed.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Lewis: I have another question.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member for Essex-Kent with a supplementary question.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Could the minister tell me, since he had \$200,000 owing from Quinn Truck Lines last November when I asked him a question at that time, can he tell me how much he has collected since then, and has any of the interest been paid on the second mortgage the government has taken?

Hon. Mr. Meen: At some stage or other the sum of \$5,000 was paid, Mr. Speaker; I think it occurred before that time.

Mr. Deans: That is the approximate amount?

Hon. Mr. Meen: That is the approximate amount that is still outstanding.

Mr. Singer: Supplementary.

Mr. Shulman: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Is it not true that the first mortgage on the property, which is owned other than by the government, is in excess of the value of the property, and that the second mortgage is worthless?

Mr. Lewis: Completely worthless; the government knows that anyway.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, not on the basis of the assessments my ministry has on that property. As a going concern, we felt we had sufficient security.

Mr. Deans: That doesn't sound very good.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview, a final supplementary.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, since the minister apparently is not familiar with the various appearances of Quinn before the Ontario Highway Transport Board, could he undertake to inquire into those appearances, and discuss with his colleague, the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Rhodes), and perhaps with Mr. Shoniker, Quinn's various appearances there and determine whether or not it is reasonable that Quinn should have been able to have successfully opposed over a number of years applications of others for PCV licences, in order that he keep those others who were truck owners serving him rather than being able to serve themselves?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, I think that question should be more appropriately directed to the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

Mr. Martel: Conveniently, he is out.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

GASOLINE TAX ARREARS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a new question of the minister on a subject directly related. Since we established the Ministry of Revenue to look after the collection of our provincial revenues, perhaps on a closer, more professional basis than was possible when it was under the Treasury, how can this minister explain to the House and the taxpayers of this province that he would allow one taxpayer to get into arrears by \$200,000 under these particular circumstances? Surely that's an indication of serious bad judgement in the administration of the Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, as our auditors do their inspections these liabilities with some of the taxpayers, I suppose, come to light. Steps are taken. Steps were taken from the very beginning in this instance with the issue of the first warrant, which is on record

with the sheriff there; some \$79,000 or so is involved. These negotiations and steps were taken at the very first hearing to bring into question whether the licence under the Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act should be continued or should be revoked, so we were taking steps.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Since the record under these circumstances is so astonishingly bad, including political interference in this situation, has the minister in his position as being in charge of revenue looked into the status of the remissions from this same source having to do with other taxing responsibilities? This would include the licensed premises owned by Quinn, operated under the Liquor Licence Act of the Province of Ontario; can the minister assure us these other responsibilities are not as seriously in default as the first ones are?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, I think the question of responsibilities for remission of tax under other licensing statutes that are not in my ministry should be more appropriately raised with the minister to whom the responsibility does fall.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: This Minister of Revenue has nothing to do with it?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I have responsibility in the Ministry of Revenue for certain of these statutes, but I think the question could be properly placed elsewhere.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Who is responsible for patronage?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: I have a question which is in three parts, if I may. One, how did the Ministry of Revenue allow the arrears to rise from \$79,000 to \$200,000, when its auditors had apparently discovered the initial problem? Two, are there any other tax debts of a comparable kind with a comparable company anywhere in Ontario? And third, are there any other mortgages held by the ministry in comparable circumstances?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, I think I probably have already answered the first question, at least in part, because over the period of time, as this liability grew and with the arrangements taken for further security, it was felt the revenues to the province were adequately secured without having to put the operator out of business.

Mr. Lawlor: Why does the ministry go further into the hole?

Mr. Lewis: And they were secure? The minister has a very frivolous view of the security of the province.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The security appeared to be there and I think it still is there.

Mr. Lewis: It still is there?

Mr. Lawlor: What will it be, \$500,000 before the minister is finished?

Hon. Mr. Meen: The member was asking are there any others; Mr. Speaker, I honestly don't know. I don't think there is anything of this nature anyway—

Mr. Lewis: Nothing of equal magnitude?

Hon. Mr. Meen: —that has come to my attention.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member for High Park says—

Hon. Mr. Meen: But yes, in the case of mortgages indeed I am advised that the ministry has over the years taken quite a number of mortgages of a comparable nature to secure liabilities.

Mr. Lewis: Can the minister name them?

Hon. Mr. Meen: No, I'm not in a position to name them, Mr. Speaker. I suppose it's public in the sense that mortgages are registered, but I don't have that information at hand.

Mr. Lewis: But the minister could get it?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I would think it is available.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: I think we've spent enough time on this question. There will be time for new questions perhaps.

ALLEGED CONFLICT OF INTEREST BY PROVINCIAL JUDGE

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I'd like to ask the Provincial Secretary for Justice if he can inform the House as to his opinion, or the opinion of the law officers of the Crown, on the alleged conflict of interest involving provincial Judge Rodger Gordon in St. Catharines.

Hon. J. T. Clement (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Yes Mr. Speaker, I read the article which appeared on Saturday last which said that Judge Gordon was linked with the defendant in a particular matter, the defendant, I think, being Mr. Quinn.

Thomas Quinn is an officer and director of Quinn Truck Lines Ltd. who is facing certain charges under the Public Commercial Vehicles Act. On Friday last he appeared before Judge Gordon in St. Catharines. Judge Gordon was advised there would be a request made of the court on that occasion for an adjournment; and he did, in fact, grant the adjournment. I think the request was made by the Crown with notice to Mr. Quinn's solicitor; it was adjourned by Judge Gordon over to some time in May.

The connection, the link as the paper said, was that Judge Gordon was an officer and director of a company called Lealta Investments Ltd. and Lealta Investments had, in fact, some three years ago put a mortgage on certain of the lands of Mr. Quinn or one of his limited companies. The inference was there could be a conflict because he appeared before Judge Gordon who was a shareholder and a director and officer of that mortgage.

Now I suggest, and state very clearly, that there was no conflict. There was no adjudication. It had nothing to do with the mortgage. It was completely unrelated. There was no conflict whatsoever.

I had the chief judge of the province look into this matter this morning and he advised that Judge Gordon in fact resigned as an officer and director of Lealta Investments prior to being sworn in, and offered his financial interest in that firm for sale to some 48 other people, the co-shareholders in that company, but that the company itself has not had a formal meeting of directors since that tendering or offering of the submitting of the resignation was put in. There hasn't been a directors' meeting, therefore it has not been formally accepted by the directors and conveyed on to the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations here in Toronto.

We perceive absolutely no conflict. The matters are unrelated. There is nothing improper in the conduct of Judge Gordon. I point out that he will not be seized of the matter when it is dealt with later on in May, or such date subsequent to that to which it is adjourned. He was merely a conduit pipe through which the matter had to be adjourned on Friday last.

But the chief judge informed my office this morning that Judge Gordon, in view of the

article in the newspaper, has requested that the board of directors of Lealta formally accept his resignation immediately, which was tendered prior to his being sworn in about five weeks ago.

Mr. Deans: Why didn't he step down from the case?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Surely the Attorney General in his position must be able to assure the House that judges should be directed, either through the chief judge or by the Attorney General himself, that it is not enough to say there is no conflict of interest, but that there can be no appearance whatsoever of a judge being involved in any aspect of responsibility for a business sitting on any aspect of a judgement associated with it.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Leader of the Opposition have a question in that?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is clearly the sort of thing, would the minister not agree, that simply must be stopped and about which the judges must be so informed without any equivocation.

Hon. Mr. Clement: I couldn't agree more. Justice, like everything else, must appear to be administered by people who are as Caesar's wife. May I point out that Judge Gordon was sworn in about five weeks ago. He was made aware that he must sever his business connection.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He should have divided himself that day.

Hon. Mr. Clement: He submitted his resignation prior to his taking the oath of office.

Mr. Deans: Then he shouldn't hear the case.

Hon. Mr. Clement: He's now in that transitional period between termination of practice and embarking on his responsibilities at the bench over which he sits. There is absolutely no conflict or connection, and surely the hon. Leader of the Opposition must realize this. There is absolutely nothing to do with his having been identified with a company that held a mortgage on someone's home or business—

Mr. Lewis: Of course there is. There is everything to do with it.

Hon. Mr. Clement:—any more than if the judge was a shareholder in a chartered bank that in fact held a mortgage on the home or

the business of a person appearing before him in the courts.

An hon. member: How about loan sharks?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We've got to put an end to this.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Scarborough West with his supplementary first.

Mr. Lewis: I find it hard to believe of the minister. Is he saying that in his own mind he is satisfied that the judge will do the right thing, to have the shareholders meet suddenly so that he divests himself of his interest, so that he can then sit on the case? Doesn't it make more sense to the minister, in the interests of natural justice, that he withdraw from this case, since at one point in time, he had a business relationship, and leave it to someone else? Wouldn't that make more sense?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, it is not a matter of his withdrawing from the case.

Mr. Lewis: From hearing the case.

Hon. Mr. Clement: He is not going to hear it; he never was intended to hear it in the first place. He merely was in court when the request was made that the matter be adjourned from Friday last over to some date in May, which was agreed upon between counsel for the Crown and counsel for the defendant in that matter.

Mr. Lewis: So he will not hear it?

Hon. Mr. Clement: No, he was not intending to hear it at all.

The resignation that was submitted by Judge Gordon prior to his taking oath of office, was in fact submitted, and I suggest was effective, as of that date.

Mr. Singer: Oh, nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Clement: I say that the company directors have not formally sat down and met, but that doesn't affect the resignation. As of the day that that was received by the directors, that is the day that it was effective. But it is not reflected in the corporate records here because the company directors haven't met and transmitted it over here as is required under the Business Corporations Act.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: So he has a legal responsibility—

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary. The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, would the Attorney General not agree that the judge is in breach of the provisions of section 12, subsection 1, of the Provincial Courts Act which say, "subject to subsection 2, unless authorized by the Lieutenant Governor in Council," and I presume there was no such authorization, "a judge shall not practise or actively engage in any business, trade or occupation but shall devote the whole of his time and performance to his duties as a judge." Is that not the conflict that the judge was guilty of?

Hon. Mr. Clement: No, absolutely not; because as of the day that he took his oath of office—I forget the date in March—he was no longer a director of that company.

Mr. Singer: That's not company law at all.

Hon. Mr. Clement: He had submitted his resignation as a director and officer of that company.

Mr. Singer: He is still a director until the board accepts his resignation.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Clement: I state this unequivocally so there will be no confusion in anyone's mind. At the same time, he advised co-shareholders of that company that he was taking an appointment to the bench and that he would like to dispose of his interest in that particular company. This mortgage was put on, I believe, some three years ago when Judge Gordon was practising law in St. Catharines.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Clement: When he decided to take his appointment to the bench, he then resigned and offered his interest in that particular business for sale. It is just as simple as that. He is not carrying on business. He does not intend to carry on business. He has terminated all his professional business, be it in forms of investment or practice. Of course, there is no conflict of interest.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Leader of the Opposition have any further questions? The member for Scarborough West with his questions.

OCCUPATIONAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH COUNCIL

Mr. Lewis: Yes; I have, first, a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. Will the Ministry of Natural Re-

sources continue to be the enforcement agency for the standards now to be established by the Minister of Health in the mining industry?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, that would depend upon which responsibilities the hon. member is referring to. Is he talking about the health responsibilities?

Mr. Lewis: I'm talking about enforcement of levels of dust emission, levels of—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That would be the Ministry of Health.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister mean that, other than the distinction he drew about the Ministry of the Environment's enforced monitoring and enforcing outside the plant, the Ministry of Health will have all other responsibilities?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In respect of health matters.

Mr. Lewis: In respect of health matters. Does that mean that the Ministry of Health will enforce the regulation of dust emissions and other emissions in the mining industry which could be hazardous to health?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, that's the intention.

Mr. Lewis: Well that's a first-rate improvement, if it happens.

Mr. Martel: A supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Will the Ministry of Health have to go through the Ministry of Natural Resources before conducting any type of investigation? For example, with respect to a hearing, would the request have to come from the Ministry of Natural Resources to do that type of investigation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is going into some particular detail to which I would hesitate to give him a reply before discussing it with both the ministers involved. But off the top of my head, and I will take a chance in saying it, I would think that the Minister of Health, having regard for his responsibilities under our new programme, would have the right to walk in or have his people walk in—

Mr. Lewis: Good.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —without regard to the ministry dealing with mines. But I want

to leave it open there, because the hon. member has asked a question—

Mr. Lewis: The Minister of Natural Resources is nodding his head.

Hon. Mr. Grossman:—which hasn't been dealt with specifically; but that is, generally speaking, our intention.

Mr. Lewis: I have one other supplementary relating to the announcement. Is it the minister's intention, or does he believe the Minister of Health in the establishment of the advisory council will be calling on members of the work force organized or unorganized of a non-corporate kind?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It certainly is the intention to have labour representation on the council itself.

Mr. Lewis: When is that further announcement to be made?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are just getting this under way. I can't give the hon. member a specific date, but just as soon as it is possible. The ministries involved are working on this programme at this very moment.

Mr. Martel: Supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary.

Mr. Martel: Yes. Would the ministry consider the establishment of in-plant committees so that they could report directly to the advisory committee he is now about to introduce?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would think Mr. Speaker, this could probably be a matter which could be recommended to the advisory council and be discussed at that time so that they could give an opinion on it.

LEAD POLLUTION

Mr. Lewis: I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. Does he think the new advisory council on health would be pleased by the special privileged extension of time which he gave to the lead smelters to extend to April 29 next the control order which he issued? Why did the minister give that special extension of time to Toronto Refiners and Smelters; and how is it that he is having productive talks with Ian Outerbridge, their counsel? What kind of deal is he arranging?

An hon. member: How can he have talks about this?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, we are making no deals. Second, the reason for the extension of time was that our director was away for a few days and we extended the time, I believe, from April 19 to April 25 or 29 or whatever it is. That was the reason. He was away and we wanted to give him a chance to sit down and discuss the notice of intent on this control order on Toronto Refiners and Smelters.

Mr. Lewis: The minister would agree that it is impossible to have productive talks with Ian Outerbridge, wouldn't he?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I would agree that we should have productive talks with all industry. I didn't know we were talking with Mr. Outerbridge, but with all industries we have productive talks. We have worked out control orders with companies which have been satisfactory to the people of this province.

PAYMENT TO ENVIRONICS RESEARCH GROUP

Mr. Lewis: Can I ask the Minister of Education: Does he know what was provided by the Environics Research Group Ltd. in the 1972-1973 public accounts year which would have cost his ministry \$128,700?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, that group had a contract—I believe the contract was issued before I became Minister of Education and assumed this portfolio—to survey the parents, the students and the teachers of this province in quite a detailed survey of their comments and opinions on the educational system of the province.

Mr. Lewis: I see. Did the Minister of Education know, since he has looked back on it, that Environics Research Group Ltd. was also commissioned by this government at the transition point—when the Premier (Mr. Davis) was Minister of Education and then became Premier—to do a study on the effects of violence and obscenity in film and television, with a complete review of the literature? Can he tell us what has happened to that study for which Ontario paid \$21,750?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of that study. It is not part of the studies I am knowledgeable about.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Did they find that violence was bad or good?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I don't know. I know nothing of that study. I have the other studies. The study done by Environics with parents in this province was made public a couple of years ago.

Mr. Lewis: One other supplementary: Has it been brought to his attention that they made the study of obscenity, violence and the censorship of film and it involved a critical evaluation of the research findings of the social and behavioural sciences—all of the material on television as well—regarding the effects of exposure to violent and sexually explicit stimuli on the individual and on social and cultural life; that some 800 people in Ontario were surveyed; that the study resulted in two full volumes; that it was commissioned while the Premier was Minister of Education and provided after he became Premier? In light of all we have heard about the interest in violence in our culture and its effects, how is it that that study has never been made public? Will the minister undertake to make it public?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, is my friend insinuating that this study is in the Ministry of Education?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I am. I am insinuating it is within the government. The Premier knows about it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am just saying I can't recall having ever seen this study. I have no knowledge that it was ever commissioned and I have never seen it.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): The minister had better get onto his staff, that's all.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I have seen the studies undertaken by Environics—I don't want there to be any doubt about that—in regard to the school system and parents, students and teachers. These studies are available. I have seen them.

Mr. Lewis: One final supplementary: Perhaps since the ministry paid \$12,400—that's about 48 days of Judy LaMarsh—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are not going to get much violence for \$12,000.

Mr. Singer: No rent.

Mr. Lewis: —and that's without rent, research assistance or anything else—since the minister has already paid \$12,400 of the \$21,000, does he think he could get hold of that study for us and table it in the Legis-

lature so that the public of Ontario could know what preliminary work has been done?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Is the member referring to the study that he is indicating was commissioned, concerning violence and the effects of violence?

Mr. Lewis: By the government, yes.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I have no knowledge of that study at this point in time but I will look into it and find out for my friend.

Mr. Lewis: Thanks very much.

Mr. Speaker: Further questions?

GRAVEL LICENCE APPLICATION

Mr. Lewis: One last question of the Minister of Natural Resources: On March 26 last he indicated to me that a gravel licence application on the part of Mr. Sam Manetta for a licence in Pontypool had not yet been granted because it was to go before the Ontario Municipal Board for a hearing. Since the board has heard the application and recommended against issuance of the licence, has the minister officially refused the licence?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the report from the Ontario Municipal Board yet. I believe I have 30 days in which to make that decision and I can assure the member that I will make a decision within that specific period of time.

Mr. Lewis: Thank you. I have no further questions.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Fort William.

WATER SAMPLING PROBLEMS

Mr. Jessiman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. Would the minister consider having a joint meeting with Lakehead University, his own staff, McMaster University and the Ontario Research Foundation so that we can come up with one honest and immediate solution to the sampling problems in the waters of Lake Superior at Thunder Bay?

Mr. Singer: Does he mean that what we have got now is dishonest?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, different results were obtained by Lakehead University, McMaster University and the Ontario Research Foundation. I believe I did answer part of the question last Friday in the House.

I've asked my staff to meet with representatives from the two universities and the Ontario Research Foundation to discuss this matter and how their testing was done. I have also asked that a joint sample be taken as quickly as possible, and the three groups will all monitor and check it together so that we can get this matter sorted out.

Mr. Singer: Will it be honest?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Supplementary: Will the minister, at the same time, do further work on the analysis of the quality of water along the north shore of Lake Superior, in places like Terrace Bay, which could be subject to some water impairment as a result of the actions of the Reserve Mining Co. down on the south shore?

Hon. Mr. Newman: Yes, Mr. Speaker. If I read the member correctly, he wants us to do some sampling at Terrace Bay—and we'll be glad to.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Huron-Bruce.

MINERAL RIGHTS TAX ON FARMLAND

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. Is a mineral rights tax on farmland under consideration by his ministry? And, if so, what is the purpose of such a tax?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, this was one of the recommendations of, I suppose you would call it the John Rhodes committee. It was the committee that was established to look into revisions of the Mining Act. That particular point, along with many others, is being dealt with within the ministry at the present time, and no firm decision has been made with respect to that particular recommendation.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary.

Mr. Gaunt: Is the minister aware of the full implications of the instituting of such a tax, in view of the fact that this could, under certain circumstances, impose a very real hardship on farmers across the province?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker. We've had correspondence from, I think, the Ontario Federation of Agriculture. We've been in discussion with them and they've expressed a point of view which, of course, we're looking at and examining very carefully.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury.

FOOD PRICES

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food: Now that Beryl Plumptre's commandos have been muzzled by threat of court action, will the minister consider a comparative food prices shopping programme in order to guide the people of Ontario in and out of certain supermarkets?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I was not aware that Mrs. Plumptre's committee has not had full opportunity to do whatever it wants to do.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River.

COSTS OF COMMISSIONS

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet. Can the minister indicate what spending restraints there are on these royal commissions the government is so fond of setting up? This particularly includes the Robarts inquiry and the LaMarsh inquiry into violence. What is it going to cost the taxpayers? Is there a budget set for both?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I can't give a definitive answer, but there are the guidelines of Management Board for expenditures that must be adhered to, and we monitor each and every one of them accordingly.

Mr. Reid: Supplementary, if I may: The government didn't do that in the commission on secondary education. May I ask, is the minister aware of who Mary Collins Associates are, who are doing work for the Robarts commission? Does he think it appropriate that an outfit whose head office is in Sudbury, and which does not have an office in Toronto, should be involved in doing work for the city of Toronto or for the Robarts commission?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am not aware of that particular point, Mr. Speaker, but I can assure the member that that commission, as well as all others, will adhere to the guidelines of Management Board.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Lewis: That is not the Sudbury Collins, is it?

Mr. Ferrier: Don Collins' wife.

Mr. Martel: That's right.

Mr. Singer: Only related by marriage.

PITS AND QUARRIES CONTROL ACT

Mr. Martel: A question of the Minister of Natural Resources: In view of the fact that both he and the Premier promised that early in 1974 the Pits and Quarries Control Act would be made applicable to northern Ontario, and in view of the fact that we're well into 1975, can the minister indicate when he intends to make the Pits and Quarries Control Act applicable? Does he realize we're now in 1975?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I swear that the member for Sudbury East must be reading my mail. I can assure him we will be making a decision and making an announcement very shortly.

Mr. Lewis: We are reading the member for Sudbury East's mail.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: He knows how to get his hands on it.

Mr. Martel: I have a friend over there.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: He has spies again, has he?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Nipissing.

Mr. Lewis: We get everything he receives through Mary Collins Associates.

SOCIAL BENEFITS PAYMENTS

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Community and Social Services.

In light of the statement in the Throne Speech that steps will be taken to compensate those whose social benefits have been discounted by inflation, would the minister indicate to me when the announcement will be made as to that statement and what parts of the family benefits, other than GAINS, will be increased to meet the need that now exists?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. In view of the conversation going on, I missed the first part of the member's question. Did he say, "in the Throne Speech"?

Mr. R. S. Smith: The Throne Speech indicated—and I quote—"My ministers will take appropriate steps to compensate those whose social benefits have been discounted by inflation." What I am asking is, when is the

minister going to take the appropriate steps for other people, aside from the fact that he has done something in the budget for those on GAINS?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, we are very much aware that inflation is causing problems to those on family benefits and general welfare, and it is hoped steps will be taken.

Mr. Reid: The government is causing inflation.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary: Did the minister promise or make a commitment to the Mother-Led Union on Friday to show them, in three to four weeks' time, the change in levels of allowance for those on effective mothers' allowance and on family benefits, and the increase in earnable income?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, we had a very good meeting with the Mother-Led Union last Friday morning. They asked me if they could meet again within another month, and I said we would be pleased to do so and at that time we would indicate to them what position we are prepared to take.

Mr. R. S. Smith: A supplementary: In other words, the minister is answering my question by saying that in one month's time he will be prepared to say what he is going to do?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I believe what I said was that I told the Mother-Led Union we would meet with them again in about a month's time, and at that time we would be in a better position to indicate to them what steps we are presently contemplating.

Mr. Martel: In other words, nothing—just slough them off.

TRUCK LOAD COVERS

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Solicitor General regarding uncovered gravel trucks: Has the Solicitor General had any success in having all gravel trucks use tarpaulins when loaded on the roads and highways of this province?

Hon. Mr. Clement: No, I haven't had any success on it, Mr. Speaker. I had a hole in my own car window to testify to that.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): We might finally get some results.

Hon. Mr. Clement: I once was interested in a gravel pit, and if anybody thinks there's

a conflict with my answer here, I'll talk to him about it afterwards.

I'll take the member's question as notice. I remember there was some discussion with the OPP some time ago, involving my predecessor, as to this sort of thing being an answer to what is really a very difficult and dangerous situation. I do not have that information available to me, but will get back to the member. I presume the member is concerned about it, and I agree it is a very dangerous situation with the damned stuff flying all over the place.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville with a supplementary.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question of the minister: Would the minister consider following the lead of the State of Michigan, where the requirements are that an open gravel truck like that is not allowed to be loaded higher than one foot from the top of the side of the vehicle?

Hon. Mr. Clement: That would seem to be a very good idea. I am not so sure that isn't the policy adhered to by most of the gravel carriers in this province. It isn't only just the gravel trucks that create dangerous situations; it is also the trucks carrying things like scrap metal, which occasionally drop pieces by the side of the road, where people hit them in cars and they do all kinds of damage.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside with a supplementary.

Mr. Burr: Is the minister aware that in Michigan also there is a \$500 fine for uncovered trucks?

Hon. Mr. Clement: I wasn't, but I am now.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River.

ADOPTION OF VIETNAMESE CHILDREN

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Community and Social Services. Can the minister indicate if there will be any more Vietnamese orphans or children coming to Ontario for adoption purposes? If so, will it be possible for people outside of the Metro Toronto area to apply to adopt these children?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The information I have received, Mr. Speaker, indicates there will probably be no further children. I'd like to mention to the member that the children who have arrived—I believe about close to

60—have been placed in Thunder Bay, Sudbury, Kirkland Lake, Napanee, Brantford, Niagara, Hamilton, Oakville and Toronto. They have been scattered in various parts of the province.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa Centre.

CONDOMINIUM REGULATIONS

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Justice and Attorney General, Mr. Speaker. Now that the Ontario Supreme Court has ruled it is unreasonable to pass a rule in a condominium to prevent pets, is the minister or the government prepared to move in order to stop similar rules to prevent children in condominiums where that rule is enforced or is contemplated?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Condominium Act, it is administered by my colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Commercial relations (Mr. Handleman), and I suspect he probably will be considering certain matters pertaining to condominiums, involving that one.

Mr. Lewis: That's quite a social reform.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Huron-Bruce.

RASPBERRY APPEAL CASE

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food and since the minister is quite familiar with the case I'll skip the preamble. Why is the government refusing to give raspberry plants to Mr. Hartman?

Mr. Ruston: We've heard that before.

Mr. Singer: They don't like him.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I wouldn't say that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Give him the raspberry.

Mr. Singer: They don't like his lawyer either.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We are simply phasing out the programmes.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is phasing out Mr. Hartman, that is what he is doing.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Gaunt: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: One supplementary, first of all, then.

Mr. Gaunt: Is it sheer coincidence that the ministry just happened to start phasing out the programme when Mr. Hartman instituted court action?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, it's no coincidence at all, Mr. Speaker. I just think that if the federal government wants to implement those programmes in this province as it does in other provinces and carry the load for them itself, then that's what it should do here. It has refused to do that here but it has in other provinces. We think it should do it here. We're going to leave things entirely in its hands. Now the member should go and talk to his federal friends.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay. There is just time for another question.

STATIONARY ENGINEERS' EXAMS

Mr. Stokes: I have a question of the Minister of Labour. Can the minister give any plausible reason why it should be necessary for an employee who wants to write his second-class engineering papers to travel 140 miles to the city of Thunder Bay and then fly all the way down to Metropolitan Toronto, just to pass those second-class stationary engineering exams? Why can't he delegate somebody in the city of Thunder Bay to conduct those examinations? Is the minister aware that it costs the employee well in excess of \$300 just to come down here to take those tests?

Hon. J. P. MacBeth (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry but I've already delegated that authority to the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. Auld).

Mr. Martel: Who just doesn't happen to be here.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: He, not being here, can't very well answer the question, sir.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kent.

PURCHASE OF RAILWAY LAND IN ERIEAU

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. What progress is being made in regard to purchasing the land owned by the

Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad in the village of Erieau? Is the minister aware that 68 citizens of Erieau have their homes on property owned by the Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad? The company has raised the rent of the leases from as low as \$300 to as high as \$900 which is a concern and a hardship on those homeowners.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I regret to advise the member that I'm not fully up to date on the situation. As he well knows I visited the area about a year ago, I believe, and I indicated at that time that we were interested in purchasing that particular property for park development. I'll certainly bring myself up to date and report to the member directly.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth with a final question.

REGISTRATION OF HANDGUNS

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General, if I may. Given that recent reports show a substantial increase in the sale of semi-automatic weapons and handguns, has the minister given any thought to the possibility of requiring that a person who wishes to purchase such a weapon should have to obtain a licence first, before the weapon can be sold?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Under the Registration of Firearms Act, I think it's called that—the federal legislation—which has been in effect for a number of years, all handguns must be registered.

Mr. Deans: Yes, but after the sale.

Hon. Mr. Clement: After the sale is when it is done.

Mr. Deans: Why not before? In other words, why shouldn't you have to get the permit before you can buy a gun?

Hon. Mr. Clement: This might be something for us to consider. I have had some discussions at the policy field about handguns, in particular about rifles and shotguns. The federal Minister of Justice, in a very informal conversation, indicated some concern to me about this some weeks ago. I might consider writing to the Solicitor General of Canada to see if they would consider this. I believe semi-automatic weapons have to be registered in the same way as handguns, but I'm just relying on my own memory. I think semi-automatics have to be

Mr. Deans: No, not so.

Mr. Reid: You shouldn't get the gun until you have the permit.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

MINISTRY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Singer moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Ministry of Government Services Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, which is the same bill I introduced a year ago, is to provide a compulsory tendering procedure far more extensive than that now contained in the Ministry of Government Services Act. It reduces the amount for which compulsory tenders are required from \$10,000 to \$750, and it includes a list of items to include purchase of any commodity or real property or interest therein, and requires that there shall be tenders in all those cases in addition to the repair or renovation of public works.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The second order, House in committee of the whole.

RETAIL SALES TAX AMENDMENT ACT

House in committee on Bill 30, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

Mr. Chairman: Does any member wish to speak on this bill? Which section?

On section 1:

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Section 1(2), Mr. Chairman, regarding paragraph 15.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, if I may speak to section 1(1), my colleague was going to speak to section 1(2) and yielded the floor for this purpose.

The explanatory note, Mr. Chairman, states that "The amendment clarifies that a sale does not include the distribution of property

to shareholders on the winding-up or dissolution of a corporation."

My questions are: When did this problem come to light, why is this amendment now required and what is the rationale by which such a distribution is not to be a taxable distribution?

Hon. A. K. Meen (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Chairman, I understand that the problem that was created came about inadvertently in an amendment made in the Act in 1967. I don't know when it first became a problem in a sense of concern except that the joint taxation committee of the Bar Association and the Institute of Chartered Accountants brought it to our attention recently, and the principle is simply that if there isn't a change in beneficial interest then there shouldn't be the attraction of tax. That's the case with the winding-up and the distribution of proceeds, and so it seems appropriate to revert now to what has been the case in the original Act of 1963, I guess that was, and was inadvertently removed from the Act in some amendments that were made in the year 1967.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, what has the practice of the ministry been? Have you been collecting the tax or have you not been collecting the tax? Has there been a ruling under which you have said this is not a taxable distribution? Or have you been collecting the tax and how you are not going to collect the tax?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I am advised that we have not been collecting the tax, Mr. Chairman, and I don't know whether it was done under a formal ruling or interpretation, but certainly I think it is appropriate that it should be remedied at this time by a formal amendment to the Act.

Mr. Renwick: Well, I make the comment for what it is worth, Mr. Chairman, that there is no reason why a transfer of title or possession from a corporation to its shareholders on the dissolution or winding-up should not be a taxable transfer for the purposes of the Retail Sales Tax Act. You can't have it both ways. Either the corporation is a separate entity from its shareholders or it is not a separate entity. At a certain point in time it doesn't cease to be, simply because it's being wound up.

I would like to have, either now or in writing from the minister at some point, exactly what the practice of the ministry has been from time to time when this so-called inadvertence took place back in—

Hon. Mr. Meen: In 1967.

Mr. Renwick: —1967, and this is now 1975. What has happened in the intervening years? What has been the practice of the ministry in such cases? Has the tax been collected? Has it not been collected? I understand the minister to say it hasn't been, but I would like to have a very clear explanation of any situation under which a corporation or its shareholders can escape the tax which would otherwise, by the terms of the Act, be payable. May I have an undertaking that I will hear from the minister about this?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to getting that. I would be interested myself in determining just what the detail of the background of this situation is. I think I can get that for the hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: Shall subsection 1 carry? Carried. On subsection 2, the hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: During the second reading I did interrogate the minister—he didn't get an opportunity at that time to reply—with respect to the inclusion of a chattel that is a fixture within the definition. I was concerned, first of all, about the ambiguities basically of the concept of fixture.

What did the minister envisage? Is he going to have within his schedule or within his legislation a list of things deemed to be fixtures? In other words, just how did he propose to handle this matter? I trust he knows the complications for the legal profession in making transfers of property these days. Very often, broadloom and other items have to be taken into account with respect to sales tax on the transfer. I would take it that a furnace rooted to the basement would be a fixture, certainly not part of the real estate in the true sense. There has always been some ambiguity about TV antennas, aerials and that sort of thing.

Is the legal profession going to be forced to make an estimate of the cost or the validity, with the depreciation involved of these various items which are affixed to realty, then on the vendor's side to extract sufficient sums of money at your five per cent figure, as it presently will stand, in order to compensate the government in this?

I mean, there are severe penalties for failure to do so. The headaches involved are simply atrocious. I suspect that you will get another inundation. Of course, you have become inured to that. You've grown thick skin over the ages and in the last few months over the ramifications and particularly vicious

effects some of your tax legislation has had, not on the basis of its validity but simply from its administrative standpoint, as to making it effective in operation. Well, what has the minister to say about these things?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Chairman, we're not really trying to define fixture here any more than it was ever defined. I agree with the member for Lakeshore that the legal profession constantly confronts the problem of determining when something is a fixture or is not a fixture. What we're talking about here, though, is perhaps best explained by using an illustration of, say, a rental water heater. This would mean that where a separate charge is made by a lessor to a lessee for rental of a water heater, the lessee is the consumer and he pays the tax on the rental price that is charged. Let me read a further part of some explanatory material that I have here, Mr. Chairman:

As in all cases of rentals of tangible personal property, the lessor will acquire the ultimate installed fixture exempt of tax for resale and he charges the lessee tax calculated on his rental charge for the installed fixture. On the other hand, though, where a lessor rents land together with a fixture for one price—that is, a total price for the whole thing—he, the lessor, then is the consumer of the fixture and he must pay the tax on his acquisition thereof and no tax applies to his rental price to his customer.

That's what we're trying to get at here; we're not trying to define fixture. As I mentioned to the hon. member for Lakeshore following the debate on second reading, I did not have a chance to make that explanation to him during my reply.

Mr. Chairman: Does subsection 2 of section 1 carry? Carried. Any more on section 1?

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: moves that section 2 of Bill 30 be amended by deleting the words, "and ending Dec. 31, 1975."

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, as with other pieces of legislation that have been before us, particularly through the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), the truncating of the legislation at a particular date is simply taken by this party to be a masquerade or a piece of charade performed for purely electoral purposes in order to win favour with the electorate coming into an election very shortly and having no efficacy with respect to the overall eco-

conomic picture at all, and not designed fundamentally to improve that situation in a deep way. If this were so, then it would have some indefiniteness with respect to it.

It is simply a pretentious handout, a piece of hypocrisy, as far as we are concerned. We have said so. We have said from the beginning that the sales tax, being a regressive tax, was questionable as a whole. We have always advocated nothing more than a five per cent sales tax but the Conservatives took it immediately after the last election to seven per cent. Now, as a pawn in their peculiar chess game, which is not being played with any Bobby Fischers, the position is that they revert to what they think is an exquisite piece of legerdemain.

The Treasurer thinks he's Houdini and can get out of his socks after wearing them for so long. It's quite impossible without putting the feet in very warm water indeed, and that's where you stand—up to your neck in the warm water. The trouble is that the water gets to boil a bit, doesn't it? It becomes most uncomfortable. We say, if you are going to do this at all, extend it.

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): When he gets into hot water he takes a bath.

Mr. Lawlor: Make it indefinite. Let it stay at five per cent. Do not have your peculiar cutting-off date of Dec. 31 this year.

If you are re-elected, of course, that's what you will do. Back up will go the tax to seven per cent. We will make this sufficiently known to the electorate as to the chicanery involved in the position and seek to penetrate.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Be honest about it.

Mr. Lawlor: But to show in an overt form our opposition to the way in which it is presently regarded and your failure to make it into an indefinite reduction in the tax, we—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The opposition will be exposed.

Mr. Lawlor: —propose to vote against it and to call a vote in this particular regard.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Chairman, I must confess I quite expected the hon. member to make that amendment when we got to this section but I simply repeat what I said on second reading of this bill. I think that this provision demonstrates some fiscal integrity on this side of the House.

When you are talking about a couple of points of retail sales tax for a total fiscal year, you are talking about money in terms in

excess of \$400 million. This province cannot afford that kind of loss of revenue on a long-term or constant basis. We believe that it can afford it on the short-term of nine months less a few days.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Yes, the election period.

Mr. Lawlor: I fully acknowledge the minister believes that.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The economy can, therefore, receive this shot in the arm that the reduction in tax will give. We are showing some intellectual integrity in telling the people of Ontario—

Mr. Ferrier: It must be the only kind you have got.

Hon. Mr. Meen: —that when we have done this, at the end of the year we will have to go back up to the seven per cent. There is nothing the matter with seven per cent.

Mr. Lawlor: It just doesn't wash.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The revenue derived from those two extra points of retail sales tax will be an imperative part of the revenues of this province in order to meet our other obligations, as spelled out in the budget and as are already part of the province's platform under GAINS and Ontario tax credits and so on.

I think it is far more intellectual to tell the people of this province that we will do this for a short period of time but that later on it will go back up to seven per cent, than to drop it to five per cent and leave it there on an indefinite basis.

Mr. Ferrier: Will it stay at seven per cent or go to eight per cent or nine per cent?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I would be the first to agree, if we could afford to go down to five per cent and leave it there, that I would love to see it stay at five per cent. I would be the happiest Minister of Revenue the members could ever imagine, if I could say, "Look, it is going to stay at five per cent." But I also have the responsibility of raising the funds that are required for the operation of this province. So I think we have to be prepared to stand in our place and say, "All right, we can tolerate five per cent, a loss of two points of retail sales tax revenues for a nine-month period, but after that time it goes back up again."

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I will be very short. I would like to know, and probably the minister won't tell me, as to whether he was in upon this policy decision? I can well envisage them sitting around the Treasurer's desk chortling with glee and rubbing their hands as to what a clever manoeuvre this whole thing is. Then somebody points out the revenue loss. And they say: "Well, in any event, we can't very well, even if it is in our hearts to do so, increase it after the election, even if we are the government. If we were not the government, then of course we don't care. If we are, at least we are giving some handouts, some pandering at the present time. But we have to be honest against our intellectual pretention with the electorate and let them know a cutoff date. If we don't do that now and then do it later, we will lose face forever. We will suffer a Pearl Harbour. Even if we should be the government at that particular time, that kind of chicanery will never be forgiven."

So you had to go that extra few inches in order to establish your time limitation. That's the very least you could do. Don't give yourself any flowers for that. To not to do that would be such a dismal piece of failure, as to bypass the electorate.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The member is admitting it is a fiscal responsibility. He knows it has to go back up and we have to prepare to face it now. That's what we are doing.

Mr. Lawlor: After Watergate, you can't pull that kind of trick, much as you would like to. The fact of the matter is that you have to level with the populace up to a point. But you are not levelling with the populace when you pull that particular rabbit out of the hat and turn toadstools into rhododendrons.

Hon. Mr. Meen: There's nothing more straightforward than telling later on what is going to be.

Mr. Lawlor: It is a piece of pretence that is so blatant it will get you absolutely nowhere.

Hon. Mr. Meen: When you are not in power and you don't expect to be in power you can have all the fiscal irresponsibility you like.

Mr. Lawlor: What you have done is sent \$225 million down the drain without getting yourselves re-elected in the process. Won't that break your hearts, eh?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, I would like the minister to answer a couple of questions. If you want us and the people of Ontario to believe this is not an election gimmick—to lower the tax now and raise it after an election—how can you lower it and then raise it at a predetermined date, all in one piece of legislation? Why don't you lower it now and then, as the circumstances warrant, have a public debate in this forum later on as to the validity of raising it again but you have just given yourself away?

You have lost all credibility by saying, "We are going to lower it now and at the end of the year, conditions will be such that the spending power generated by this reduction will no longer be required so the tax will be back up." People just aren't buying that argument and we don't buy it.

If you were really sincere about putting additional spending power in the hands of the people by lowering the tax these two points, you would say, "We will now lower it and when conditions warrant, we will have another debate and we will look at the conditions prevailing at that particular time and we will see if and when it is necessary to put the tax back up again." Tell me why you are not taking that approach to it?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I think we can argue this until, in a figurative sense the cows come home because it's the same argument. You can take the one approach or you can take the other. In our case we are saying it's \$250 million approximately—if I can pull a figure out of the air—for the lost revenue for nine months for two points of retail sales tax.

That kind of lost revenue we can tolerate for the balance of this year but the economy of this province cannot tolerate that kind of lost revenue on an annual basis. We are telling the people of this province that for this period of time here's their incentive. It will put that much more money into the pockets of the taxpayers of Ontario and hopefully they will go out and spend it.

Mr. Good: You are just guessing.

Hon. Mr. Meen: As the Treasurer described it, he hoped the \$2 saving on a \$100 purchase would burn a hole in the purchaser's pocket and he would go out and recycle that \$2 along with the other money he has just spent. We are telling the people now; we are not leaving it to a debate in the fall or a debate next winter as to whether it should go back up again and if so by how much.

Mr. Good: That's the cynical part of it.

Hon. Mr. Meen: We don't believe there is anything the matter with seven per cent as a total retail sales tax figure in a normal economic year in Ontario but the Treasurer has recognized that certain incentives and certain steps have to be taken in his budget—through the mechanism of his budget—to get the economy moving at a faster pace in Ontario.

If you want to make these arguments, I would suggest you can make them to the Treasurer in the budget debate. I am saying to you that this is, I believe, the most completely responsible position a government could take. It is far more responsible than simply taking the tax down to five per cent, leaving it there for X number of months and saying, "Now, maybe next year we may have to go back up again."

We are saying we know where the money comes from. We happen to be the ones who are cloaked with the responsibility of running this province. With our various programmes, we have to know where the money is coming from as well as where it's going and we can't spend it before we have got it.

In my case, my responsibility is to recover the moneys under the Retail Sales Tax Act. I can understand why the Treasurer was quite prepared to reduce it. I can also understand why he didn't feel it should be reduced on an ongoing basis and as a constant kind of thing rather than this temporary arrangement as, indeed, we are doing with respect to production machinery, albeit that's for a somewhat longer period of time.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, the minister should not be allowed to raise taxes automatically at the end of the year without a public debate. That's what you are arranging right now.

Hon. Mr. Meen: We are having a public debate right now.

Mr. Good: That's what you are arranging in the passage of this bill—to put the sales tax up at the end of the year without any public debate or forum.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, I am trying desperately not to be cynical when people phone me up; they see the cynicism in this bill which is going to be terminated at the end of the year. It's difficult for me not to take the same approach. I am trying to go along with your explanation.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): He is not a cynical person. He is trying to believe in you.

Mr. Germa: I will show you what I have been doing. I am trying to go along with your explanation that the economy needed a short, quick shot in the arm. And this is how you proposed to pump probably \$300 million back into the economy.

Mr. Good: It's \$227 million.

Mr. Germa: It's \$227 million. All right, now supposing it is—

Mr. Good: He has misled us again. He said \$250 million.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I said I estimated. I was pulling a figure out of the air—and that was my problem.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury has the floor.

Mr. Germa: Supposing your programme is successful and it does encourage—

Hon. Mr. Meen: I don't have my copy here.

Mr. Germa: I wish the minister would listen; I'm asking him for an answer to my proposition. Supposing your programme is successful and it is going to encourage people to go out and make major purchases prior to the end of the year. There could be a rush on appliances, certainly. There might be a short, quick pickup in business. People who are going to plan major purchases are going to make damned sure they get them on the books before Dec. 31.

Now, what I'm worrying about is that the government that takes over after you people have disappeared is going to be facing a slump, come Jan. 1, when everybody has made their major purchases that they had planned over the past six months. You're going to have a downturn in the economy. You're going back to the old boom and bust syndrome again.

I think this jerking and the severe changes in policy are not serving the interests of the people in Ontario to their best needs. You have to chart a steady course so people will know where they're going. And here you are jerking on the levers, back and forth, so that we don't know where we're going; and our economy is going to react in the same manner.

Can you not see that there's going to be a severe downturn once the tax is reimposed on major appliances and things like that? Have you thought that out? I know you

people don't think any further ahead than the next election, but can you not see that is going to result in a reduction in jobs and a reduction in trade and commerce come the first of the year, after people have gone out and done their major appliance and automobile buying in order to take advantage of the termination date of the tax?

Mr. Lawlor: They figure they'll be elected by that time and don't have to worry that much.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Chairman, I don't know how much more the Minister of Revenue can answer on a question that's really a matter of economics in the area of responsibility of the Treasurer. But, in short, what the Treasurer has been saying and what we're all saying is that we believe that this kind of measure will be the incentive to get the economy rolling again.

January is rather traditionally a slow month anyway. You have the Christmas period of Christmas buying, and we think that it should be this year, with a reduction in tax through the nine-month period of 1975, we should see a fairly substantial upturn in commodity sales. And it might be that January would show a momentary drop. But it's the Treasurer and his economists belief that the economy will then have been turned around, and will be growing again anyway, and that we can then tolerate the increase in the retail sales tax back to seven per cent.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Thank you. I'm not like my colleague, the hon. member for Sudbury; he's trusting, he really is.

Hon. Mr. Meen: And you're not? Don't you trust me?

Mr. Deans: He trusts you and he thinks that the things that you do are done for the highest possible purposes. I don't think so. I have some different views of it from that. I really do think that somewhere in the back rooms of the Conservative Party somebody dredged up a pre-election programme and this is part of it?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Everything we do you're going to try and put in the context of an election.

Mr. Deans: I know. It's my natural instincts.

Mr. Ferrier: That's the reason why the government can't do it.

Mr. Deans: I realize it. It is my natural doubting tendencies. I can't help it. I suppose it's maybe from listening to seven different budgets and hearing all of the diverse reasons why you have to do the things you do, and then finding afterwards that they don't work. As you look at all the things you've done over seven years, the machinery tax rebate through to your speculation tax, through to your energy tax, and you give us all these wonderful reasons and economic theories as to how they're going to do the job. And then they all turn out to be a lot of nonsense. So, I sort of come to the conclusion that much of what you say you really don't mean. You're only saying it because you have to.

Hon. Mr. Meen: You give me the same impression.

Mr. Deans: I have got to tell you it was very cleverly devised, it really was. The way you brought this bill in, this is really a clever political move. You bestow certain benefits while at the same time saying, "You know, it's not political because if it had been political we wouldn't have set a termination date. Therefore, you can all trust us. This is not a political move, not an attempt to buy your votes. This is just a plain, ordinary economic stimulus."

Then the Treasurer, standing before a municipal organization last week, said, "We'll be bringing in the budget probably in early January"—there's the key.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I doubt that.

Mr. Deans: Then we wonder. Let's assume for a moment that by some happenstance you win the election. I don't think you will but let us assume you do just for the sake of the argument. The Treasurer brings in his early January budget. What you are really saying is, "In order to try to gain your support politically we'll give you a reduction in tax. In order to try to make it look not political we'll tell you that it is going to end in nine months."

What you are not telling them is how much more you are going to soak them for it in your early January budget. That's the key to it. Unfortunately, we won't be able to tell that until it happens but I am predicting that in early January you are going to soak them for everything you can get, if you win.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: You are going to take advantage of every single tax that is available

and you are going to put it right to them in early January with your new budget. You are going to say: "That shot in the arm didn't work, unfortunately. It got us re-elected but it didn't work the way we had hoped and we can't go along with this deficit mounting the way it is. Therefore, we are going to have to raise taxes. We don't like to do it, mark you—we would prefer not to—but fiscal responsibility requires it. In January we'll be raising the taxes and we will be raising this back to seven per cent as we said we would. We'll be changing the tax structure at the income tax level to recover a little more, and we'll be raising the tax on certain liquors and cigarettes and gasoline to get a little more." You might even say in the gasoline situation, "It's to try to save energy, to discourage people from purchasing."

I could write your January budget speech because I know how you think now after 7½ years. I have listened to them all and I can see it all developing. By the end of December the poor souls who will have saved \$80 or \$85 will be soaked for \$100, maybe \$150, over the next—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: You are cynical!

Mr. Deans: Cynical? Not at all; I am simply telling you the truth.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I know that mind of yours.

Mr. Deans: That is the reason why I have some doubts about it. I realize you wouldn't let me bet; I offered to the other day and couldn't get away with it. I tell you, as I look ahead, I think, somehow or other, that is the way it is going to be.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: You can't see past your nose.

Mr. Deans: I think that is the way it is going to be. I can see it now. In early January—Jan. 15 at the latest—in comes the Treasurer with his budget and he will say the federal government hasn't done what it should have done. It hasn't made enough money available, it hasn't cut this tax.

He will say: "We are in trouble in Ontario. As you know, we had to put the sales tax back to seven per cent, as we said we would." Beyond that point he will say, "We are in more debt than ever before and therefore, reluctantly, we are going to have to ask for more." A little like *Oliver Twist*, you will be in asking for more. The only difference between him and you is that he had to ask; you take it without asking. That is the difference.

What is going to happen is that every other tax—not every other tax but a number of other taxes—will be raised in order to make up for the deficit you are going to incur as a result of the reduction from seven to five per cent. I think it is dishonest, I really do, but nevertheless you are going to do it.

I hope the people out there benefit from it. I hope they have the sense to save the extra two per cent because they are going to need it to pay next year's. If they spend it this year when you raise it next year they are going to have to take it out of their already hard-pressed pockets. I hope enough of them have enough sense to hang on to some of it so they can pay it back when you raise the other taxes on the things they have to have—because you are going to raise them. As sure as I stand here you're going to raise them, and when you raise them you'll conjure up equally good economic arguments. You'll just get a different economist, because you can't get two to agree anyway. So you'll get a different economist and he'll tell you that that's the proper economic approach to take and you'll do it.

I find it pretty hard, Mr. Minister; I've got to tell you the truth. I think there are other ways. I think we all understand that. We understand and you understand that we would have done it differently, but that's okay.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: You sure would have.

Mr. Deans: But I don't think, on balance, that you are telling the whole story. When you bring in a budget I think you've got an obligation to make that budget, to all intents and purposes, for a fiscal year, but I think it's reasonable during the course of the year, if there is some unforeseen economic problem, to bring in a supplementary problem. I think that's entirely proper, but at this point you're talking now about nine-month fiscal years. That's what you are talking about. You're talking about a budget in January. You're talking about a budget in January. I read the statement of the Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. Meen: It doesn't change the fiscal year.

Mr. Deans: Which means that this budget is for only nine months and the next budget will contain all of the changes that have to be made in order to put an additional stimulus into the coffers of the Treasury at the expense of the people of the province, because you hope, by that point, to have a mandate that will carry you four more years.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: You are predicting an upturn.

Mr. Deans: I'm predicting you'll go out and we'll be—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: An economic upturn.

Mr. Deans: —faced with the problems of trying to resolve the economic imbalance that you've created by this rather silly fiscal measure.

Mr. M. B. Dymond (Ontario): Oh, the member for Wentworth is dreaming.

Mr. Chairman: Does any other hon. member wish to speak on section 2, subsection 3(a)? We have an amendment here. Would it be agreeable that we stack this or are there some other amendments coming up? Agreed?

Mr. Lawlor: No, call a vote on it.

Mr. Chairman: Does any other member wish to speak on any part of section 2? Section 3?

Mr. Deans: We are calling a vote on section 2.

Mr. Chairman: Oh, I asked if it was agreed to stack it and I thought I heard the members agree.

Mr. Deans: My colleague said no.

Mr. Lawlor: I said no.

Mr. Chairman: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't hear you.

Mr. Deans: My colleague is eager to vote now.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of Mr. Lawlor's amendment to section 2, subsection 3(a) will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

The committee divided on Mr. Lawlor's amendment to subsection 3(a) of section 2 of Bill 30, which was negatived on the following vote:

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 27, the "nays" are 44.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and section 2(3a) of the bill carried.

Does any other member wish to speak on any other part of section 2 of the bill?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I have one brief comment on section 2(3). I agree with

the proposed new subsection 8, which is the purpose of subsection 3 of the bill. I noticed, in reviewing the bill, that it is clear now that it is mandatory that the refund be made, whereas under the former bill it was permissive. I take it to mean that the proposed change to the word "shall" from the word "may," is that money paid, whether it's paid under a mistake of fact or under a mistake of law will be repaid to the taxpayer, and that no longer will that device of making that subtle distinction of whether it was paid under a mistake of fact or a mistake of law be available to the Treasurer or to the minister and that, as a mandatory matter, if a refund is required to be made, he must and will be required by this change to make that refund.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Chairman, the words are that where the tax was not payable as tax—and I take that to mean whether it was paid under a mistake of law or under a mistake of fact—if the tax was not payable then, in fact, it must be refunded within the two years.

Mr. Renwick: I'm not sure we are talking about the same thing. The Act as it presently reads prior to the section that we're discussing states that:

Where a person has paid an amount under this Act as tax that is not payable as tax under this Act, such amount may be refunded upon receipt by the minister of satisfactory evidence that the amount was wrongfully paid.

Now, in the proposed amendment it states that:

Where a person has paid an amount under this Act as tax that is not payable as tax under this Act, such amount shall be refunded.

I take it that if, in fact, it has been paid, either under a mistake of law or under a mistake of fact, that the money will be refunded in both such instances.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Chairman, that's my understanding and my intention.

Mr. Chairman: Shall subsection 3 carry?

Subsection 3 agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Any other comments on any other section? If so, which section?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, a minor point on section 3.

On section 3:

Mr. Renwick: I agree with the proposals in section 3 with respect to the single licence being required—that is, in subsection 2, rather than to require an individual licence for each premise on which the business is carried on. But I notice that instead of being required to post either the original licence or a photocopy of it in a conspicuous place, that all that there now has to be at each premises at which the business or trade is carried on is a copy of the original licence, and that a customer can only see that document by asking for it.

I don't know whether it's important or not important, but certainly it traditionally has been that the retail sales tax licence must be posted up in a conspicuous place in the establishment where the trade is carried on. As I take it, it's not going to be necessary because of the provision of the very last item, that's item 6, which is part of the amendment proposed by subsection 2.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Chairman, it has to be available. I would presume that if there were any number of requests to examine it, the copy would then be placed in a sufficiently conspicuous or available spot so that anyone who was interested could examine it. I don't believe that is any particular problem. What we are really getting at here is, as the member for Riverdale has indicated, is a single permit for any particular vendor, rather than requiring him to have one for every one of his outlets. Thereupon we do require a section for copies of the permits to be available for inspection at each one of the retail outlets.

Mr. Stokes: I'd like to ask a question, and I'm asking it out of ignorance, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Is this the section that deals with the issuance of exemption permits that will allow Indian reserves to be exempt for people living on Indian reserves?

Hon. Mr. Meen: No, Mr. Chairman, this is under the retail sales tax sections for retail merchants.

Mr. Stokes: Where in the Act would I be able to discuss with the minister the availability of exemption cards for those who are exempt from the retail sales tax itself?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Those provisions are not in this particular bill, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any other discussion in any other section prior to section 5? I assume section 3 is carried?

Section 3 agreed to.

On section 4:

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, in order that we can conduct this debate on this major portion of the bill, I would like to move that clause 4 of Bill 30 be amended by deleting from subsection 3, paragraph 49 and renumbering paragraph 49(a) to be paragraph 49, and I so move.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Chairman, could I have some explanation from the hon. member for Riverdale? Are we now dealing with section 4, subsection 3 of the bill?

Mr. Renwick: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Have we then finished with subsections 1 and 2?

Mr. Renwick: We have no comments on those two subsections.

Mr. Chairman: Is the hon. member for Welland South dealing with section 4, subsections 1 and 2?

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was dealing with section 4 of the proposed bill. I wanted to add a new clause to it. It would be that subsection three of section 4 be amended to include a new subsection following the preamble "but no exemption may be claimed under this paragraph for any machinery or equipment," and that subsection (e) read "(f) which is imported into Canada if such machinery or equipment for the same purpose can be manufactured in Canada."

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could comment.

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Renwick: As I understand it, in response to the minister on subsection 1 of section 4 and subsection 2 of section 4 we have no comment. We can take them as passed?

Mr. Lawlor: Well, I have just one little comment on subsection 2. The alteration in subsection 2 involves just a new phrase called "product-holding fixtures." I would like a little explanation of why that has been inserted and what it means.

Hon. Mr. Meen: It refers to jigs, Mr. Chairman, devices for holding articles while in the course of manufacture.

Mr. Lawlor: You've got jigs in there already.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Well, product-holding is another aspect of that kind of thing.

Mr. Lawlor: I don't know what he is talking about anyway.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I may say that what I have done in the proposed amendment is simply to move that clause 4 of the bill be amended by deleting from subsection 3, paragraph 49 which, Mr. Chairman, you will recognize is the substantial part of the section, leaving, however, paragraph 49(a) but renumbering it as 49.

Mr. Chairman: Right.

An hon. member: Carried?

Mr. Deans: No, I wanted to speak to my colleague's amendment. I don't think he's quite sure what the motion is all about.

Mr. Renwick: It's very complex.

Mr. Lawlor: Why doesn't the minister just accept it?

Mr. Deans: I think you should because really it is a terrible subsection.

Mr. Chairman: I think that the Chair would deal with Mr. Renwick's amendment first. Then after that amendment is considered we would deal with the amendment moved by Mr. Haggerty. If the hon. member for Wentworth would like to comment on the amendment, he can.

Mr. Deans: I would like to comment on my colleague's amendment which makes, in my opinion, very good sense. The intent of this portion of the legislation, as I understand it, is to do four things. It's intended to help stimulate the economy. It's intended to stimulate output or productivity. It's intended to stimulate investment and it's intended to stimulate job opportunities. Those are the four areas in which this particular section and this action of the government are intended to have some impact.

I want to talk about those four things, because I want to suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that this particular amendment is likely to have the opposite effect in terms of the Ontario economy in all four of the areas it was intended to assist.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The amendment?

Mr. Deans: This change that the government is proposing.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Not the member for Riverdale's amendment?

Mr. Deans: That goes without saying. I would assume that had you been following the debate, you would have understood that.

I think the question you have got to ask about the whole matter of the stimulation of the economy and the intended stimulation for investment purposes is, first of all, do you understand that the majority of companies don't make these kinds of decisions overnight? The majority of companies don't decide on a Friday to make major changes in their production machinery purchases for the next week, or two or three weeks later. On balance, they have long-range programmes for the replacement of production machinery. This kind of change isn't likely to have much impact if in fact they haven't already made up their minds to purchase production machinery in this particular period of time.

With regard to the stimulation of productivity or output, I think anyone who looks at the economy of Ontario realizes that with few exceptions, industry is now working below capacity, it is not producing anything near the optimal capacity of the machinery that is already in place, and people are being laid off right across this province.

Regardless of whether one speaks of the auto industry, the appliance industry or any other industry, in almost every instance the machinery already in place and the manpower available have the capacity to produce more, given the opportunity. Therefore, this move is not likely to be able to stimulate output or productivity unless—and we come to the next point.

This particular amendment, put forward by the minister on behalf of the Treasurer, is intended to stimulate jobs. The question you have got to ask yourself is, where are these jobs going to be stimulated? What is the effect of the purchase of new production machinery on the Ontario scene? You can't begin to answer those questions until you understand how much production machinery there is manufactured in Ontario, because it will only be at the production machinery manufacturing level that there will be any additional incentive to produce new jobs.

Production machinery, in this day and age, by its very nature tends to eliminate jobs in the factory that it's going to go into, rather than create new jobs. Production machinery tends to be automated and therefore tends to cut down on the numbers of job oppor-

tunities available at the manufacturing level where that machinery is going to be used.

It might be argued by the government that this move will stimulate employment opportunities, but those employment opportunities will be stimulated in the areas or locations where the machinery itself is being produced, rather in the locations where the machinery is to be used. Therefore, it will be counter-productive in terms of the creation of employment opportunities in the Province of Ontario.

The other matter is the stimulation of investment, that this may stimulate companies to invest. But then you have to ask again, where will this investment take place? Is there a particular advantage to stimulating investment by Ontario corporations which will result in an improved economic condition in some other part of the world but which will have a detrimental effect on the job opportunities, both short-term and long-term, in the Province of Ontario?

I think as you look at the four points put forward by the government as being the valid reasons why it wants this particular measure to be carried, you have to question whether those points are going to be beneficial to the Ontario population or whether they are going to be detrimental.

I am going to tell you to begin with that it is detrimental to the economy of Ontario if the economic stimulation takes place other than in Canada, particularly outside the Province of Ontario, in other countries.

It is detrimental in terms of productivity increases if the purchase of production machinery means further automation and a further loss of jobs in the province. There is no point, by a reduction or elimination of a tax, in our encouraging people to buy machinery, even if it were possible to do that, if the end result is going to be the purchase of machinery which is more automated in its nature and which will eliminate the jobs of the people who work in the Province in Ontario and therefore will be detrimental to our overall economy.

There is no purpose at all in a company being able to produce more as the result of automation if it means more Canadians out of work. To go along with that, as I said when I began, you have to understand that there are very few companies in Ontario currently working at peak production. The stimulation of production could well have been done by a more vigorous move on the part of this government to assist companies operating here to sell the products they are cap-

able of producing outside this country in the international markets.

If you were going to zero in in some way in trying to up production capacity, if you were going to try to take advantage of the productive capacity both of manpower and of machinery already in place in the Province of Ontario, a sensible solution would have been to have had some kind of exporting corporation established which would have gone out into the markets of the world and tried to sell Ontario and its products.

But what you have done is counter-productive. There is no point in turning around and saying you are going to give a remission of tax for the purchase of highly automated machinery for the purpose of creating additional production if the available productive capacities are not being used. This is where I think you are headed in the wrong direction.

I think, as I have said, you have also to look at the whole investment picture. Given the nature of Ontario companies' production capabilities; given the markets they currently have before them; given the unemployment that is taking place in Ontario and across this country; given the equally important, perhaps more obvious, unemployment in other parts of the world with a reduction in their purchasing capacity, what companies in their right minds are going to alter their production procedures and go out now and automate their companies?

Who is going to be encouraged by a reduction or an elimination of the sales tax to undertake an automation programme or a replenishing or refurbishing programme in his plant if he hadn't already decided the machinery was obsolete and he hadn't already made the decision to go ahead in any event? Who do you know who is going to do that? How many companies, just because you have eliminated the tax, are going to go out and do that?

I say to you that the whole direction you are moving in in this particular area tends to defeat all of the very things you have set out as being the reasons for doing it.

Hon. Mr. Meen: They might very well do it a lot sooner.

Mr. Deans: If they do it a lot sooner, you have to ask yourself the question—I did and I think it is fair—if you are right and they do it a lot sooner and they automate more quickly, we will create more unemployment in Canada.

Hon. Mr. Meen: If your basic premise is loss of jobs that is not what we are talking about.

Mr. Deans: I'm sorry.

Hon. Mr. Meen: We are talking about creating more jobs.

Mr. Deans: Let me look at that then. If, as you say, they will move more quickly toward the purchase of new production machinery it will, because the production machinery is—

Hon. Mr. Meen: That presupposes that you are retiring the old.

Mr. Deans: No one presupposes you are retiring the old—

Hon. Mr. Meen: They may very well be going into other product lines.

Mr. Deans: Let me try it with you in this way: First of all, surely you would agree with me that we are not now producing at our productive capacity in most industries?

Hon. Mr. Meen: In some areas.

Mr. Deans: In most industry, is that fair?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I couldn't say. I would say in some areas they are producing at less than capacity.

Mr. Deans: Would you say in the automobile industry we were producing at our productive capacity?

Hon. Mr. Meen: No, I certainly would not.

Mr. Deans: No. Would you say in the appliance industry that we were producing at our productive capacity?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I would say they, too, are running below, so in those areas they would probably upgrade it.

Mr. Deans: Would you say in the furniture industry that we are producing at our productive capacity?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I have no idea.

Mr. Deans: No. The truth is no. In which industry would you say we were producing at our productive capacity?

Hon. Mr. Meen: You go ahead. You make a speech.

Mr. Deans: That's right. Well then the major employers, both the direct employers and their subsidiaries and all of the auxiliary

employers that are attached to them, are not producing at their productive capacity.

Hon. Mr. Meen: But they may very well be able to get into other product lines.

Mr. Deans: Let me go on. In major steel they are not producing at their productive capacity now in any of the steel mills in Ontario. They are currently planning for expansion, but that planning has been on the books for some considerable period of time and all of the plans take, as they say, five to eight years in order for the actual turnover to take place. We can't benefit from that here in Ontario.

Now if you are telling me that they may then speed up the purchase of this automated machinery in order to produce more, what are they producing more for when the productive capacity of the manufacturing sector is not now being used to its maximum? Why would they go and buy this new machinery to produce more, if they are capable of producing more now and they have no markets for it?

Hon. Mr. Meen: That's in those particular product lines.

Mr. Deans: I am talking about the majority of product lines in the major employment areas of the Province of Ontario; the major employment areas. So don't sit and tell me this is somehow or other going to be a good move. It has got to be detrimental and you know it. You can't argue on the one hand that—

Hon. Mr. Meen: No, no.

Mr. Deans: —they are going to speed up the changeover to more automated machinery, while agreeing on the other hand that what is already in place is capable of producing at least 20 per cent more than it does now, or in some cases 50 per cent more, and it isn't being used to the total capacity that it is capable of being used to. There is no rationalization of those two positions.

But let's assume then that you are right. Let's assume they decide for some reason that they are then going to move to this automated machinery in any event, even though they haven't got a market for the capacity of that automated machine. They then purchase that machine and they put it in place and what's the outcome of that? They are then able to produce more with less manpower because of the automation. That means they are able to meet the current demand with fewer people involved, so that instead of

creating, instead of stimulating employment, you are in fact acting detrimentally to the employment picture.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Your whole argument is premised on the assumption that the automated equipment is where the money will go.

Mr. Deans: Well, let me tell you that I haven't seen many people buy hand-cranked machinery, at least recently.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Of course not, but you have seen them going into machinery for new product lines.

Mr. Deans: And I also know that when people buy production machinery the tendency is to attempt to get more automated machinery, and you can't deny that. I worked in the industry for a number of years and every single thing that we did in the machinery industry—I worked in an industry that designed and manufactured production machinery—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: How about the construction industry?

Mr. Deans: Oh we will talk about construction in a minute if you would like, if you really want to get into this.

Every order that was placed was for a more highly automated machine than the one which was already in place on the floor, in the line, on every occasion. Where there was more automated machinery available it was purchased, and where there wasn't if it was simply for replacement purposes, when there was a cutback in production they tended not to try to replace the machinery because it wasn't necessary. Okay?

So if you look at what you are trying to do, it doesn't work. This kind of move is useless. What had to be done was to stimulate the sales over here. The production is already capable of meeting stimulated sales, but the sales were not being stimulated. So that if you were going to do anything at all, it had to be at the selling end and not at the buying end. All right? Not at the manufacturing end. Now what do you say?

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): We are doing that, too.

Hon. Mr. Meen: We are doing that at the other end.

Mr. Deans: Now what you're faced with is this: Let's assume they all take advantage of it. Let's assume that everybody that can does take advantage of this and every single piece of machinery that can be replaced is re-

placed. Let's assume that every piece that can be replaced is replaced.

Hon. Mr. Meen: But your whole argument is specious, because it's founded on the replacement of machinery rather than extension of facilities.

Mr. Deans: No, no. We have already agreed—

Hon. Mr. Meen: Who agreed?

Mr. Deans: —that there is no need by most industry in the current economy for an expansion of their productive capacity.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I haven't agreed to that.

Mr. Deans: You haven't agreed to that? Then you don't know what's going on now.

Mr. Germa: How many are unemployed in Ontario today?

Mr. Deans: There's no point in me even talking to you then about it if you don't understand that when you're only producing at 70 per cent or less of your productive capacity, there's no need for you to buy new machinery to produce more when you haven't got a market for it.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Not more of the same product.

Mr. Deans: Now if you don't agree with that, I don't know how we can ever make the point with you. If you can't understand that, then you're in real trouble; you're in real trouble if you don't understand it.

But we go on. Let's assume that they do, in fact, replace the machinery that's in line, the stuff that can be replaced. Let's even assume they buy new stuff; that they don't replace it, they do buy new stuff along your line. What happens then is that the new machinery, being much more automated as it always is, that machinery requires fewer people to make it operate. The productive capacity is increased, but there is no market for the product. You are, therefore, able to produce more in less time with more highly-automated machinery and with fewer man-hours of work. You therefore create more unemployment; particularly where we're not in a growing economy, and we're not at the moment. Now what happens? Who benefits from this purchase?

Well, we've discovered the man who works in the shop doesn't benefit. The consumer doesn't benefit, because there is a sufficient amount being produced to meet the consumer demand. And so then the person who bene-

fits must be the person who manufactures the machinery. Now if that person lived in Ontario or even in Canada, if that machinery was being produced somewhere within the confines of this country, then we would benefit. There would be a stimulation to that particular manufacturer or those manufacturers and that would create a great deal more economic movement.

Unfortunately, those people aren't located in Canada. I venture to say almost all of the production machinery purchased today is manufactured outside of this country. It's manufactured in the United States, it's manufactured in Sweden, it's manufactured in Germany, it's manufactured in other parts of the world. Some of it's manufactured in Japan, though not much of it. So that you find that any of the production machinery that's going to be purchased is manufactured elsewhere and it is to that economy that the benefit flows. The investment of dollars here flows to there, the employment that's created is there; and, therefore, the benefits are there. The non-benefits are here, where you can produce no more and where you employ fewer people.

So that this kind of manoeuvre at this particular point in this inflationary period, with the economy on the downturn, can only be detrimental to the overall economy of the province.

Now let's go back to a few years ago. I made a similar kind of an argument a number of years ago over something called the reduction in machinery tax. It was called the machinery tax rebate, as I recall. We asked the government, on a number of occasions over two years to produce figures which would show there was an additional job which could be identified as having been created as the result of the production machinery rebate. Not one single job could be identified; not one.

I suggest to you that the argument with regard to employment will be parallel this time to the time some four years ago, or three years ago—I can't recall the exact date—when you brought in a similar measure. It didn't work then and it won't work now.

This kind of measure we can well do without. There's someone in the government—I don't know who it is—but someone in the government has some misguided view of the way people produce things. Someone doesn't seem to understand the impact on the existing economy of this kind of move.

If we were in a growing economy where there was a crying need for further production and the manufacturers, for some reason

or other, were having difficulty in getting things retooled to meet that growing economy, a move like this might make some sense. Maybe it would make some sense, as was suggested earlier, if this would be used over a period of time to try to stimulate the development of a machinery manufacturing industry sector in Ontario and in Canada. But this kind of measure, as you have put it forward, cannot possibly benefit the Province of Ontario. It can't possibly benefit us, other than to put additional dollars into the pockets of people who had already made up their mind to buy machinery, that's all.

There can't be an employment benefit, there can't be a production benefit, and there can't be a manufacturing impetus benefit; because there isn't a sufficient length of time. If you had meant this to work, really, you would have to look ahead five to six years to see it actually beginning to form in terms of the establishment of a production machinery manufacturing sector in the Province of Ontario. If this had been designed to stimulate those small industries which currently produce certain kinds of machinery to go into the business in a larger way and to try to create additional markets for the machinery they produce and to produce additional lines of machines in order to meet existing needs in the country and in the province that would have made some sense. But that is a long-term proposition; it isn't met in 23 months, that takes a number of years to develop.

If you were talking about giving particular benefit to Canadian production machinery manufacturers which would have enabled them to diversify their operations and search out, first of all, and then attempt to tool up for the manufacture of machinery which is needed in Canada but which is not currently manufactured in Canada, I would have said that was a good move. But the number of months—is it 21 or 23?

Mr. Stokes: It's 21.

Mr. Deans: Twenty-one months. In the 21 months available there is neither time for the existing manufacturers to make an accurate assessment, nor is there the incentive; because they know full well that in 21 months this measure no longer pertains and we end up back where we started. They are at a disadvantage vis-à-vis the capacity of manufacturers outside the country to produce in larger quantity and thereby take advantage of economies of scale.

Could I move the committee rise, it being 5 o'clock?

Mr. Deans moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the House begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR:

NOTICE OF MOTION No. 2

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 2 by Mr. Lane:

RESOLUTION: That ambulances operated by the emergency services department of the Ministry of Health in northern Ontario be equipped with emergency electrocardiograph monitoring and treatment equipment together with attendants properly trained in its use and operation.

Mr. Lane moves resolution No. 2.

Mr. J. Lane (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Speaker, the resolution which I have had on the order paper for some time and which I would like to deal with at this time, is actually the brain child of Dr. G. F. Trobridge of Sudbury. After training in England, Dr. Trobridge arrived in Sudbury nine years ago and later joined forces with Dr. Field to make an open heart surgery team for the Sudbury area. We are, indeed, very fortunate to have doctors of this calibre in the north and I'm sure many lives have been saved as the result of the combined efforts of these brilliant doctors. However, we have found that a very high percentage of heart disease victims are dead on arrival and regardless as to how many clever doctors we have in our hospitals they cannot save the lives of heart victims unless these people get to the hospitals alive. That, basically, Mr. Speaker, is what this resolution pertains to.

Although I am very proud to be a northerner, one fault of the north is the great distance people must travel to receive proper medical attention of one kind or another. I realize that some health problems are not closely related to a time factor, but many are, in particular, dreaded heart disease. This matter has been of great concern to me for some time. When I hear about the survey that Dr. Trobridge conducted, I requested his advice regarding this survey and suggested that I bring the matter before this House in the form

of a resolution or a private members' bill. I had a reply from Dr. Trobridge, dated Oct. 22, 1974, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the record a portion of this letter:

In 1970 I performed some work in northern Ontario with the help of the department of emergency services of the Ministry of Health, which demonstrated that it was possible in the context of northern Ontario to monitor a patient's electrocardiograph from a moving ambulance on most of the highways around Sudbury. The primary purpose of this work was to demonstrate that it would be possible to detect serious cardiac irregularity in patients being transported by ambulance with a reliability that could lead to satisfactory emergency treatment while still in the ambulance.

I felt this could lead to improving the chances of the patient with an acute heart attack reaching hospital alive. At the time, the research was only directed toward the feasibility of transmitting the cardiograph and we showed that in the vast majority of cases such monitoring could be achieved in a technically satisfactory manner.

The experiment was terminated in 1971 and so far as we in northern Ontario are concerned no further action has resulted.

For the results of this experiment to have been applied successfully, ambulance drivers and attendants would have had to be trained to perform cardiac massage and electrical defibrillation with the intent that they could perform these functions in the ambulance on the direction of a central coronary care unit registered nurse, who would have interpreted the cardiograph. Possibly also the ambulance drivers could have been trained to start the administration of appropriate intravenous medications. Authority for these actions would of course require special legislation.

Subsequent to the above research, I also considered the plight of the patient with an acute heart attack living a distance from Sudbury, who is admitted to one of the smaller hospitals such as Little Current, Espanola or Elliot Lake. In these hospitals, cardiac monitoring and defibrillation is possible as the equipment exists, but continuous monitoring of the patient as in a larger hospital coronary care unit is impossible and the nurses concerned do not have enough continuing exposure to these problems to be able to interpret the findings and take emergency action. This means that the chances of survival of cardiac arrest

in a small hospital are less than in a large hospital.

In order to combine both these problems I considered the possibility of central computer-assisted monitoring of coronary care patients in hospitals right across northern Ontario. I feel the best approach to offering a first-rate service for sufferers of heart disease in northern Ontario would be a central computer-assisted monitoring service for the patients in the hospital, and the operator of this room would also take care in terms of monitoring of the patients in transit in ambulances. At the same time, under suitable legislation, the ambulance drivers would be trained in the treatment of cardiac arrest and possibly in the administration of drugs.

The same monitoring service could be used to assist in the transport of other very sick patients. The continuously open telephone lines between Sudbury and other centres would, when not in use for cardiograph transmissions, undoubtedly be used for other medical communications and indirectly help to maintain a high standard of medicine through northern Ontario.

Members will note that Dr. Trobridge mentions that ambulance attendants would have to be trained in the operation of this equipment and the administration of appropriate intravenous medication. It is estimated that this would require an extra three or four hours training for the ambulance attendants and, of course, special legislation to permit the attendants to carry out this function.

I continued to correspond with Dr. Trobridge on this proposal requesting more information, including statistics. I would again like to read into the record a portion of a letter which I received from him dated Jan. 15, 1975:

It seems that in the Sudbury area with a population of a little over 180,000 there are normally seven ambulances. During 1974 these ambulances answered approximately 9,000 calls. Of these approximately 420 were due to heart disease. There were approximately 185 patients reputedly dead on arrival.

There are no accurate statistics to indicate how many of these so-called dead-on-arrival patients were in fact dead, and how many could have been saved. The ambulance men were questioned as to their memory and it seems likely that 35 of these patients were not necessarily dead at the time of arrival of the ambulance and within electrocardiograph monitoring and

resuscitation some of them may have stood a chance.

In the research I did a few years ago I demonstrated that using a cardiograph amplifier and ordinary ambulance radio, with, if necessary, landline telephone, it was possible to transmit cardiographs from the ambulance, moving or stationary, over a very considerable portion of the Sudbury regional municipality. There is no doubt there are many black areas, in such areas as rock cuts, but these do not matter. What is more important is that the furthest outlying places are now beyond radio range but the proportion of the population involved there is small. We also showed that over a greater distance the ambulance could always transmit the cardiograph to the nearest ambulance base station by radio and by placing the handset of the telephone on the loudspeaker the electrocardiograph signal could be satisfactorily received at any distance. Instructions resulting from those cardiographs could of course, be returned via telephone and retransmitted by radio.

At the present time the cheapest way in which each ambulance could be equipped would be with one of the two-man team being fully instructed in the use of equipment and the treatment of the patient. The equipment would consist of an electrocardiograph amplifier transmitter, costing approximately \$350, and a defibrillator (an instrument for administering an electric shock to start the heart) at a cost of about \$1,000, i.e. about \$1,350 per ambulance. It is anticipated that the existing radio network would be adequate to start the scheme though if 100 per cent coverage was wanted, intermediate repeater stations for the radio system would be required. I personally feel that we have to accept it that there are certain limitations in terms of complete coverage for northern Ontario.

I feel the signals obtained from the patient in the ambulance should be received at an intensive care unit or a coronary care unit so that a nurse well trained in the management of cardiac arrest and normally expected to act in such situations on her own initiative could interpret the cardiograph and advise the ambulance attendants. I do not believe it is necessary, possible, or even desirable that all tracings would be seen by a doctor. Having interpreted such tracings it would be the duty of such nurse to advise as to the necessary treatment, including electric shock treatment.

It is also felt desirable that the ambulance attendants should be permitted to start intravenous therapy so that life-saving drugs may be given very fast. Such drugs would be used to prevent the heart stopping or to support it in case of repeated failure. Again, therapy could be directed via radio or ultimately might be used at the discretion of the ambulance attendants themselves, depending on their training.

If the ambulance men are working under supervision three or four hours of training in relation to cardiac massage, respiratory support and defibrillation is all that would be necessary. However, if they are to work on their own initiative they would need a considerably longer period, perhaps several weeks, and this would be more costly but at the same time, probably very much more productive of results.

I have inquired concerning the number of ambulances in northern Ontario from Mattawa to Kenora, and north of Parry Sound and it seems there is approximately 50 ambulances. Not all of these have full-time attendants but if they did we would be considering approximately 400 ambulance attendants of staff of these vehicles.

It seems that at the present time the ambulance men have no legal authority even to institute cardiac massage, which is the elementary first aid life-saving procedure. Needless to say the rules are broken as in the following example. A man suffered a cardiac arrest in downtown Sudbury. His son started cardiac massage and artificial respiration. The ambulance arrived 15 or 20 minutes later and the ambulance man continued the cardiac massage all the way to the hospital (presumably illegally). My partner and I then resuscitated the man who recovered. He later underwent open heart surgery successfully and is now in good health.

Surely the ambulance men must be given legal support to carry out first aid measures as in this example, where if the ambulance men had followed the rules they would have killed the patient.

I feel I should point out that this whole subject is still controversial in the minds of some doctors who feel reluctant to allow paramedical personnel to undertake potentially dangerous therapy. I agree training is necessary and to some degree supervision is necessary. If we are to make any more impressions on the horrifyingly high mortality from cardiac disease, I feel the profession must accept help from the para-

medics groups, and at the same time support them wholeheartedly.

I realize my friends in the large urban areas will not really appreciate what Dr. Trobridge is proposing or the message that I am trying to get across today. Therefore, I will try to compare the large urban areas to the far-flung rural areas of the north.

Under normal circumstances, in most urban areas a person suffering a serious heart attack could be picked up by an ambulance and rushed to a large hospital in a matter of minutes. But in parts of my riding it would be a matter of one to two hours, and in the more remote areas of the north it could be several hours.

For a remote area the best method of transportation is flying the patient to the hospital. However, in many cases the weather conditions will not permit flying. In my opinion, Dr. Trobridge's proposal makes a great deal of good sense. If this plan was acted upon, we in the north may at last have an equal or near equal chance to our southern cousins of surviving the dreaded heart disease.

I realize that many people will say that we cannot afford to spend the money. My reply is that if we save even a few lives each year the cost would indeed have been very small. If we must control costs, let's cut back on our Cadillac requirements regarding building hospitals, homes, homes for the aged, and so on. While bricks, stone and marble look nice, they do not save lives. I, for one, would rather see a less elaborate building and have the good feeling that the money saved in this manner was actually saving lives in northern Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I am very interested in the opinion of the hon. members regarding this proposal. I hope the speakers from all parties will at least support the resolution in principle so that we will have a good case to present to the Ministry of Health for its consideration.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of resolution 2 standing in the name of the previous speaker. The resolution reads:

That ambulances operated by the emergency services department of the Ministry of Health in northern Ontario be equipped with emergency electrocardiograph monitoring and treatment equipment together with attendants properly trained in its use and operation.

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, may I say what is good for the south is also good for the north. The reverse likewise is true; what is good for the north is likewise good for the south.

I support the resolution, knowing full well that there may be some costs involved. But how do you place a value on an individual's life? I know the Minister of Health (Mr. Miller) is going to come along and say, "We are very cost conscious today. We are going to come along and curtail services," and so forth. But, Mr. Speaker, you don't curtail services such as the one suggested by the member whose resolution we are here discussing.

I wonder how many of us have seen an electrocardiograph machine? I happen to have been involved with one at one time or another in my earlier days. I know full well that the piece of equipment is not necessarily operated by just the ordinary individual. It requires quite some training, and this is where I think the first requisite has to be fulfilled.

Before we can implement a programme such as that recommended here, I think the community colleges are going to have to become deeply involved in developing more paramedical personnel. They will have to do this in co-operation with the medical authorities, with the doctors, the dentists and any other medical professionals who may be part of the health services team. I think there is a real place for paramedics and, in this instance, for the paramedical ambulance driver, so to speak. Gone are the days when all the ambulance driver needed was a first aid certificate and a chauffeur's licence.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): It was a three-week course.

Mr. B. Newman: No, it was a little longer than a three-week course. I think it was a 12-week course, because I conducted courses in first aid for the St. John Ambulance Association for years and years. It took approximately 12 weeks then, and that was one day a week. But even then, you didn't know enough concerning the delivery of health services. I think programmes could be set up by the community colleges where individuals could be trained for this specific function; that is, the function of being an ambulance operator, driver and a paramedic.

Mr. Speaker, the member makes mention of the number of ambulances in the north and the number of trained personnel. Well, Mr. Speaker, when we get to the south, we have that greater population and we really

have a greater need in the south than you do in the north. This is not to say that they don't have the need and they don't deserve it. As I said earlier, what is good for the south is good for the north, and we should never forget the north.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Not necessarily.

Mr. B. Newman: As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, the first aid certificate is no longer good enough. Individuals driving ambulances are going to have to be fairly skilled; they're really going to have to be paramedics. They're going to have to be part of a health service team. They are going to be the troops at the front line. They are going to be the first contact with the patient. The quicker treatment can be undertaken, the greater the chances for survival.

As far as health services go, it is almost the same as the fire department. The quicker the fire department can get to the scene of the fire, the more likely they can put out the fire. The quicker the health services team—the paramedic, the ambulance driver, with the equipment mentioned in this resolution—gets to the scene of the individual, the more likely the chance of survival for that individual.

Mr. Speaker, when one looks at American television there is one programme that deals with paramedics. The extent to which the paramedic and the extent to which we can deliver health services to all parts of a province or a state or a community are concerned is really just as far as one's imagination wishes one to go. Naturally, there are going to be costs involved in some instances—some substantial cost—and we can't come along and just let costs carry us away. We have to develop the personnel so that we can get the maximum use out of them with the best training and at the most reasonable cost possible.

Mr. Speaker, with the resolution that the member has introduced, I can foresee that by means of electronic equipment—that is, your CB or other electronic device—we could be monitoring the individual as soon as the ambulance arrives on the scene. Likewise, we could be relaying all of this information to a central dispatch which, in turn, could be connected either directly or indirectly to a hospital. Proper treatment information could be relayed back to the paramedic who is attending the person suffering from the cardiac problem.

Mr. Speaker, I made mention of the need being greater in the south than in the north. I make mention of that only because of population densities—no other reason. There is probably the environmental damage that may be greater in parts of the south than it is in the north. As a result, respiratory and heart conditions may be a little more acute, a little more frequent in the south as opposed to the north.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, from a brief presented to the Ministry of Health back on June 25, 1974, it was requested that a heart-lung pump be established in the city of Windsor. The group in their submission made mention that cardiovascular diseases cause 55 per cent of all deaths. One can see if cardiovascular problems cause 55 per cent, there is need for an electrocardiograph and other types of equipment in ambulances—and how important they happen to be.

I know the ministry is not going to approve this. It is going to look up economies instead and say this is too expensive. We can't put a value on an individual's life. The Ministry of Health did put a value on individuals' lives when it came to the city of Windsor and denied the community a heart-lung pump after 43,000 people signed a petition requesting that type of equipment. After the equipment had been purchased—and purchased, in my opinion, with the full consent of the community—the ministry denied its installation.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, the Ministry of Health will not go along with this type of resolution.

I can also see in this a real urgent need when I look at a headline in my own paper of Jan. 17, 1975: "Committee urges Coronary Units in All Hospitals." We can see how coronary problems are probably the problem of greatest importance in today's society. Unless we can come along and have ambulances and personnel trained to be the first line of defence when they come to a patient who is suffering from a coronary problem I am afraid that the incidence of death from coronary conditions will increase and not decrease.

I am not a doctor and as a result probably I don't have the authority of the member who will be speaking for the government side shortly. I hope he can come along and set the record straight. I hope we will have his support likewise so that all three parties can after some fashion convince the Ministry of Health that the resolution as introduced by the member is deserving of support and is deserving of implementation not only in the

northern reaches of the province but throughout the province.

I don't think for one minute, Mr. Speaker, that we should say that every ambulance should have this type of equipment but at least in the south there should be as many ambulances as the health services in the community think should be equipped with this type of equipment.

I hope the government accepts the resolution as presented by the member and that we have action following it. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise to support the resolution as far as it goes. I would have hoped, though, we could have been here today discussing a matter which is far more serious, far more encompassing than what is contained in this particular resolution.

I note that the member who introduced it spent a good deal of time indicating the need for this particular service in the Sudbury area. I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the mover of the resolution that in my estimation the delivery of health services in the north—and this resolution deals particularly with one aspect of health services in the north—needs a complete overhaul. When he mentioned existing ambulances to be equipped with electrocardiograph units and the necessary paramedical personnel to operate them I wish he had mentioned a good many areas of the province which don't even have ambulance services.

I want to call to the attention of the member for Algoma-Manitoulin and the member for Oshawa (Mr. McIlveen) who seems to be paying a good deal of attention to the discussion here, that we have areas, such as between the city of Thunder Bay and Ignace, a stretch of 156 miles along Highway 17, which don't have ambulances. I could call their attention to an area stretching from Highway 17 up to Pickle Lake, from Ignace to Pickle Lake, a distance of 192 miles, that doesn't have an ambulance of any kind. There is no health delivery system of any kind sponsored by this government. At the top end of the road, 20 miles from the top end, we have an excellent clinic funded, operated and staffed by the Department of National Health and Welfare which is a federal agency. The people who pay OHIP premiums at the top end of that road must rely on services provided by a federal agency. As a result of the dependence of well over 1,000 people in that area on this

clinic, the staff are overworked and the facilities are overtaxed.

I would have preferred to have been standing here today discussing a complete revamping and a complete overhaul of the health delivery systems in the far north. I think that if we are going to serve the needs of people in the north, whether it be electrocardiograph equipment or something else, we must have much more mobility than we have at the present time.

There is anywhere from 70 miles upward between medical facilities. If you want to go from Manitowadge to Marathon, it is about 70 miles, Mr. Speaker. If you want to go from Nipigon to the city of Thunder Bay, it's 71 miles. If you want to go from Pickle Lake to the city of Thunder Bay, where many of them have to go even to get a tooth pulled, it is 347 miles. If you want to go from Pickle Lake to Dryden, it's about 250 miles. When you are talking about these distances, Mr. Speaker, you are talking about a need for greater mobility, and greater flexibility in the delivery of health systems. I think that this is something that this government hasn't come to grips with.

I see there are two former Ministers of Health in the House, the member for Ontario (Mr. Dymond) and the member for Quinte (Mr. Pötter). Both seem to have taken an active interest in our problems. However, before they got around to solving any of these problems in a major way, they were moved to other responsibilities and here we are speaking about a private member's bill, trying to convince the present minister that the health delivery systems in northern Ontario are less than adequate.

Mr. Speaker, we need a greater commitment to redress the neglect and the indifference of many, many branches of the Ministry of Health to the inadequacy of health services, whether they be paramedical or otherwise. Concurrent with that, we need a commitment from a good many of the professions. We have a great deal of difficulty in attracting doctors, dentists, psychologists, and physiotherapists—you name it. We have those kinds of problems.

That's why I am asking anybody within hearing distance for a complete review of all of the existing facilities that people down here take for granted and that are just non-existent in the north, unless people are prepared to travel in many cases several hundred miles to take advantage of them. As I have said so often in this House before, a good many of those people—in fact, all of them—pay the same OHIP premiums as you and I down

here in Metropolitan Toronto, Mr. Speaker. And, of course, you can walk or drive a few city blocks and have access to these services. That is not the case in northern Ontario.

I want to commend the mover of this resolution for having brought it in. It is a small step in the right direction but, as I have said, I would have been much happier standing here discussing a completely mobile and diversified health delivery system. I think we need a new approach to a long-standing problem. I have even gone so far as to suggest that we even put something as elementary as telephones along our main highways, so that if an accident occurred or if a situation arose such as is envisaged by the mover of this resolution, at least we would have some contact with a base hospital someplace where ambulance attendants might call upon the advice and the assistance of some doctor in a community perhaps 60 or 70 miles away, make an on-the-spot diagnosis and ask for some kind of advice, at least until they got somebody into hospital.

Of course, when you're talking about areas in the north you're not talking about areas that necessarily have all of the services that are available in Windsor, in Sudbury, in Ottawa or in Metropolitan Toronto. Most communities in the north have a small hospital, with 15 to 25 beds. Many of the medical staff there are not surgeons; they're not well skilled. And a lot of the sophisticated medical procedures that you people down here take for granted, are not available. If you can't find the service in the city of Thunder Bay, even though it may be 250 miles away, on many occasions we have mercy flights by the Department of National Defence—and indeed in some instances by the Ministry of National Resources—to fly somebody from a far remote community to the city of Thunder Bay and then to transfer them down to Toronto, where these facilities and medical services are available.

I think this is just a small step in the right direction. The mover of the resolution was well intended—and I don't want to take away from his resolution—but I think we should have a complete overhaul of the delivery of health services and a detailed look at the kind of facilities that are available. I think one of the underpinnings for a complete and adequate medical delivery system in the north is the need for flexibility to suit the needs in a particular situation. Another is the need for almost complete mobility. If it's a dental clinic, it should be on wheels because if it's needed in one place today and 50 miles down the road next week, I don't

think we should have to rely on an antiquated railway car that's steamheated and has to be brought all the way down to Toronto to be refitted and everything else. You know, that's 1900 stuff. I think we should bring our health delivery systems into the 20th century. I suggest the only way to do it is to have mobility and flexibility to meet the needs in a given area.

I support the resolution as far as it has gone, but I would prefer that a complete revamping of all of the health delivery systems in northern Ontario be undertaken forthwith. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oshawa.

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I listened with very great interest to the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville and the hon. member for Thunder Bay, and they brought up many interesting points on health delivery systems. I, for one, would certainly appreciate taking part in some future bills concerning the health delivery system, not only for the north but for the south as well.

Mr. Haggerty: Introduce one then.

Mr. McIlveen: Well I'm waiting for the member for Thunder Bay because I hadn't thought of many of the things that he suggested.

Mr. Stokes: I didn't interject. It was somebody up there.

Mr. McIlveen: Oh?

Mr. Stokes: I am listening with great interest.

An hon. member: It was the member for Welland South.

Mr. McIlveen: Well, I will follow his lead any time.

I want to endorse the remarks which the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin has raised with respect to health-care delivery in northern Ontario. I state, without hesitation or reservation, that the central importance of an effective health-care delivery system is its capacity to save lives and to alleviate, in whatever way possible, the degree and intensity of sickness which any individual may experience. We all want to enjoy good health. We all want to live as long as possible.

The great hallmark of an effective health-care system lies in its preventive role, the ability to help people before they reach hos-

pitals or to prevent that possibility from ever arising. Preventive medicine not only saves lives, but in the long run it reduces the high cost of lengthy hospital care.

As we all realize, the cost of financing Ontario's outstanding health-care system has grown substantially in the past few years because of a combination of factors. The Health Ministry, recognizing the trends of higher cost, has placed greater emphasis on the priority of preventive care.

An examination of programmes looking after our senior citizens reflects the significance of home care wherever possible and feasible, instead of placing them in nursing homes or hospitals. I cite to members several other instances where the health ministry and all health professionals are working together to realize that great potential.

What my colleague's resolution aims to achieve is further strengthening of our health-care system to help those cardiac patients have a greater opportunity of life by establishing a strong communications network between the ambulance and the cardiac care unit in a hospital in emergency situations. What is required to create such a communications network involves technical and manpower considerations. By installing electrocardiograph monitoring and electric shock equipment in each ambulance and through the use of telephone and radio suitable instructions could be issued to ambulance attendants so as to ensure the cardiac patient is alive when he or she reaches hospital.

I haven't had a great deal of personal experience in this field, but I have a few patients alive today who were called DOA on arrival at hospital and, because of monitoring and the proper defibrillation techniques, are walking and alive and contributing to society today.

As the member for Algoma-Manitoulin has pointed out, the proper use of this equipment would necessitate sufficient training in cardiac massage for the ambulance attendants and the appropriate training for a registered nurse in interpreting cardiography correctly.

Naturally, it would be necessary to alter the legislation which presently prohibits ambulance attendants from confirming a diagnosis or doing any work of a medical nature in which an exercise of medical judgement is needed. The primary purpose, I suspect, is to protect ambulance personnel from potential cases of liability.

In supporting this resolution, I believe it is most important to realize fully the legal implications of extending responsibilities of am-

bulance attendants into areas of medical judgement. However, legal barriers should not remain as the major justification for preventing assistance to people suffering from cardiac arrest. Nor should the costs of installing this type of equipment be used as an all-encompassing argument. Really, the human versus the cost factor in devising any formula to balance the extension of health-care services against rising costs is a difficult, if not sometimes impossible, task.

As I understand the proposal, the cost of installing an electrocardiograph amplifier transmitter is about \$350 per ambulance, and a defibrillator can run anywhere between \$1,000 and \$1,350 per ambulance; including cost of equipment, manpower training, and maintenance cost for this system.

Many of us who live in southern Ontario can argue that such a system should be made province-wide. Yet there is a great deal of merit in initiating the system in the north to overcome great geographical distances and travel difficulties in getting a patient to hospital alive. Despite some current criticisms about the difficulties of obtaining an ambulance in emergencies we, in our southern urban centres, have great access to ambulance service. I can tell you from personal experience in my area our ambulance operations are providing an efficient and quick service and are living up to every one of their commitments.

The proposal is designed to cut down on the number of heart attack victims. Latest statistics show over 40 per cent of deaths from heart disease occur before the age of 70. Translated into what that means to society, it means that society is robbed of 200,000 years of productivity in any one year.

Those are startling figures when placed in the context of this proposal. Despite potential legal and cost problems in this proposal, I would urge all members to support it. At the very least I would urge the health ministry to initiate a pilot project for some part of the north to determine in a scientific and objective way the number of people who can be saved by having such equipment in an ambulance. Let us remove any doubts about the flexibility of this proposal on a widespread basis by undertaking a well-developed pilot project.

I commend the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin in bringing this resolution to the attention of the House. I believe his genuine interest in helping people of the north refutes most clearly the often-repeated perception that members of this government have a bricks-and-mortar fixation in the delivery of

health care. Here is an outstanding example of a member most desirous of advancing services to people. For that we owe him a debt of gratitude—

Mr. Stokes: The member's colleague said there was too much preoccupation with bricks and mortar.

Mr. McIlveen: —in wanting to save lives from the dread disease of heart disease. What was that last remark?

Mr. Stokes: The member's colleague said there was too much preoccupation with bricks and mortar. He said, "Let's put some more money in this."

Mr. McIlveen: I just agreed with him. I think he is dead on. I think there are many pilot projects such as this where one could do a true study to find what the needs are from Thunder Bay to Ignace. I don't know what they are at the moment but I do know there are many problems in different areas. The member for Thunder Bay pointed out some of them and, most certainly, I for one would be willing to participate in any project in the health care delivery system because I think there's a great need across this province.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Welland South.

Mr. Haggerty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support the resolution presented by the member for Algoma-Manitoulin, that ambulances operated by the emergency services department of the Ministry of Health in northern Ontario be equipped with emergency electrocardiograph monitoring and treatment equipment together with attendants properly trained in its use and operation. I'm delighted to see that every speaker so far has endorsed the resolution. I think it warrants further consideration by the Ministry of Health and perhaps by the government members themselves.

I was particularly interested in the member for Oshawa's finally supporting a bill dealing with medical treatment facilities in the Province of Ontario. He touched on a number of statistics that we're all interested in. Particularly, he wound up his speech by saying he would endorse it on a pilot project. I think at this time anything is better than nothing. We'll take half a loaf if we can get it even on a pilot project.

My main concern in dealing with the principle of the bill itself is that it deals only with northern Ontario. I can think of other communities in southern Ontario, par-

ticularly in my area, where under the new health councils that are being established almost any person who has a cardiac failure will have to go almost to the Toronto General Hospital just off to the east here because of a lack of facilities of equipment for heart patients in local hospitals.

I can think particularly of some of the hospital auxiliaries in my area that have gone out and purchased such equipment. I can think of the Port Colbourne General Hospital where the auxiliary has gone out and purchased this equipment, and it is providing excellent service there. I think much of it can be done, like anything else that is done, on an emergency basis. I can give much credit to the ambulance drivers today, with the limited training programmes that they have received so far, who are doing an excellent job.

As the member for Windsor-Walkerville and I have stated before, it's time that we're going to take an overall picture of our medical services in Ontario and that we're going to have to come in with paramedics. I think this is the coming thing. Too often, Mr. Speaker, you can't get a doctor at the scene of an accident on a highway. You can't get one at almost any scene.

In an industrial accident or in the case of a man with heart failure on the streets, often when I walk down the streets in Toronto the very first thing I see on the scene where a person requires such treatment as this is a fire department truck. The firemen are called first. Then, about 10 minutes after, the ambulance comes. As the member for Oshawa stated, to buy a resuscitator or an inhalator would cost maybe \$1,200, \$1,500 or \$1,800, whereas a monitoring device would be about \$350 or something. There's a saving right there.

I think when one looks upon the services that can be provided in an emergency, it is well worth while for the Minister of Health to come in with such a programme as suggested by the member for Algoma-Manitoulin. The end result, I suppose, is to have lives. In the age of electronics and computers, these things can be done by radio right from the emergency truck to the hospital.

The member for Windsor-Walkerville mentioned the TV programme "Emergency" on Saturday nights. Every youngster in the Province of Ontario is perhaps watching this programme, and they want to be a fireman or a doctor. This is a programme where you don't see violence, and these youngsters are interested in such a programme.

There is another point I want to raise, Mr. Speaker. Ambulance driver qualifications come under the Employment Standards Act of the Province of Ontario; and do you know what the minimum rate is set at? It is \$2.50. We want confidence in these people and their capabilities when they go to the scene of an emergency. They could say: "Look, all we are getting is \$2.50 an hour. You are going to get the service you pay for."

That's one thing I think should be corrected. That rate should be removed from the Employment Standards Act and these persons should be receiving a decent income. Many of them in my area are doing the job by moonlighting. The only way they can survive is by moonlighting. I think it is time we must revise that particular section.

These men should be given upgrading in their qualifications for emergency treatment, and we should review that section in the Employment Standards Act. I think this would be a major step in the right direction and would encourage those persons to further advance their education.

It was mentioned by the member for Windsor-Walkerville that the place to educate them is in the community colleges. Nurses are being trained in the community colleges. Perhaps there is another thing, when I mention nurses, that we should include them in an ambulance call. They are in many instances fully qualified. In some cases they almost do as much as the doctor; this is what I've been told.

I was interested in the comments of the member for Oshawa where he mentioned the question about liability. I introduced a bill here some three or four years ago, a Good Samaritan Act that was to relieve persons from the liability in respect of volunteer emergency, medical and first aid services. I think that is a direction the government should be moving in, providing that Good Samaritan Act.

You can pick up the reports from the Workmen's Compensation Board, Mr. Speaker. They have a programme for going out and training personnel in industry to be qualified for emergency treatment in case of an accident.

Mr. B. Newman: The member always gives good suggestions.

Mr. Haggerty: Always.

There is a possibility that these persons can be taken to the courts. I think the ambulance drivers are excluded. I think there are provisions under the Act that they are

excluded from any possibility of liability. But, again, when you take a nurse, she could be available at the scene of an accident along the highway but it's taboo with her to become involved. She won't touch a person out there; and I think in many instances a doctor won't either.

Mr. McIlveen: They cannot use a defibrillator.

Mr. Haggerty: In many cases doctors will not provide emergency treatment at the scene of an accident. In the case of a cardiac failure, perhaps the doctor says: "I don't have the proper equipment and I won't provide that emergency treatment." He'll not become involved.

I think all these things should be changed. I commend the member for Algoma-Manitoulin for bringing in the resolution. It's a good resolution. I think if we have to try it on a pilot basis, then try it in the riding of the member for Thunder Bay. I think he's indicated the lack of medical facilities in that area and we should be moving in the direction of providing these people with something up there.

Mr. McIlveen: We have to have the medical personnel who are interested and they now have the interest in Algoma-Manitoulin.

Mr. Haggerty: I'm sure there are interested personnel in the Thunder Bay area; in places like Schreiber.

An hon. member: We can train them.

Mr. Haggerty: Sure, we can train them; and this is what we are saying, train them.

I think it is a good resolution and I strongly support it. I'm sure all members will. I think there is an indication by the government members that the government will be bringing in legislation very shortly to help the member for Algoma-Manitoulin.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words on the resolution presented by the member for Algoma-Manitoulin, which would provide for the installation for electrocardiograph monitoring equipment in ambulances, particularly in northern Ontario.

I wholeheartedly support the proposition. He has made good arguments that due to the geographic area that northern Ontario encompasses, there is probably a greater need for such equipment in the northern part of the province than in any part of the province.

However, I would also suggest, not being of a parochial nature, that this service, if it is implemented by the government, should not necessarily be unique to northern Ontario. I am sure there are parts of the southern part of the province too—or that area which is not north of the French River, which is commonly designated northern Ontario—there are some areas south of that line which are equally disbarred from nearby hospital facilities.

Presumably, the reason the member for Algoma-Manitoulin brought the resolution to the attention of this House is that the government must have seen fit to reject his proposal. Being a member of the government side, I am sure he must have gone to the department or to the minister with this idea and must have been rejected and he has now, therefore, come to the House in order to get an opinion and to go back to the minister—

An hon. member: A real fighter.

Mr. Germa: —in order to have the government recognize there is a shortage of medical services in the northern part of the province. As the member for Thunder Bay pointed out, this is merely a Band-Aid that is being applied, but even a Band-Aid is welcome in some cases in northern Ontario.

I noted that the member for Algoma-Manitoulin was using one Dr. Trobridge as his consultant. I have had dealings with Dr. Trobridge and I know that he does run a heart unit in the Memorial Hospital in Sudbury. He's quite an aggressive person. He appears to be quite well qualified for the work he is doing.

He is doing a lot of heart surgery there and I had reason to deal with him a year or so ago. He did get in touch with me to try and assist him in obtaining a nuclear-powered heart pacemaker for implant on one of his patients. The government at that time—the minister being now the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Potter)—was reluctant to grant permission to Dr. Trobridge to make this nuclear-powered heart pacemaker, despite the fact that he had already installed numerous, probably dozens, of ordinary pacemakers in various other people. He advised his patient that the only hope she had of getting one of these things was to contact her member of Parliament, who happened to be myself. I went to the minister and I had the greatest runaround you ever saw in your life, Mr. Speaker, trying to convince the ministry that they should supply Dr. Trobridge with this nuclear-powered pacemaker.

Eventually we did. The minister did concede and he did release one of these things off the shelf, in conjunction with the Atomic Energy Commission in Ottawa. It's a nuclear-powered device and one has to go through the Atomic Energy Commission in Ottawa in order to get them to agree. But the main stumbling block seemed to be the cost. The cost of supplying this nuclear-powered device was five times as much as an ordinary powered device, even though one can show that there are favourable economics involved. The nuclear-powered unit will last for a period of 10 years, while the ordinary one would have to be replaced every second year. So over a 10-year period a person would have to undergo major surgery five times to have a new implant made, whereas if a nuclear-powered one was put in then the person would only require a new implant every 10 years. So there are the economics of saving on operating room costs, physician costs and everything else.

That gives members some idea of what kind of a man this Dr. Trobridge is. And even though the minister of the day said, "You're going to get this one, but it's the last one I'm going to give you," because he wanted all of these implants to be done down here in Toronto in one of the big hospitals where they do nuclear-powered implants, despite the minister's admonition that Trobridge isn't getting another nuclear-powered pacer, we have had two more in Sudbury since that time.

By the way, the heart unit at Sudbury, where Trobridge works, is the only one in Ontario outside of the heart unit in Toronto that has done nuclear-powered pacemaker implants. It seems to me as a layman, to be a very progressive unit. They do a lot of work, and I know several people who have had good results from Trobridge.

If Trobridge recommends that this electrocardiograph monitoring system would be of benefit to the people in Sudbury, then I will go along with Trobridge. I think he is a very active person. According to the member for Algoma-Manitoulin, he seems to have already done some experiments in transmitting electrocardiograph signals and he

knows there are certain weaknesses in the system if it were to be installed. If the ambulance is moving through hilly terrain, for instance—and it will be if it has to go any place around the Sudbury area or even any place in northern Ontario—it's bound to be moving through rock cuts and there will be distortion of the radio signals. But that wouldn't be much of a hardship, because you would be in a rock cut for only a minute or two or three at a time and then you would be out in the open again, so you could be monitored at least part of the time on your way to the hospital.

I would also like to give credit to the government for the installation of these ambulances sponsored by the Province of Ontario. Prior to the installation of this system, we had a hodge-podge all over the province where private operators were trying to supply ambulance service. I recall one person who had the contract in Sudbury used the ambulance for delivering newspapers all over the place. When he got an emergency signal, or the ambulance was needed, he would dump the papers on the street corner and tear off to pick up somebody and take him to the hospital, then come back to deliver his newspapers. This is the kind of service that we've had in Sudbury.

It would really be the icing on the cake if Sudbury, a city that has got the facility to experiment and, in Trobridge, the man with the willingness and the imagination to experiment, could be selected as the area of the province to conduct a pilot project. I certainly would be willing to support such a proposition and to encourage the government to accept this recommendation. I wholeheartedly support the proposition, and I do hope that the minister and the government will hear these words in the House and take the necessary steps to get moving on this project. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: This order of business is completed.

Clerk of the House: The second order, House in committee of the whole.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 21, 1975

Transmitting estimates of certain sums required for the service of Ontario, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor	1007
Home buyer grant, statement by Mr. Meen	1007
Occupational and environmental health council, statement by Mr. Grossman	1007
Flood control measures, statement by Mr. Bernier	1009
Flood damage assistance, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Deans, Mr. Gaunt	1010
Quinn Enterprises, questions of Mr. Meen: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Ruston, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Singer	1011
Gasoline tax arrears, questions of Mr. Meen: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis	1013
Alleged conflict of interest by provincial judge, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer	1014
Occupational and environmental health council, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Martel	1016
Lead pollution, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Lewis	1017
Payment to Envirionics Research Group, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Lewis	1017
Gravel licence application, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lewis	1018
Water sampling problems, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Jessiman, Mr. Stokes	1018
Mineral rights tax on farmland, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Gaunt	1019
Food prices, question of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Germa	1019
Costs of commissions, questions of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Reid	1019
Pits and Quarries Control Act, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Martel	1020
Social benefits payments, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. R. S. Smith, Mr. Lewis	1020
Truck load covers, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Burr, Mr. B. Newman	1020
Adoption of Vietnamese children, question of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Reid	1021
Condominium regulations, question of Mr. Clement: Mr. Cassidy	1021
Raspberry appeal case, question of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Gaunt	1021
Stationary engineers' exams, question of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Stokes	1022
Purchase of railway land in Erieau, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Spence	1022

Registration of handguns, question of Mr. Clement: Mr. Deans	1022
Ministry of Government Services Amendment Act, Mr. Singer, first reading	1023
Retail Sales Tax Amendment Act, in committee	1023
Private members' hour	1037
Notice of motion No. 2, emergency equipment in ambulances in northern Ontario, Mr. Lane, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Stokes, Mr. McIlveen, Mr. Haggerty, Mr. Germa	1037
Recess, 6 o'clock	1047



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, April 21, 1975
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 21, 1975

The House resumed at 8 o'clock p.m.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I don't think that's so.

RETAIL SALES TAX AMENDMENT ACT (continued)

House in committee on Bill 30, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

Hon. J. P. MacBeth (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, before the House proceeds for the evening, I would like to draw to your attention in the west gallery a group of Scouts from the 17th Toronto Boy Scouts Troop from the Church of Christ the King on Rathburn Ave. They are here this evening, sir, under the leadership of Mr. Warrington, Mr. Brannan, Mr. Rippon and Mr. Thompson. I would ask the House to greet them in its usual style.

On section 4:

Mr. Chairman: When the committee rose we were debating Mr. Renwick's amendment to Bill 30. The hon. member for Wentworth had the floor.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): He was breathless then and he still is.

Hon. A. K. Meen (Minister of Revenue): He has two hours.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): I did indeed. I tell you that this bill leaves me breathless, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Meen: After three hours?

Mr. Deans: I am taking deep breaths but I am not yet ready.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The member just took too long over dinner.

Mr. Deans: I got sort of tied up on my way in; that was my problem.

Before supper I had tried to make two or three points that I know the minister agrees with but he obviously publicly can't agree to. If there is to be any benefit at all that would flow from a bill such as this, the benefit is likely not to flow to anyone in Canada, certainly not to anyone in Ontario, in any significant amount.

Mr. Deans: The fact is, and the minister knows it, that the cost of taxation is all taken up in the cost of any of the items manufactured. The cost of the replacement of production machinery is very much a cost that is calculated into the final selling price of the product. The determination by the majority of companies of if and when they should replace or enlarge their operation is very much calculated in the cost of doing business. The elimination of the tax on production machinery is not something that will either reduce the cost of the commodity or for that matter make doing business any easier; because it won't result, if history is to be any measure, in a reduction in the cost either of manufacturing or of the selling price of the product.

The problems that I have with it, and I put them to the minister earlier, are these. If it were intended to stimulate the economy, quite obviously the economy that it will stimulate will be the economy that benefits directly from the production of the production machinery. That economy is likely to be in the US or in Sweden or in Germany.

If it's a matter of the stimulation of productivity, then productivity has not, in most industries, reached its maximum level in Canada at this point. The unemployment we face and are facing currently is the result of a decrease in productivity or the production of products. The purchase of new or additional machinery in order to stimulate productivity is not necessary, simply because the machinery already in existence and in place is capable of producing much more than it is currently producing. Therefore, it could be said that we ought not to be moving into additional stimulation in these purchases until such time as we reach a reasonably high level of production.

If it is intended to stimulate investment, then that investment, of course, will flow out of the country to the area where the production machinery is being manufactured. In the matter of jobs, the only jobs created by the further automation will be jobs related directly to the production of the machinery itself rather than jobs related to

the production of any end product that the machinery might be used to build, or to develop, or to produce. I would like to ask the minister if he could this time—I don't recall if he was the minister the last time—produce for us some of the background material to substantiate the position they have taken.

I would like to know, first of all, how many jobs does the government anticipate will be created in the Province of Ontario as the result of the elimination of the sales tax on production machinery? What's the short run goal, let's say, over the next six months? What's the long-term goal over the entire 21 months that the tax will not be in effect in the province?

Can the minister indicate to us what is the level of investment in production machinery that he would normally anticipate would be undertaken in the province in any normal company fiscal year? He can pick any 12-month period he wishes.

Could he then indicate what additional investment is anticipated, on the basis of any reasonable production of statistics, as the result of the elimination of the tax? Can the minister indicate to us what increase in productivity he would anticipate might take place—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): He hasn't a clue.

Mr. Deans: —during the 21-month period.

Mr. Lawlor: He wouldn't know if we asked him.

Mr. Deans: And could he then identify the industries, either in a general way or in a particular way, that would likely take advantage of the elimination of the tax. Could he tell us where the markets are that will consume the additional production; whether they are domestic, or whether they are off-shore, or perhaps in the United States; and in what particular areas he sees the Province of Ontario benefiting? Can you tell us in dollars how much you expect will be invested in addition to that which may well have been invested in any event? And can you then tell us where there are markets for this additional product that will be produced as a result of this new machinery that will be put in place?

Mr. Lawlor: Don't wait for his reply. It will be completely amorphous.

Mr. Deans: Because these are the questions that have to be answered before you can make this determination.

Mr. Lawlor: They never have been yet.

Mr. Deans: We have got to know, first of all, whether there is any basis for a calculation of lost revenue to the Province of Ontario; whether you can identify, as surely you must be able to, in which industries there is likely to be some major purchases undertaken; whether those major purchases are going to be undertaken as a result of this tax incentive or whether, as in the case of the Steel Co. of Canada and many other places, those were decisions that were made a number of years ago to enlarge or to develop new industrial effort.

I think that we are no longer going to accept in this Legislature just a simple, *carte blanche* statement from the minister that this is a good thing.

Mr. Lawlor: He is looking it up in the back of the book.

Mr. Deans: Because frankly we don't think it is a good thing. You can read the book. I have read the book. I have read the appendix and tried to decide on what you based your calculations to decide if this was, in fact, going to be beneficial to the Province of Ontario. I can't find any evidence in that book, the budget of early this month, or in any other statistic or in any other statement of the government, any indication at all with regard to additional jobs, with regard to additional purchases, with regard to benefits and where the benefits might flow with regard to the increased productivity that you talk of or with regard to where those commodities will go to be sold.

Those are the keys. If you can produce those kinds of figures, I suppose it might be solved. We might agree; not that it matters to you, I'm sure. Nevertheless, we might, just for the sake of the record, at least agree that it's a worthwhile endeavour.

Mr. Lawlor: A little intellectual honesty.

Mr. Deans: I tell you something: I don't happen to think for one minute, any more than I thought three years ago, that there'll be one additional job produced in the Province of Ontario as a result of this measure, any more than there was any job produced as a result of the machinery tax rebate.

I can't believe there is any more production machinery produced in Canada today—significantly more—than there was three or 3½ years ago when you produced the machinery tax rebate programme. At that time it was evident that the majority by far, probably 80 per cent or more—

Hon. Mr. Meen: That was not the same kind of programme as this.

Mr. Deans: It was the same kind of programme.

Hon. Mr. Meen: It was an abatement against income tax.

Mr. Deans: It was the same kind of programme. It was an attempt to stimulate the purchase of production machinery for the purpose of the production of jobs.

Mr. Stokes: Obviously the last one didn't work because you didn't try it again.

Mr. Deans: Don't tell me that wasn't the same kind of programme. You may have couched it in different terms, you may have brought it in under a different programme; but the fact of the matter was that the intent of that programme was to encourage the purchase of production machinery by industry with the end result, supposedly, that there would be more jobs in the Province of Ontario. I well remember the debate; I took part in all of it. I can tell you that as I now read through the debate which took place at that time I could probably have turned to you and said: "There is the Hansard. Put it on the record. It's equally applicable." Because it is.

I want to know from you, if you could answer these points I raise; I have some other questions.

Hon. Mr. Meen: We went through all this on second reading.

Mr. Lawlor: That's \$400 million down the drain.

Mr. Deans: Could you answer those four questions for me?

Hon. Mr. Meen: In short, I have been listening to the member for Wentworth for the last hour before dinner and now for the last—

Mr. Deans: Not so.

Hon. Mr. Meen: —10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. Deans: Only 25 minutes.

Hon. Mr. Meen: That's all right; I enjoy listening to you. The point I'm making, Mr. Chairman, is that this is really the same debate we went through on second reading.

Mr. Deans: Not so.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I don't have the figures the member is talking about.

Mr. Deans: Why?

Mr. Lawlor: Of course you do.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I am the administrator of this Act. I'm not the economist of this province.

Mr. Lawlor: You're here to justify your legislation.

Hon. Mr. Meen: You're talking about the budget and these are the very points you should be putting to the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), either in a budget speech—

Mr. Deans: How can we? He's not here.

Hon. Mr. Meen: All right, but the Treasurer will be here. As a matter of fact, he will be here tomorrow.

Mr. Deans: But it's too late, the bill will have passed.

Hon. Mr. Meen: You could have asked him for the replies during the debate on second reading.

Mr. Lawlor: He couldn't explain it either. None of you can.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I would simply say to you there are many factors involved besides whether or not you're going to attract heavy production machinery which, as the member for Wentworth suggests, is made outside Canada; and he suggests that's the only advantage. That's not the only advantage.

Mr. Deans: What are the advantages? Tell us about them.

Hon. Mr. Meen: You're suggesting that you're going to retire existing equipment to create other jobs. What we're saying is there are those who were planning to expand their plants to go into other product lines. The specious argument the member for Wentworth has been using is that this kind of tax relief will be used to alter manufacturing techniques and thereby put people out of work.

Mr. Deans: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Meen: We're saying that's not the effect. I suppose that could happen in some areas but I'm saying the initiative behind this, the thrust behind it, is to get more manufacturing going in this province. Not different manufacturing, more; more product lines and different articles to be produced. It's fine to have a surplus of certain things but it's also great if you can produce other articles presently being im-

ported and employ more people to run the new machines. You're still going to be running the old—

Mr. Deans: There isn't enough time.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The lead time is sufficient on this.

Mr. Deans: It is not sufficient.

Hon. Mr. Meen: That's why this is designed differently from the abatement in retail sales tax which is immediate in its effect and is for the limited period of nine months. In this instance, this is for a period all through this year, all through next year and into 1977.

Mr. Deans: No, 21 months.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Well 21 months, but then there's the delivery period after that. It allows a substantial amount of lead time for companies planning on doing certain things and creating certain expansions, getting into other lines to manufacture articles which were not previously manufactured here. The Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs developed these figures. Don't ask the Minister of Revenue to produce them.

Mr. Deans: I have to.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I don't have access to those figures. I don't have that staff. That staff is in Treasury and Economics. I would say to you that they are the ones who have ascertained that this kind of assistance will be well felt in the industries.

Mr. Lawlor: Pure cop-out. What is your ministry there for?

Mr. Stokes: You are asking us to pass your legislation; you should come here prepared to answer the questions.

Hon. Mr. Meen: We voted on the principle of this on second reading. Now what we are doing is dealing with this matter section by section. I'm happy to try to explain it, Mr. Chairman, and I assure you, I'll do the best I can, as the man who administers this Act, to explain the mechanisms of it. But, if you are going to get into the principles and the background of it, then of course that is the basis for the debate on second reading.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, I object to that—

Hon. Mr. Meen: I told you that you wouldn't agree. I knew that.

Mr. Deans: We are expected to deal with legislation in second reading and in committee, and the minister who has carriage of the legislation is supposed to be able to speak about and for the legislation. I might say to you that this is the problem of getting an omnibus bill that deals with a number of different points and entirely different principles. This bill reduces the sales tax for the purchase of normal things from seven per cent to five per cent, and you also have a bill which eliminates the sales tax on production machinery. We couldn't possibly deal with all of those on second reading. Even if we could have dealt with them on second reading, we would still be dealing with the same minister. The minister has to be answerable, whether he likes it or not. He cannot hide behind it any more. The Treasurer cannot hide behind this minister; he cannot bring in this garbage and then expect us to accept that the minister is not able to answer for it. The minister has got to be able to—

Hon. Mr. Meen: That's what we have a budget debate for.

Mr. Deans: No, but that isn't.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Ah, but it is.

Mr. Deans: That is quite unfair. This is a particular taxing measure that has been brought in in the Province of Ontario—

Mr. Lawlor: You are taking it clause by clause; we are zeroing in on this and we want to know.

Mr. Deans: There is no point in us dealing with this three months after it is passed; that is what the budget debate means. There is no point in us talking, three months after the bill is passed, about the inequity of the bill, or how it won't do what it was intended to do. The only time we can deal with that is now. Since you are the minister with carriage of the bill, I want to know from you, first of all, how many companies in the Province of Ontario you anticipate will take advantage of this in the next 12 months.

Mr. Lawlor: Don't ask any more questions. Stop right there.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I told you, I do not know. I don't have the figures.

Mr. Deans: How many jobs do you expect will be produced as a result of this bill?

Hon. Mr. Meen: As the Treasurer has said, Mr. Chairman, budget-making is imprecise at best.

Mr. Lawlor: He doesn't know. He doesn't have a clue.

Mr. Deans: I see. How many dollars do you expect will be invested in the next 21 months that would not otherwise have been invested in the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Meen: The same answer prevails.

Mr. Deans: The same answer? I see.

Mr. Stokes: This is not your finest hour.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Oh come on. We went through all this.

Mr. Deans: Yes, that is right, and we are going through it again. Do you anticipate that there will be a number of companies established in the province to produce production machinery as a result of this bill?

Hon. Mr. Meen: That is the general idea.

Mr. Deans: I see. How many do you expect? How many people do you expect will be employed in them? No answer?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Well, I told you—

Mr. Deans: Okay, let the record show that the minister doesn't know.

Could I ask you then in what areas you anticipate that these companies will be set up? What kind of production machinery do you anticipate these companies will set up to produce? You don't know that either?

Hon. Mr. Meen: You might ask the Treasurer.

Mr. Deans: I don't want to put words in your mouth. If you know something, speak up.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Oh, come on.

Mr. Deans: You don't know that either?

Hon. Mr. Meen: You are the one who is making the speech. Come on, make it.

Mr. Deans: No, I am not making the speech. I want to know.

Mr. Stokes: He is going to have a dialogue.

Mr. Deans: How many jobs do you expect might be eliminated in the Province of Ontario as the result of the purchase of automated machinery to replace existing machinery?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Well, now, who would know that?

Mr. Deans: Well, I am asking. You brought in the bill!

Hon. Mr. Meen: Who is suggesting the replacement of existing equipment? You are the one who is making that suggestion.

Mr. Deans: What I want to know from you is, do you know anything at all about the projected impact on the economy of the province of this piece of legislation?

Hon. Mr. Meen: No.

Mr. Deans: No?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Very simple. I can tell you the estimated—

Mr. Chairman: Order please. I wonder if we could get back more specifically to the amendment—

Mr. Deans: We have moved that it be deleted—

Hon. Mr. Meen: Great. Let's have a vote.

Mr. Deans: We now want to get some proof as to why it ought not to be deleted. This is an absolutely futile exercise. What is the point of bringing in the legislation if you don't know anything about its impact? What is this place?

Mr. Lawlor: It's the last word in arrogance, that's what it is. He doesn't give a damn. He couldn't care less.

Mr. Deans: What is the point of coming forward with legislation that is a cornerstone of a budget—

Mr. Chairman: Order please. A lot of these points were covered on second reading.

Hon. Mr. Meen: They were all covered on second reading.

Mr. Stokes: The minister wouldn't conduct his own household affairs this way.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I would set my own budget too.

Mr. Deans: One could only speak to the principles contained in the bill.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Deans: I'm now asking specific questions related to this section of this bill. I think the public of Ontario has the right to know how it is that you intend to benefit the Province of Ontario by giving this money away.

Mr. Lawlor: The Minister of Revenue needs your help, Mr. Chairman, but he doesn't need it that much.

Mr. Deans: Surely that's not too much to ask. Surely to heaven we can expect that somewhere along the way someone from that front bench there who has the responsibility for the management of the province can tell us why we're eliminating this tax for the next 21 months; what the calculations were that resulted in the decision being reached and what the substantiation was in terms of employment, in terms of dislocation, in terms of new purchases and in terms of investment. Surely it's not too much to ask whether there was any study conducted into whether or not this would be more likely to benefit the Province of Ontario in terms of new job opportunities than it would be likely to be of non-benefit to the people currently working.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I understand that to be the case.

Mr. Deans: Then would you please produce for me the statistics to tell me that's the case? I have some 100,000 people sitting in one riding who want to know.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Oh come on now.

Mr. Deans: I'm asking for them. You might laugh about this but I'm not kidding you; this is not the way to deal with public business. If you're going to have the responsibility for bringing forth legislation, then surely we have the right to expect that you will have an answer to at least one of what you must agree are the pertinent questions related to why this piece of legislation should pass.

I'm sorry, I trust you in many things but it's not nearly enough for you to stand up and say: "I believe the Treasurer has made the right decision." I wouldn't expect you to say otherwise. I think he has made the wrong decision. We've got a stalemate." I want you now to tell me, as you're privy to his information and I'm not, how he arrived at the decision that the elimination of this tax would be beneficial.

I don't want you to sit there, I want you to tell me. I don't have the information from him. He doesn't tell me. He doesn't know, in fact, He's just as bad as you are. He couldn't stand up and tell me the answer to these questions because he doesn't know and because he doesn't care. But I think you do.

Hon. Mr. Meen: That's not so.

Mr. Deans: Okay, then give me the answers.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Chairman, I'm certain that the Treasurer does care. He has put into his package, which we call the budget, all the pluses and all the minuses, the increases in revenue anticipated from various quarters and the decreases which we are proposing in certain quarters, long term and short term. He has come up with these various elements of incentive for the economy of this province. To say the Treasurer doesn't care is a rank injustice to one of the finest men in this Legislature.

Mr. Deans: Then I take it back. He cares.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Of course, he cares.

Mr. Deans: Then tell me how he came to his decisions. Since you know he cares, you must surely have access to the information that he had that brought him to the decision that this is a wise move to take. He has given you the job of getting this through the House. All right, fair enough.

I want you to tell me what it was that was available to him by way of information with regard to the amount of additional investment, with regard to the degree of replacement that's likely to take place, with regard to the amount of unemployment this replacement may cause, with regard to any new industry which has indicated it might set up in the Province of Ontario, with regard to the areas in which this industry will set up in the manufacturing of what kinds of products, with regard to the salability of the end product and the markets available for it in the Province of Ontario; and with regard to how much additional production we can expect and whether or not that will be in addition to the existing low level of production as the result of unemployment and diminished markets or whether that will be in addition to the production capacities of the industries already in effect. I want to know how many more dollars are going to be invested.

I want some answers to some of the questions that surely we're entitled to have answered before we are expected to pass a bill which reduces the treasury of the Province of Ontario by \$220 million. Good heavens, man, that's not too much to ask for! You're asking us to approve the reduction of the treasury of the province by some \$220 to \$250 million. I'm now asking you to give me justification as to why I should approve it.

I don't want to hear the Treasurer is a nice guy. I don't want to hear that the

Treasurer cares. I want to know the background to it. That's what this clause-by-clause discussion is intended for.

I don't want to know from you that it's drafted properly or that you'll collect it. I heard about your collection methods earlier today. I don't like them. With Quinn, I heard about how you collect. I heard about your \$200,000-plus you haven't collected and you've taken liens against which aren't even first liens.

Mr. Stokes: First mortgages.

Mr. Deans: First mortgages. You'll never collect as long as we all stand in the Legislature; I heard about those. I don't have much faith in your method of collecting, but I've less faith in giving you the power to do this unless you can tell me why it is and what the substantiation is? Please try; that's what this is all about.

You may be surprised to know we all got elected for a different purpose. I got elected to find something out. You got elected simply to toe the line. I don't toe anybody's line.

I want to know why it is that we in the province are going to be short \$250 million. I want to know what benefits will flow from it and I want to know tonight. I'll be here for a long time and so will you, so we might as well get used to it. Why don't you try answering it?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I wonder if the member might try listening again?

Mr. Deans: I'll try.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The fact of the matter simply is that this is part of the Treasurer's total package. This happens to be one of the incentives to industry to get in there and in the next 18 months or 21 months get into expansion work they wouldn't otherwise get into; to start the production of goods we are presently importing; to start the employment of people who otherwise might be unemployed. This is what we are trying to do.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): You might follow some of the select committee reports.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The Treasurer has taken this route along with the other portions of his budget. I do not have the specifics. They are not in my ministry.

Mr. Lawlor: That is pitiable. That is pathetic. That is hopeless. You are a respon-

sible minister of the Crown. You had better pull yourself together.

Hon. Mr. Meen: My ministry administers the taxing statutes. It does not have the economists on the staff who make these kinds of studies.

Mr. Stokes: It is a pig in a poke.

Hon. Mr. Meen: That's the kind of study which is done in the Ministry of Treasury and Economics. If the member wants more than that, he is simply going to have to ask the Treasurer.

Mr. Deans: But I can't, Mr. Chairman. I can't ask the Treasurer because the Treasurer isn't here.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, that's right.

Mr. Deans: I can't pass this bill until I know the answers to these questions.

Hon. Mr. Meen: You are not going to pass it.

Mr. Deans: Because they are the questions that have to be answered.

Let me try again. Let me go back. You and I both remember the machinery tax rebate, okay? I know we do because we were both here and we talked about it. Can you recall the debate on the machinery tax rebate in which we were informed that this was going to produce additional employment in the Province of Ontario? That was one of the things.

It was going to be used to purchase new machinery and that new machinery was going to create new employment. I would think that you, being a responsible minister dedicated to the cause, would at least have taken a look at that taxing measure and its impact to determine whether or not this is similar, which it is, and whether or not this has the likelihood of success over and against what happened with that particular measure.

Can you tell us, so that we have some way of measuring it, what benefits flowed to the province by way of increased employment or by way of additional purchases as the result of that measure which was almost identical in impact to this measure?

You can't? You don't know? Is it fair for me to say that the minister doesn't know? Other than blind faith can you give us any reason why we should support this measure? Can you give us any single statistic; any piece of substantiating evidence which would justify me, as a member of the opposition, going to my constituents and saying that the

government convinced me that this was an appropriate step to take. Is there anything at all that you know that you can tell me that will allow me to go and tell them that? Any single thing? Is there?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Of course, there is. And I have already told you.

Mr. Deans: Then will you tell it to me?

Hon. Mr. Meen: You always turn off your hearing aid.

Mr. Deans: I don't turn off my hearing aid. I don't wear a hearing aid. I heard you say that the Treasurer decided that this was an appropriate piece of the overall package that makes up his idea of how we will stimulate the economy.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Right.

Mr. Deans: And now we are dealing with this appropriate piece. Will you tell me what makes it appropriate? Tell me what makes it appropriate. Now I understand the reduction from seven to five. I understood—

Hon. Mr. Meen: I'm not sure you understood that.

Mr. Deans: Let me tell you I understood, though didn't necessarily agree with, the homeowner grant. I understand the additional benefits to the aged and to certain segments of those on social assistance. I understand those things. Okay? They make some sense. There is a certain amount of conventional wisdom around that tells me that those measures may be beneficial to someone, somewhere, in substantial enough terms to justify doing it. Now I want you to tell me about this piece of legislation. I want you to tell me why I should vote for it. That's your job. Tell me why I should be supporting it. Tell me anything about it that makes it worthy of support.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I've given you the answers five times already.

Mr. Deans: You have not given me a single answer. How many jobs is it going to create?

Hon. Mr. Meen: What is the answer you want?

Mr. Deans: How many jobs will it create?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I've told you.

Mr. Deans: You don't know. You don't know how much of the investment will be new. You don't know where the jobs will

be created. I've asked those questions. This is ridiculous. You are not even fit to carry the legislation through the House. You don't know anything about it.

Mr. Chairman: I ask you—I appeal to you—what right does a minister have to come into this House and tell us he knows nothing about the purpose of the legislation, can't provide any substantiation for why we should support it, and then expect us to vote for it?

It is a requirement of the ministry that they stand up and substantiate their legislation. It is a requirement. It's traditional and is required of the ministry that they be prepared to answer for their legislation, in terms of its correctness—

Mr. Lawlor: That's what responsible government is all about.

Mr. Deans: —with regard to the way it is drafted, and with regard to its correctness in terms of the impact that will be felt and the substantiation for it.

Now, this minister can't do that. Therefore, this bill should be stood down until some minister can come into the House and tell us the answers to some of the questions we are asking. It isn't right—it is anti-democratic, if you will—to expect members of this Legislature to vote on a bill for which there has been no substantiation put forward.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I really don't think that the minister is going to stand the bill down, and that we are going to have to deal with it as best we can within the very limited way in which this minister sees his portfolio.

I'd like to try to go at the problem somewhat differently, because the ministry is going to continue this legislation long after the date of expiration set out in the bill. We have seen, time and time again, this kind of benefit granted to industry with a time limit. And then we get an extension, and another extension, and another extension, until it becomes embedded in the mythology of our time.

That's what has happened with the fast write-off provisions over the years, going back many many years. They were revived in an accelerated form by the federal Minister of Finance in 1972. And he has persisted in them since that time, and this government has gone along with it.

I think it's fair to say that the objectives, which were stated as long ago as 1972 by the federal Minister of Finance with respect to the fast write-off provisions, are in substance the objectives which this minister expects, for his government, to be achieved by these measures. I don't think for one moment that it is possible for him to say, when we come to a particular clause in a particular bill, that we can be constrained to dealing with it only in terms of the mechanics. If the mechanics is what he is talking about, there's very little problem with the mechanics. In fact, there is no problem at all. The only problem is that it's scattered throughout with the opinion of the minister which of course is not exactly the kind of taxing statue we admire.

The minister can't stand up on behalf of his government and say to us, "I will deal with the provisions of the proposed new paragraph 49, providing for these immense exemptions," and tell us that we're engaged in a game of semantic checkers to see whether or not the mechanics will work or not. We can deal with that later on. The minister has got to tell us whether or not the objectives that the mythology of the Liberal government at Ottawa and the mythology of this government at Queen's Park persist in will be achieved. Otherwise, why should we vote for this particular exemption?

May I say to the minister that one of the methods of providing tax benefits by transfer payments is the grant of exemptions to industry. It's the same thing as a transfer payment. If the bill did not collect this revenue, the only way it could be passed back to industry—and at least it would be an honest way—would be to raise the money and the revenue and pay it out selectively to those industries that can prove their need, and not in some aggregate way across the board.

It is very interesting to note that the progressive men in the US Congress have finally persuaded the government and the chief of the budget that one of the schedules to the federal budget would be a statement of the total cost to the taxpayer of all of the benefits granted by way of exemption throughout the Internal Revenue Act of the United States.

Let me put it another way, and quite simply: The profit of a business is what is determined in accordance with sound and generally accepted accounting principles applicable in the circumstances and applied consistently with the preceding years. It is trite to say that you first look at that profit and then adjust it for all of the special rules of the In-

come Tax Act or the Corporations Tax Act, as it happens to be here in the Province of Ontario with respect to corporations. It's those adjustments that we try to get a grip on to understand why those concessions are made, why those concessions continue and why they become embedded in the tax system.

It is much simpler, of course, for us to talk to a government which fails to make transfer payments to people who require the additional income at a level and at a rate of increase that will be sufficient to meet their economic needs. It is very easy for the Treasurer to introduce, to sponsor and to stand in his place to deal with the first home buyers' grant of \$1,500 because he's talking about giving \$1,500 to a selected number of people dealing with the bump that has gone through the population of the Province of Ontario since the baby boom of the post-war period.

It's all very fine when he stands up and attacks us and claims this or that, and he goes through his usual tirade in talking about people getting \$1,000 in cash, then maybe another \$250 and another. But, when it comes to \$106 million in this fiscal year and a programme of \$410 million over the full term of the programme—the term of the programme being until Jan. 1, 1977, with delivery before Jan. 1, 1978—when we come to talk about why that concession should be granted to industry, the Treasurer is never in the House. We are never able to come to grips with him, and I don't accept and the minister doesn't accept that the budget debate is the time to do that, because the Treasurer is never in the House during the budget debate.

The time when you deal with taxing measures is when the measure is before the House, and that is what we are doing tonight. That is what we are going to try to do now.

I want to say to the minister very clearly that his colleague—and they are both members of the same government—did it deliberately. The Treasurer said in addition that "I shall propose tonight additional incentives to strengthen business investment and productivity."

And he goes on further on to say that his estimate of that will be \$100 million in direct cost reduction on the purchase of taxable items. And I quote: "Ontario business will enjoy \$100 million in direct cost reductions on the purchase of taxable items." I'll comment in a moment as to how we are ever going to see those cost reductions reflected

in the consumer goods which are manufactured as the end result, which is supposed to be one of the purposes of the budget.

He then says very gaily that "\$100 million will be divided up." Housing will get \$25 million; construction, \$25 million; industry and commerce, \$50 million. Later on in his budget speech, a few pages later, he deals with this particular provision. And I still can remember his nod to the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett) while he read the budget: "Over 25 per cent of this amount will benefit export-oriented industries."

Well, the minister says to us, "I don't have the retinue of economists that the Treasurer has." Isn't it strange that the retinue of economists that the Treasurer has and the staff that the government has at its disposal would happen to find that this \$100 million will be divided one-quarter to domestically-oriented industry, one-quarter to export-oriented industry, one-quarter to construction and one-quarter to housing? The very fact that they put that facile allocation of \$100 million before this assembly means they do not understand that kind of aggregate solution is not a solution to what must, of necessity, be a selective problem.

All right, I want the minister at some point to justify to me how we are to reach the conclusion that 25 per cent is to go to housing, 25 per cent to construction — which I presume is non-residential construction — 25 per cent to domestically-oriented industry and commerce, and 25 per cent to export-oriented manufacturing industry?

Secondly, I want him to tell me how are the costs going to reflect in the prices to consumers? There is nothing to indicate that prices to the consumers of the ultimate goods are going to change one iota.

I don't pretend for one single moment that this game of "Two for the Seesaw" of inflation and recession is something which I understand any more than the minister or any more than the Treasurer understands, but the reason we don't understand it is that you are locked into some kind of a mythological view that the capital investment programmes of industry, the construction programmes of those in the construction industry and the residential housing market are determined by the kind of tax concessions that you put forward. There is nothing whatsoever to suggest that the change or drop in the prices of the consumer products are reflected in any large measure whatsoever.

Let me just quote very briefly from a good socialist document, the monthly Economic Letter of the First National City Bank for

February, 1975. They are dealing in this particular article with changes in prices and how they are reflected at the far end of the scale.

There is a tendency to think that finished goods prices should be the first to reflect changes in the pace of economic activity; prices in the wholesale, manufacturing and raw material sectors should respond later as the impact of declining final demand ripples backward along the processing and distribution chain. But the fact is that price changes really flow in the opposite direction, from the earlier to the later stages of production and distribution. Prices for raw materials tend to respond first and show the largest changes, while prices at each subsequent stage of processing respond later and by smaller amounts. This pattern was characteristic of much of the post-war period, regardless of whether prices were rising or falling.

It goes on very clearly to make the very simple proposition that in managed industries, where the prices are managed, the first thing you do is you cut your production and you maintain your price, you lay people off work and you try as best you can to cut your overhead. There is no way, there is no way, that ultimately the price of the goods to the consumer will be markedly reduced.

We have had the example of the bonus to the car buyer because they have an over-inventory of automobiles in the United States. The bonus is marginal; a couple of hundred dollars or \$150. There is never any real attempt to move that inventory at a price which will give the consumer a reasonable and decent break. It was used simply as bait, and every time when the automotive industry or any other industry—not the marketplace—makes the decision that it cannot sell its products because demand isn't sufficient, it keeps the price up and it cuts the production and lays off the workers. And there is no reverse process by which you granting them further tax concessions is going to protect the job of any person, nor is it going to provide new jobs.

It is just that simple, because by the time this tax concession is absorbed in their productive process, by the time the end product comes off the assembly line or is produced and available for purchase in the marketplace, if the demand is there, the price will be maintained. If demand is not there, the price will be maintained but the production will be cut back.

I think that's what my colleague, the member for Wentworth, was trying to say to the minister; that you do not produce employ-

ment in this fashion. You cannot possibly produce it in this fashion.

Let me just very, very briefly look at two or three matters which are rather interesting. Again, they are socialist documents and therefore should have the ear of the minister. I'm talking about the Monthly Review of the Bank of Nova Scotia for July, 1974; the Monthly Review of the Bank of Nova Scotia for October, 1974; the Business Review of the Bank of Montreal for January, 1975, and "The Canadian Economy 1974-1975" of the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce.

What do these documents say? What these documents say is to emphasize again what my colleague, the member for Wentworth, has said—that capital investment plans are a long way down the pipe and a long way up the pipe. They're made over a long period of time, with respect to the increase of the industrial capacity of the particular business in relation to all of the conditions under which its conducts its business.

You're asking us to provide this tax benefit as if in some way it's going to affect the investment intentions of the major segments of industry. Well, let's just have a look at a couple of the areas that the ministry is talking about.

"Business (fixed investment) — percentage change from the previous year in non-residential construction and machinery and equipment." It gives the figures from 1968 through to the end of 1973, and makes the forecast for 1974 and 1975. The dollar figures which I use are in millions of current dollars, except as noted. Well, I won't be noting any.

In 1972 it's \$13,262 million; in 1973 it's \$15,599 million. In 1973 that represented 13.1 per cent of the gross national expenditures of the country. The forecast for 1974—

Hon. Mr. Meen: It's the same as capital construction.

Mr. Renwick: This is "business (fixed investment)", made up of non-residential construction and machinery and equipment. In 1974, the figures rise to \$19,270 million, and in 1975 it is forecast that they will rise to \$22,920 million.

The percentage figures from the previous year for those years which I've quoted are: for 1972 over 1971, 8.4 per cent; 1973 over 1972, 17.6 per cent; 1974 over 1973, 23.5 per cent; 1975 over 1974, 18.9 per cent.

And that, roughly speaking, is divided—not exactly, but I'm not going to quote the figures—roughly 50-50 in non-residential

construction—a little less than 50 per cent—and slightly more than 50 per cent in machinery and equipment.

It also gives the figures for residential construction in the private sector as well. But the whole of this particular forecast for the economy in 1974-1975, which duplicates annually what it has done years before—1973-1974, 1972-1973, 1971-1972—is to indicate that the investment intentions of industry are extremely buoyant, extremely dynamic and—

Hon. Mr. Meen: That was at last July, though.

Mr. Renwick: This was September and October. All right, just remember that the Treasurer's budget was made up of a lot of things a little bit later on in the year, but not very much. But let's at least take that as a starting place.

Mr. Deans: That's where he started considering it.

Mr. Renwick: All right. The Business Review of the Bank of Montreal, January, 1975: "The Slowdown Continues." It lists all of the various areas where there has been a slowdown and weakening in the economy: Retail sales, housing slowdown, deterioration in foreign trade, the fall-off of the industrial production index, the index of real domestic products; the question of the employment statistics; the question of both job vacancies and unemployment; price inflation; and it goes on to deal with all of the areas which are of concern—which are of very real concern—to the Bank of Montreal about what is going on.

But then it goes on to say:

At the long end, the federal government survey of the investment intentions of Canada's 220 largest firms indicated that heavy demand for funds will continue into 1975. The surveyed firms intend to spend some 30 per cent more than in 1974. While much of the increase will, of course, be accounted for by inflation, the programme nevertheless means a substantial volume gain, 16 per cent, perhaps greater than the physical capacity of the construction industry, especially if strikes and work stoppages prove to be heavy.

Whether or not there would be substantial cutbacks to the programme, however, became a moot point because of the tax hassles and so on, but the initial response from the oil industry—and they were dealing with the royalty question at Ottawa—to the changes which were made was favourable.

Regardless of whether cuts occur in the investment programme as a result of government tax policy, it is also threatened by severe cost escalation; as one example, again in the oil and gas area, huge expected cost increases were announced. Projects which formerly were costed in the billion-dollar area now are estimated at \$2 billion, and with future oil prices and government policies uncertain, a number of companies were considering their commitments.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The Chair has been following the hon. member's remarks with a great deal of interest but it seems to me that you have been getting back for some time to the principle of the bill rather than the clause by clause. I would ask you to direct your comments to the amendment.

Mr. Renwick: I am dealing, Mr. Chairman—and I don't intend to go on at much greater length—with a clause which grants an exemption to industry which will cost the treasury of the province some \$410 million. I have a few questions that I tried to put to the minister in the course of my remarks and I want very much to be able to complete them.

I may say that the Bank of Nova Scotia had this to say about the long-range programme of business investments—nothing at all to do with taxes:

On the basis of the large projects looming up in the energy sector and of a continuing rapid growth in many other capital outlays, there is a widespread expectation that the capital programme will remain sizable through the rest of this decade. Until quite recently it had appeared there was danger of a bunching of major projects around one or two years in mid-decade; but with the likely timing of some of the largest of these, notably the Mackenzie Valley pipeline, having been pushed further out, it now seems that the pressure of spending may be spread over a number of years.

All told, and with due allowance for further inflation of project costs, the total investment programme between the years 1974 and 1980 could require financing in the order of \$300 billion. This would imply the movement of a consistently large share of gross national product into total fixed investment, perhaps about 24 per cent. In periods of peak investment activity this share has been as high as 25 per cent, though never for very long.

A continuing growth of the economy could, in fact, generate the bulk of the savings required, but it would be unrealistic for domestic financial markets to be fully adequate to this enormous task, particularly in the case of the largest individual projects for which some foreign funds will be required. Challenges are also implied for the country's supply of skilled labour in the pool of available technical resources.

I want to come to what seems to me to be the unspoken reason for this particular exemption which has been granted. The government of Ontario has invested and undoubtedly will have to provide the funds. If this is the way in which they are going to provide the funds, if they say it and lay it on the table, that's fine.

They're going to have to provide the kind of investment incentive, if that is required, for the project called Syncrude. Is it really, Mr. Minister, that on the \$250 million worth of orders to be placed in the Province of Ontario, according to your colleague the Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell), some \$100 million had been placed but much more is not? Is what you are saying that in connection with that project, in order to persuade the oil companies to provide the knowhow and the technology and to continue to participate in it, you have had to say to them that the people in the Province of Ontario who manufacture and produce for them the equipment and machinery which will go into their production are going to be granted this substantial exemption so that the big oil companies in the Syncrude project, which still have the substantial and controlling share of that project—if my memory serves me correctly, a substantial interest in it—are going to have that kind of a tax benefit? Is that what we are really saying?

Are you really saying that because of the size of the various projects, not only in the oil industry in Canada but the natural gas industry in Canada and the expansion programme of the hydro-electric power system—not that they're going to ultimately ever benefit the consumer by it—you're going to provide these benefits in order that those industries will provide the capital equipment which is required?

Is that what's happening? And if that is so, why don't we say it? We say it and say it very clearly.

Is it really fair for the minister to say to my colleague, the member for Wentworth, that it may happen in the odd industry they will become more capital intensive and less

labour intensive; and that they will introduce more automated equipment and more modern equipment, requiring less of the labour component by the kind of stimulus which you're stating that you're going to provide?

Those questions remain unanswered. Mr. Turner, some months ago, in 1972, stated that the purpose of the fast write-offs, which you're perpetuating in the Corporations Tax Act, was to improve the competitive position of Canadian manufacturers in international trade. The Treasurer said the same thing. Mr. Turner said it was to create jobs, to stimulate capital investment and to reduce production cost and prices. The Treasurer said the same thing.

The study that was made of the effect—on the basis of the statistics from StatCan—of the effect of the two-year write-off and reduced tax rate for Canadian manufacturers in 1973 showed there was no evidence that those write-offs did anything with respect to increasing jobs or with respect to stimulating foreign trade. It couldn't possibly have. We have one of the largest deficits on foreign trade at the present time that has existed for some time. As for stimulating capital investment, it didn't need any stimulation. They were already going to spend many billions of dollars on capital investment, and while it might reduce production costs it would never reduce prices to consumers. You will never be able to show that any such price reduction ever took place because of the quotation about the way in which, "by the time the price change comes out to the consumer at the end of the line it is negligible." There is no change—no such change that will ever benefit the consumer.

The minister says and the Chairman says that we must look at the bill. Section 49 provides a very broadly-based power in the minister. As I understand it, he can't make any selections whatsoever—although there is the strange provision at the end that he can provide "prescribed by the minister to be excluded from the exemption conferred by this particular paragraph." Presumably that gives him a wide authority over what he can or cannot do in the course of exercising his discretion under this bill. Many times it talks about the opinion of the minister.

Mr. Deans: He hasn't got an opinion. He doesn't know anything about the bill.

Mr. Renwick: All I would like to put on the record are the figures from 1972 over 1971, 1973 over 1972, and 1974 over 1973, of the effect on employment in the manufacturing industry of the fast write-offs, of

which presumably this is going to be a part. The year-to-year percentage change was: 1972 over 1971, before the fast write-offs, 5.1 per cent; 1973 over 1972, 5.2 per cent; 1974 over 1973, 2.3 per cent. There was no indication whatsoever that the percentage change in employment as a result of those write-off provisions was substantial, was significant or altered what would have taken place without them.

I think we are entitled, Mr. Chairman, to say in the course of the debate on this section 49 and in speaking to the amendment which I moved on behalf of this caucus, that the proposed paragraph 49 be deleted. I think we are prepared to say that you are almost totally completely wrong.

You are not going to achieve any of those objectives, because what industry would do of its own volition in the conditions in which it exists in the Province of Ontario, knowing that the government always speaks for business, it would have done in any event. The minister, I think, has to answer to this House why tonight we should be giving \$106 million for the rest of this year; and for the period ending at the end of 1976 a total of \$410 million.

That is a transfer payment, because the payments by government basically are made up very simply by salaries, by wages, by transfer payments directly made, by the purchase of goods and machinery and equipment, and by granting this kind of exemption to industry when industry doesn't need it.

Does the minister understand that we have just come through a period of time when the corporations in this country have made the largest percentage profits in many years—

Mr. Deans: In history.

Mr. Renwick: —when there is no indication whatsoever that the cost of basic commodities to the consumer is coming down? The only area in which the marketplace operates in any sense—and then only in a limited sense—is in the commodity market. It doesn't operate in any other place. There are already built into the cost of living problems of every Canadian, items which are never going to come down again regardless of what you do about supply. I quote:

Although food items have continued to show the largest percentage gains in the Canadian consumer price index this year [that's 1974] the rate of increase has, in fact, been slackening for the past six months.

It is non-food items, particularly housing and transportation, that in this period have been leading the index higher. Household operation costs, for example, are running some 13.4 per cent higher in October than a year earlier. Public transportation was 11.2 per cent higher and clothing was 9.8 per cent up. Unlike food, where occasional price declines alternate with price rises in response to changes in supply, these items seldom show significant declines so that once a general upward movement is built up it becomes difficult to reverse or even to moderate.

The wide-ranging lists of increases in the pipeline over the next few months virtually assures that non-food items will continue to show uncomfortably large price gains. This would sustain a fair part of the momentum in the whole consumer price index even if food prices increases should moderate further, as seems quite possible.

All we are saying is until your government looks at the consumer; until the government designs some method by which these benefits will come through to the consumer; until the government decides upon some method by which it will orient its tax attitude toward housing, not toward construction, not toward commerce but toward the price the consumer will pay for all of the items which go into the cost of living—be they capital items for the consumer or consumable items for the consumer—until you orient your thinking that way, you will be taken in every time by the mythology, the continuing mythology, of the domination of the business community over the tax structure of this country. There is no other way by which you are ever going to orient your thinking any other way.

You've got to think about that. You are a member of the government. It's your bill. You are giving them \$406 million. You are not guaranteeing one thing.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Not a job.

Mr. Renwick: You are not saying that we are going to require this to be done. You are not saying this is the effect which is to happen. You are not saying we will selectively allocate, if necessary, for the production of jobs. You never ever do it that way. It's funny; with the \$1,000 grant to the homeowner, he's got to complete his house purchase and then apply.

You never ask that of industry. You never say to industry: "You install the machinery and equipment in your plant. You buy the new machinery and equipment. If you can show you are reaching any of the objectives we want you to achieve over a period of time, come and ask us. Give us an application and after the event we will assess whether or not you qualify."

You do it for the first-time home buyer. You don't let him march to the bank and make an assignment of his right to receive the \$1,000 so he can use it as part of the down payment. You don't do that at all.

Mr. Stokes: You do it with ODC. You say, "Show us some jobs."

Mr. Renwick: You always give the benefit to industry in advance. You never demand any performance from them. You always give it to them over a long period of time and you always give to them in massive amounts. And they don't need any of that mollycoddling from this government in any way, shape or form. That's what is wrong with this section and that's why we have moved that it be deleted. I presume now that the minister will try to answer at least some of the questions which, in a rather long discourse, I've tried to pose for you.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Chairman, I must say that I have enjoyed listening to the member for Riverdale on these points. I think I should also say that it is regrettable that a tax bill, such as the amendments to the Retail Sales Tax Act, has to be in the form of an omnibus bill in which we've purported to have second reading and debate in principle. Certainly the member for Riverdale has touched on some points here tonight that I hadn't heard fully elaborated on, or as fully elaborated on, and I've enjoyed listening to him.

It's perhaps regrettable that a function of the Minister of Revenue and the function of the Treasurer and Minister of Economics are separated in this government. That's the fact, and as a consequence I don't have the kind of knowledge to answer some of the questions of economics which he poses.

I've listened with interest to his quotation from the Bank of Nova Scotia quarterly, and I was interested in some of the figures he was indicating there. If I read them correctly, they appear to be indicating, at least as of the January edition, that the growth rate—instead of being some 25 per cent—was down to 18. And when one sees a diminution in the rate of growth, one starts to worry. What the Treasurer and his advisors have been telling us is that in this budget he has

had these several thrusts to get the economy rolling again. I don't think anybody, on this side of the House at any rate, pretends to be a magician, or to have a crystal ball. All we can do is use the best advice available to us through our economists and other specialists in this area. I don't think for one minute that we're suggesting the reduction in retail sales tax on the acquisition cost of production and construction equipment will demonstrate a—

Mr. Stokes: I'm glad the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman) is back.

Hon. Mr. Meen:—direct or linear reduction in the cost of the articles. By the time those articles come into the marketplace, other costs may very well have influenced the price upward. Certainly I don't know; I'm not any economist. I agree with the member for Riverdale—both of us happen to be members of another profession—but I'm not that skilled to try to analyse the results that flow from the various studies these experts have made. The fact of the matter is that this is the Treasurer's attempt—part of the thrust in his budget—to get the economy turned around, to get more jobs. That's one of the objectives—more jobs, more production and a better competition in the foreign marketplace to the extent of some 25 per cent. If it costs us \$108 million during the first year in lost revenues there—

Mr. Stokes: Why doesn't the minister reduce the personal income tax if he wants to stimulate the economy?

Hon. Mr. Meen:—that will be because there will have been an enormous increase in the purchases of manufacturing and production equipment.

Mr. Cassidy: No, no; it is a give-away.

Hon. Mr. Meen: And I'm suggesting to you that if that is so, that will have created many jobs.

Mr. Deans: It won't.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The hon. member was asking about Syncrude. As I understand it, if Syncrude were to place orders here in Ontario, that would require the manufacturers to obtain new production machinery. Well then of course we will benefit from that, and we will then get the manufacturing undertaken here in Ontario. But I think the member may have been suggesting, and I raise this question myself, whether this kind of credit would apply to production machinery manufactured here if it was sold to Syn-

crude for use outside the province. And of course the answer to that has to be no, it does not.

Mr. Chairman, I guess we could debate these principles for many hours. I don't know how much more I can say that I haven't said about five times already as to the thrust of the whole of the Treasurer's budget; a substantial part of which is reflected in the retail sales tax amendments before the members tonight, and particularly significantly here in section 4, subsection 3.

I think it is a very important section in the bill and one which all members should endorse. It is not a give-away. It is there as an incentive. The province has other programmes under ODC and the like for direct assistance of a demonstrable nature. This is a different kind of thrust. It is an attempt to get the economy moving in these areas with out injecting ourselves into—

Mr. Stokes: But at least those programmes demand showing certain jobs.

Hon. Mr. Meen:—every one of the applications that would otherwise have to come before us and be administered by some tribunal of government.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I guess I can't ask the minister to state whether this will or will not be the case, but if he is returned in the next election and if I am returned in the next election, I will make him a bet, if I am allowed to do so under the rules of the House.

Mr. Deans: I tried that.

Hon. Mr. Meen: He tried this before.

Mr. Chairman: Who will the member have holding the money?

Mr. Renwick: The Chairman will hold the money.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Put it on the record.

Mr. Renwick: Isn't this, in fact, a step toward implementing—even at this late date—the recommendation of the Smith committee? It was that the present exemption from sales tax be reviewed and revised so that all purchases of machinery equipment and other goods that enter into direct cost of manufacturing and producing will be exempt, and purchases of all goods entering into indirect cost of manufacturing and producing will be taxable.

Isn't this an implementation of the first part of that recommendation and isn't it true

in all likelihood that in 1976, and if your government is returned—which, God help us, it won't be—that the minister will be extending this particular exemption ad infinitum and that it will become embedded in the tax system?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Chairman, you as Chairman, and a number of others here tonight—

Mr. Stokes: How much is he willing to bet it won't?

Hon. Mr. Meen: —who sat on that committee, will remember that section. But I think the hon. members will also recognize that one of the goals of the government is rather to move in the other direction to try to avoid exemptions of one sort and another. This is an exemption for a specific purpose and for a limited period of time. I don't think it is the intention, whatever, I think that if I were a betting man—and I am not—I would be prepared to take the hon. member for Riverdale up on that one. Because I think, if anything, we are probably moving in the other direction.

Mr. Renwick: A bottle of scotch.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore on the same amendment?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes. Just a brief statement. The government of Ontario in the year 1961 brought in a sales tax. Until that time it had resisted doing so. Most other jurisdictions in the North American continent had done so. The revenues that proceeded from the succession duties and corporation taxes and from the income tax was sufficient unto the day at that particular time. Then in 1961 you brought it in at three per cent.

Since that time it has usurped and overwhelmed and practically wiped out the death tax concept. The corporation tax has become a negligible entity, really, in terms of the overall picture in the province. We are relying for about \$1 billion a year now on sales tax, on a scale much greater than any other field. The only one even remotely comparable to it is the income tax for the Province of Ontario.

In 1969, in the teeth of—I wasn't going to speak on this matter until Smith was brought up—in the teeth of what was recommended in the Smith committee, and by the committee of the Legislature upon which the hon. minister and myself sat, the government brought in a tax on production equipment. It made certain exemptions, but nevertheless it was brought in. A howl went up in 1969

when this was done. Our report was submitted in 1967. We made the distinction between direct and indirect.

Hon. Mr. Meen: It was 1968.

Mr. Lawlor: In 1968?

Hon. Mr. Meen: It was Sept. 16, 1968.

Mr. Lawlor: I was looking at the recommendations of the committee here on this reform and this is dated September, 1967.

Hon. Mr. Meen: You are dealing with the Smith report.

Mr. Lawlor: No, on our report. Anyhow I don't know how this date got in here because we got elected in 1967.

Hon. Mr. Meen: That's right. We will get elected again too.

Mr. Lawlor: In any event, you have brought it in. Now what you are doing is pulling back upon a piece of legislation you brought in six years ago—

Hon. Mr. Meen: Only temporarily.

Mr. Lawlor: —which you thought had validity then. It would have been an interesting thing, in the course of this debate, if I had done just as much preparation for the debate as the hon. minister has done by going back and taking a look at what the hon. Charles McNaughton in those days used as his nostrums with respect to the position of the tax, its validity, its justification and its absolute necessity for the good of the province. I would have quoted ironically a few passages which I am sure must be sitting around on that, saying how beneficial the thing is. Now we hear from you just how disbeneficial it all is.

This is a nub point, a crunch issue, for us over here, because I think that as responsible members of the opposition we have to have some kind of verification of what the government intends to do with the tax revenue. We have to put our finger on it and say there are tangible, beneficial, known results. The fact of the matter is your earlier legislation would have given one to believe that you at that time did not believe that these results were commensurate at all, or as tangible as all that.

The experience of Turner up in Ottawa who has had his finger in the works for an awful long time and from which they have learned a good deal by the processes of experimentation, much of which have been

quoted by my colleague in the House tonight, would again lead one to believe that the thing's a fallacy. It's pigeonholed with insufficiencies. You would think you would have learned.

We can only attribute motives. We can only say that being a part of big business you reward your friends. At every opportunity you get, justified or unjustified, you hand out the largess, particularly in an election year. When you sit over there mute of malice or, maybe worse than that, bereft even in terms of ignorance and give no justification at all, what else do you do but confirm already harboured suspicions in this regard?

You are saying in effect that you thumb your nose at the opposition. You say, "Go blow your horn, boys. I have got the votes when the moment comes. I am not even going to stoop, not to conquer but even to recognize their existence." That irks us. That causes a pain in the belly and we have to get rid of our thing. We have to go through a process of catharsis over here. You can see how this debate goes on in this particular context.

If you would just learn a little bit, you would put your head together with the Treasurer's, if he is ever free enough to do so, and generate a few things.

You have done this before on that whole business where you prolonged the debate for bloody weeks over the Land Speculation Tax Act because of the same insouciance, the same hang back. It is a supercilious type of thing and it just doesn't work.

We beat you to the ground on that particular thing and you almost became a human being. It was wonderful to behold. Humility began to take over from humiliation and at that particular stage you begin to fly. The Premier (Mr. Davis) even kept you in your job for a little while longer. For a while there it was pretty rickety, wasn't it, lad? You were right on the verge there, because you came in precisely ill-equipped, bereft of answers to what were legitimate questions asked by the opposition.

All right, I don't wish to prolong this debate any longer. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, my colleague, the member for Lakeshore, made what is a very clear distinction. That is, that the fallacy involved in this type of exemption, of which there are many others scattered throughout the taxing statutes dealing with corporations, is the fundamental difference

between this party and your party and the governing party in Ottawa. I doubt if I have ever seen a more succinct statement of the fallacy than the statement made on May 7, 1974, by the federal minister:

The first element in our strategy against inflation has been and continues to be the expansion of supply. The central feature of that policy has been in place for some time.

Our fiscal and monetary policies have been designed to bring the economy up to full capacity and growth. We have taken measures to increase the capability of the economy to produce sufficiently the goods and services which are needed. This not only increases our production capacity, it also creates remunerative and satisfying jobs, relieves shortages and reduces costs. The reduction of taxes on manufacturing and processing is clearly bringing about just such a massive increase in capacity.

You read his statement of the other day and you'll understand, perhaps, and get some inkling of why that is a succinct statement of the fallacy of the thinking of your government and the government at Ottawa, which distinguishes our party from your party.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): That's why you're not in power.

Mr. Renwick: At least we'll level about it. The reality is that some day—given the opportunity to express and to say what, in a difficult field, we're trying to say inadequately—some day the people in the Province of Ontario are going to understand it. I think they don't understand it because they're never levelled with.

The government never, ever, gets into a debate about this kind of problem. The government never, ever explains what the justification is for the give-away to the industry. The government never attempts to get any performance, and the government always hides this kind of part of the tax debate in this mechanical forum in which we're dealing with it on a clause-by-clause basis.

Mr. Stokes: The minister says all he has to do is collect the money.

Mr. Renwick: Our party, at the federal level, got hurt badly in the last federal election, not because of what we're saying here tonight and what our colleagues in Ottawa were saying then about the Turner budget, but because of what your colleagues

in the federal Conservative Party did with respect to their solution for the economic ills of the country. "Two for the Seesaw," recession, inflation. Your party and its federal counterpart put up a prices and incomes control policy that was not thought out, unworkable, unintelligible, inappropriate.

And we got hurt in that two-way fight. I don't make any bones about it, of course we got hurt. We lost seats. We lost a significant number of seats.

One of these days we will be able to state, in a way which is intelligible, that until we protect the consumer in the Province of Ontario; until we recognize that it's his ability to buy the goods and services generated by the economy of the Province of Ontario—of Canada as a whole; until we learn that that's where the reliance for our economic stability stands, we're always going to be faced with the problem of the export-oriented industries that can't hack it overseas. Because, for some reason or other, we pay high enough wages for people to live at a decent standard. That's why your government will always be able to say that really the problem is in the United States. If the United States is all right, we'll be all right.

Well, you and I know the United States isn't going to be right for a long, long time, after the experience of the last 15 to 20 years. We know that, but we can't keep blaming the external world. We've got to realize that the only place to put the tax concession is to the individual citizen of the province, so that he can consume. When we do that we'll have a self-reliant economy. And your government won't be able to frighten people about losing jobs, about anxiety, about law and order, about violence. You know, it is all part and parcel of the same thing. You actually think, as your government says in this House in these weeks preceding the election, that if you can create enough anxiety out there that somehow or other they will let big brother continue as the government of the province. We don't believe it.

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Aren't you trying to create anxieties?

Mr. Deans: No.

Mr. Renwick: That is exactly what you are doing—and you do it all the time.

Mr. Deans: We don't have to create them.

Mr. Cassidy: You create the anxieties.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): You create so much anxiety that we don't have to do anything.

Mr. Renwick: Let me return to the kind of thing that delights this particular committee. One of the conditions of the exemption—and it is very interesting that you don't really trust your friends—you are thinking that they may scrap a couple of contracts and redate them or rewrite them. It's a very interesting one. So very politely done. As a matter of fact, I don't find any penalty if anybody is caught doing this.

Isn't this an interesting condition of the exemption:

The contract for the rental or acquisition of which is, in the opinion of the minister, made for the purpose of obtaining the exemption conferred by this paragraph in substitution for or as the result of the cancellation of a substantially similar contract entered into before April 8, 1975.

We call that fraud. That is what we would call it. Why, Mr. Minister—

Mr. Lawlor: Don't distract him.

Mr. Renwick: If there is a money matter, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) always wants to get in on it.

Mr. Stokes: He is an old Minister of Revenue.

Mr. Cassidy: He's setting the new minister straight.

Mr. Deans: He tried the last time and failed. He was the guy who carried the machinery tax rebate and failed.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Minister, I always like to get one amendment in each bill. Okay? We have got a nice little technical amendment here that I would like to have included.

Hon. Mr. Meen: We are dealing with your one amendment. What do you want to do with it? How do you want to handle it?

Mr. Renwick: I am going to move another one afterwards because I don't anticipate that the amendment on behalf of our caucus is going to pass.

Will you consider, so we won't have to waste a lot of time about it, amending item (f) to cover not only a contract which has been substituted for an earlier contract, but also the direction that is referred to somewhere in the earlier part of paragraph 49; that is, the second part: ". . . pursuant

to a direction for the fabrication or manufacture thereof made or given after April 7..."

In order to make it understandable to you, I would amend clause (f), as one of the conditions, to read as follows.

The contract for the rental or acquisition of which or the direction for the fabrication or manufacture of which is, in the opinion of the minister, made for the purpose of obtaining the exemption conferred by this paragraph in substitution for or as the result of the cancellation of a substantially similar contract or direction entered into before April 8, 1975.

That might catch a few more of your friends.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Chairman, I think there are other provisions in the Retail Sales Tax Act—unfortunately, I don't have my consolidation of the Act here, but I was asking my staff if they could give me some help on it. I think there are some general provisions in the Act providing penalties for fraud or misrepresentation. I would find myself in sympathy with the hon. member for Riverdale if in fact there is nothing that would catch this section. But I think it is already covered. However, I can tell you this much: I certainly will give it consideration, which is all he was asking me to do.

Mr. Renwick: I will send it to you.

Mr. Lawlor: That is just the one point. What about the other one?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I have already answered the other one.

Mr. Renwick: What about my point about the direction?

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: You are speaking to Mr. Renwick's amendment, are you?

Mr. Martel: No, I am speaking to the original amendment that Mr. Renwick moved.

Mr. Chairman: Well, the only amendment the Chairman has before him is the original amendment.

Mr. Martel: Right. That is the one I am speaking to, Mr. Chairman—not the one he has just sent down.

Mr. Chairman: We must deal with the first amendment before we can accept another one.

Mr. Martel: I want to deal with section 49. I really find it difficult to believe what the minister has said. My colleagues have indicated that contrary to creating jobs we suspect over here that, in fact, the purchase of any new equipment, of course, will result in just the opposite effect and, in fact, it will reduce the labour force. I can well recall rail-roading back in the early 1950s. They started to automate then.

Hon. Mr. Snow: You were still wet behind the ears.

Mr. Martel: I might have been, but they started to automate then. In my own community, in one shop alone they wiped out a force of 190 men down to about 10, which prevails to this day. I can also recall working with my colleague from Sudbury for Mother Inco. In 1971 their profits were in the neighbourhood of \$108 million after taxes, with almost a 20,000 man workforce. Last year their profits were about \$310 million, or \$330 million, I guess, with the reduction of 5,000 men. One has to accept the fact that the type of equipment that is installed in this day and age, whenever you replace equipment, is that type of equipment which will, in fact, reduce jobs.

When the minister gets up and says it's going to create jobs we over here want to know how. They estimate that. What type of logic is behind the belief that it will create more jobs? I cite the Inco example of 20,000 employees in 1971 reduced to 15,000 by 1974; the profits tripled and the workforce is reduced by 5,000.

I am always intrigued with this minister, because I well recall the bill which went through last year dealing with the land tax. It's interesting, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Revenue last year admitted that he hadn't read the select committee report on land. The government legislation flew in the face of all of the recommendations of the select committee, on which sat the Minister of Housing for a while, now the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman), and the Minister of the Environment (Mr. W. Newman). That report moved against taxation, and yet this minister got himself in hot water and I guess that bill was debated for the better part of two months, and we've seen the minister eat crow on it.

The minister has made a great deal tonight about the desire to create jobs as being the basis of this move. One wonders where the Minister of Revenue and the Treasurer

have been with respect to at least eight reports advanced by the select committee on economic and cultural nationalism alone; a committee dominated by seven Conservatives and on which there were two Liberals and two New Democrats. Those reports dealt with mining, electrical, land, advertising, and each of them made a whole variety of recommendations which would, in fact, have led to more jobs.

Mr. Chairman, if I might, we might just look at the mining one for a moment, because we're talking about equipment. That select committee recommended that if the private enterprise system in Ontario did not move to create mining equipment in Ontario, that the government of Ontario do so. We don't produce, as you know, Mr. Chairman, mining equipment owned by a Canadian corporation. Oh, possibly a few little widgets might be developed by some Canadian firm in Ontario, but that select committee recommended that we start to get into the production of mining equipment in a heavy way as a government if the private enterprise system failed to do so.

We're giving away \$410 million over the next two or three years in this piece of legislation. If the minister was sincere about wanting to create jobs then, in fact, he might have taken the \$410 million that we're going to play with here and give away, and introduce a Crown corporation which, in fact, would have produced mining equipment which could have gone to satisfy the Canadian need and be utilized also, as the select committee found out, for world export. We are probably the second leading economy in natural resources—

An hon. member: No, first.

Mr. Martel: Not second, first? We don't produce any mining equipment ourselves. It's smaller countries that do it, like Atlas Copco from Sweden. The select committee recommended that sort of move by this government. If the minister were interested in creating jobs, there's an avenue which would have created a world market for us—the spin-off from research and development, which was a second report of this select committee, and the research and development and what it would have led to.

What I'm saying is you've got before you at least eight reports of a committee on which seven of your colleagues sat; two of them are now cabinet ministers. We spent the better part of three years just studying six or eight industries where sound investment

could have gone to create jobs in this province.

You admitted you didn't read the land one last year and it's obvious this government hasn't read the seven or eight reports with respect to investment, with respect to advertising, with respect to colleges and universities, with respect to architecture or any of those reports which would have led to the creation of more work.

As my colleague, the member for Lakeshore, says, one then has to become cynical and suspect that the government of Ontario is paying off its political friends ahead of time. The fat of the land going to their corporate friends will, I suppose, show up in corporate donations because they have not moved despite, I guess, several millions of dollars for that select committee work. Not that much? The Clerk shakes his head. Anyway that work is going down the drain because the government doesn't read.

I listened to an interesting programme last night, Mr. Chairman. My colleague, the member for Riverdale, has already mentioned the protection of the consumer. Last night on a programme called "Marketplace" it indicated that legislation in Australia now insists that corporations have to justify their increases. Kellogg's, a small company, attempted to justify the increased prices of its commodities, and why it wanted to increase them. When it went before this specific committee it was discovered that the cost of advertising was greater than the cost of labour. When it was questioned on that, for its reason to substantiate that, there was no saving to the consumer. There was to the company, to ensure that people didn't go back to eating bacon and eggs and continued to buy Kellogg's cornflakes.

That's what my colleague, the member for Riverdale, was talking about. None of the money you are giving away—the \$410 million—will show up in jobs or will show up in savings to the consumer because most of the investments have already been made. As I said, they fly in the face of everything the select committee reported on in trying to create new terms and new types of employment for this province.

Obviously the government hasn't looked at it and I become cynical, as a member of that select committee, because it's obvious it was just a sop to keep the back-benchers busy. I'm afraid that's the way it is, because on the land tax which this minister brought through the House, the committee urged the government not to move in the direction it did ultimately, and that was through tax.

It flew in the face of the 31 recommendations, I guess, which were in that report. It's obvious the other six or eight reports will not be acted upon by this minister because the only thing Tories and Liberals seem to understand about economics is more giveaways.

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): That is your party.

Mr. Martel: No, more giveaway to the corporate sector.

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): You want everything for nothing.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Never satisfied.

Mr. Cassidy: They are never satisfied.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, it was interesting that while we were in England we visited ICI, which is the parent company of CIL, I guess. Dr. Barrett—I believe that was his name—said, "You Canadians are rather silly and naive. You think the creation of new jobs in certain designated areas is because of the giveaway programme you've got. That's so immature it is not even funny but if you Canadians are so stupid that you want to give the money away, then we are going to ask for it."

He added, "Our location of a plant in any specific area has nothing to do with your giveaway programme. It's the infrastructure already there in your society which induces us to go to an area. But if you want to play giveaway we'll have our hand out and we'll take it but it doesn't determine whether we are going to locate there or not."

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Are you saying that the DREE programme doesn't work?

Mr. Martel: The DREE programme, with the cost of jobs, was ridiculous.

Mr. Roy: You had better talk to your member from Cornwall.

Mr. Martel: I'm telling you it's ridiculous.

Mr. Roy: Do you know what the unemployment was there?

Mr. Martel: The only thing you Liberals and Tories understand is more giveaways.

Mr. Roy: You'd better talk to your member from that area.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Get off it. Stop kidding yourself.

Mr. Roy: It was \$7 million over how many years?

Mr. G. Samis (Stormont): That's less than a swimming pool in Oakville.

Mr. Roy: Are you saying that none of that money brought jobs into your riding?

Mr. Samis: Sure it brought them jobs.

Mr. Roy: Well, you'd better talk to your colleague then.

Mr. Samis: But look how long it took.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, my friend might check with his friend in Nova Scotia where they gave Michelin X—how much was it?

Mr. Chairman: Would you like to proceed on the amendment?

Mr. Martel: It was \$75 million or \$80 million and they didn't know how many people were employed there.

Mr. Chairman: Would the member for Sudbury East like to proceed, as far as the amendment by Mr. Renwick is concerned?

Mr. Roy: The mistake was made in your riding.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that there are other ways; you don't have to buy into the economy. If you are going to pay for it, surely to God you should own it.

Hon. Mr. Meen: No.

Mr. Martel: Surely to God you should own it. You'd make a lousy businessman then.

Mr. Roy: Why do you think he is Minister of Revenue?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Why do you think he would like to be?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Would the member for Sudbury East get back to the amendment, please?

Mr. Martel: I am right on the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Let's come to order and proceed.

Mr. Martel: I'm right on the amendment and trying to—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Come on, let's go. Let's get some action here.

Mr. Martel: I want to make the point that you are not going to create jobs with giveaway programmes. You might look to the reports that are before you, and start to follow the recommendations there, particularly in the mining one. In all seven or eight of those reports there was a whole series of recommendations to create employment in this province and none of them recommended giveaway programmes.

My colleague, the member for Wentworth, and I worked very hard on that select committee to make sure we didn't recommend more giveaways. In fact, we moved very hard so that if government was going to invest, it would have equity. Surprisingly enough, your colleagues on that committee—two of them are cabinet ministers; one of them is the chief government whip; and two of them are parliamentary assistants today, I guess—all agreed with it. I wonder what happened from the time those reports were tabled to the present time when we continue along the same old line of playing Santa Claus.

I would like to hear the minister tell me because I sat in here in 1969 when we talked about more jobs if we gave away more money for new equipment. As we questioned the member who was later to be Treasurer on the jobs that that created, he couldn't give it to us. When we questioned him and the man who followed him as to what the giveaway programme of \$57 million meant in terms of jobs, again the member for London South (Mr. White) admitted: "We don't think it created a job; but we can't prove it." In fact all of your giveaway programmes don't do a thing.

Hon. Mr. Meen: That was the ODC.

Mr. Martel: I beg your pardon?

Hon. Mr. Meen: That was the ODC.

Mr. Martel: Yes, that was ODC, right. I'm saving the whole mentality is giveaway. You always come to the House and ask us to give away more, but you never are in a position to give to us even after it's been in effect—that was just a slip by John White to say that it didn't create jobs.

Hon. Mr. Meen: No, he was expressing some candour. We weren't able to produce the figures.

Mr. Martel: No, you haven't been able to. One afternoon the member for London

South made a slip and said: "I'm not sure if it has created a job."

All we are saying here is that you tried this programme before. What were the effects then and on what do you base it now? How many jobs? Why do you want us to give \$410 million away? You must have some projection. Maybe it was something you drew out of thin air. Maybe it was, but surely you must have something? The Treasurer must have told you one or two things. I implore you not to go through this charade the way you went through the land tax bill. You just sat there and took a terrible lacing for two months and were never in a position to answer, because the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. White) the other day gave you the instructions, "Carry the bill, no matter what." Now you're in the same position and you can't give us an answer. It must be embarrassing.

An hon. member: The poor old Minister of Revenue.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Pardon?

Mr. Martel: I would ask the minister to tell us.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Where was the member when I answered before?

Mr. Martel: I heard. The minister didn't tell us anything.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The member for Sudbury East wasn't in the House.

Mr. Martel: Why don't we stand the section down until the Treasurer comes around and tells us on what he based it? Then maybe there would be some credence to us even debating this, because at the present time there isn't even any credibility in debating this section, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Deans: I want to go back for just two or three minutes to talk about the employment angle, because I think that's probably important at this particular point, given the unemployment that we'll likely be faced with. I was sitting listening to the debate and thinking about the \$400 million. I had miscalculated. Earlier on I was talking about \$200 to \$300 million; I had forgotten it was going to be over \$400 million. I wondered what sort of things might have been done with \$400 million, and I want to make a suggestion to the minister.

I believe that this move is wrong, as you know. I think it will likely create less em-

ployment rather than more. I'm saying, given my own view of it, a view that's shared by a number of other people—some of them with a great deal more knowledge in the field of economics than I will ever have—but given that they too think that this might be counter-productive in terms of employment, that it might drag investment dollars out of Canada, that it might not do the things that you think about, let me tell you something about it.

Do you realize that if you had taken that \$400 million that you're prepared not to collect and if you had put that into housing you could have created 20,000 housing units under the HOME programme; 20,000 housing units? I can't recall the exact figure—I asked for it but I don't have it at the moment—but given that each house employs about let's say two man-years—I'm not positive that that's real—and given that each house, as a side effect, employs on a five-to-one ratio for all of the other subsidiary industry that's related to house building, have you stopped to think of the numbers of jobs that you could have created in this economy by using that money in the field of housing?

Not only that, but have you stopped to think of the impact, the social impact that that \$400 million would have had in the provision of accommodation for people at a cost that they can afford? Have you stopped to think that that \$400 million would have been returned, every single penny of it, to the coffers of the province with interest; that it would have been an investment, not a giveaway, and we would have been able to monitor the value of it and we could have told right to the last job how many new jobs were created in the Province of Ontario with the investment of \$400 million in mortgages?

When you look at the range of potential things that could have been done with the money that you're prepared not to collect, and any reasonable understanding of the impact of the elimination of a tax, either in the short run as you have indicated, or in the long run as my colleague from Riverdale has stated, and given all of the wisdom available to us in terms of the studies that were conducted with regard to other taxing measures that have been set aside, presumably for the purpose of stimulating the economy and encouraging production development, if you had really wanted to create jobs and, at the same time, if you had really wanted to meet a social need, and if you had wanted to use the money in such a way that the money would not have been a giveaway but rather would have been an investment in the devel-

opment of the province, the alternative was so clear.

The alternative use to which the money could have been put was so clear: You could have created 20,000 \$20,000 mortgages, which is the level at the moment under the HOME programme; you could have made that money available at six per cent and you would have ended up with 20,000 housing units and your \$400 million plus the interest. You would have benefited from that by untold numbers of jobs and you would have met a social need at the same time.

Hon. Mr. Meen: There are only jobs in the construction of those houses. It is of a transitory nature.

Mr. Deans: No, that is where you are wrong.

Mr. Martel: There are electrical jobs.

Mr. Deans: That's the trouble with this government; it doesn't see beyond the nose on its face. There aren't only jobs in the construction industry. There are jobs in the manufacturing industry for all of the items of trim that go into the business. For example, all of the plumbing industry benefits and all of the electrical industry benefits. There is a great segment of the manufacturing industry that benefits. The furniture industry benefits.

Mr. Cassidy: Furniture, appliances.

Mr. Martel: Heating.

Mr. Deans: Thanks very much. The heating industry benefits. If you want, I could go down and I am sure I could produce a list of 50 different industries that would benefit substantially from the investment of \$400 million in Home Ownership Made Easy mortgages. That is the five to one that I am talking about. Those are five jobs that are created outside for the one job that is actually seen as being in the house building industry.

You couldn't under any circumstances, with any calculation, show me a similar benefit that will flow from the elimination of this tax in the manufacturing sector. There is no way. There is no other sector of the economy that stimulates the economy to the same extent as the development of accommodation does. It has such a spin-off effect.

You could have made that \$400 million available at any rate of interest. You could have chosen your own. You could have begun

a brand new programme, for God's sakes. If you can do without that \$400 million over this next 21 months, you could have done without it over a longer period of time.

That's why I can't support the kind of measure, because it isn't well thought out.

Mr. Martel: It wasn't thought out at all.

Mr. Deans: You have no proof. I can produce for you, if you can just wait until I get the statistics, in actual jobs the numbers of jobs that I could create with the use of the **\$400 million. I can do it in 10 minutes.**

Mr. J. A. Taylor: You couldn't do anything in 10 minutes.

Mr. Deans: I can tell you how many jobs I could create, if I were the government, with \$400 million.

Mr. Martel: Who do you trust?

Mr. Deans: I could tell you, better than that, how many families I could house. I could tell you, better than that, by normal projection how many additional jobs will be created throughout the manufacturing sector as the result of that stimulation.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: You couldn't say hello in 10 minutes.

Mr. Deans: More than that, I can tell you the saving to the average family in terms of dollars saved, based on the interest rates that I would charge for the money that you are going to give away. And I would get back every penny of the money that I would invest.

You tell me that that doesn't make more sense. You tell me that my stimulation, which will create more jobs in manufacturing, won't result in those manufacturing industries benefiting to a far greater extent than they will with the seven per cent elimination of tax. You just tell me it won't.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Where is the member going to build those homes?

Mr. Deans: You tell me it won't.

Hon. Mr. Meen: What do you mean? You tell me where you are going to build those homes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: You tell me. Listen, I will show you where you can build them all, every single one of them.

Mr. Cassidy: You will have houses coming out of your ears.

Hon. Mr. Meen: They are building right to capacity now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: What I am saying to the minister is—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ferrier: You can build them up in Timmins.

Mr. Martel: The Minister of Housing (Mr. Irvine) says there are all kinds of building lots for sale.

Hon. Mr. Meen: They want purchasers with the money to buy them.

Mr. Deans: I'm doing what I shouldn't do. I am offering the minister an alternative, an alternative use that the money could be put to that will create more jobs.

Mr. Martel: And provide housing.

Mr. Deans: More jobs that will be a far greater stimulus to manufacturing and will meet a social need. In addition to that, the money I am going to invest will all be returned, plus interest.

Mr. Martel: That's a fact.

Mr. Deans: You will get every penny back.

An hon. member: Back to the drawing board.

Mr. Deans: All you have to do is charge five per cent if you like. You can make it available to income groups of \$10,000 and less and charge five per cent. You will get it all back, every penny of it.

Now you tell me that that's not a better method!

Mr. Stokes: You will be re-elected with an overwhelming majority.

Mr. Deans: You tell me that's not a better measure than this garbage you are bringing in tonight.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Tell it to the Treasurer.

Mr. Deans: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Tell it to the Treasurer.

Mr. Deans: I am telling it to you, because it is your bill.

Mr. Cassidy: It is your bill.

Mr. Deans: I am saying to you that you are wrong.

Mr. Martel: We would tell it to the Treasurer but he isn't here.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Read Hansard.

Mr. Cassidy: For the record, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Deans: I want to make it clear. I am now doing for you what you couldn't do for me.

Mr. Martel: You couldn't do it for yourself.

Mr. Deans: I am now telling you what to expect. This is the difference between my research and yours, okay?

Every house creates between 130 and 150 man-days of employment.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: What's that got to do with the bill?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Big deal.

Mr. Stokes: What do you mean, big deal?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Then what happens? The house is built and the guy is out of work.

Mr. Stokes: You won't create one man-day with your project.

Mr. Cassidy: We don't know of any job that will be created by your measures.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Let's get back to the bill.

Mr. Stokes: Mean old Arthur Meen.

Hon. Mr. Meen: You only say that because you love me, Jack.

Mr. Deans: Okay, my 20,000 houses will create 2.6 million man-days.

Listen, what's the matter, don't you like it? My 20,000 houses will create 2.6 million man-days of employment; man-days.

An hon. member: Where did you get that?

Mr. Martel: Who woke you up, Claude? Who woke you up?

Mr. Deans: That's at the bottom end.

An hon. member: Back to the drawing board, Art.

Mr. Deans: Now let me go on. Those are direct jobs; those are direct. Those are the actual jobs that my 20,000 houses, using your

\$400 million as an investment, will create. For every one job in the house-building industry—let's be really conservative—we create three jobs outside; three jobs outside, okay? That means that my housing policy, using your \$400 million that you are prepared to give away, will create 7.8 million man-days of employment outside. All right? Now I have got two million—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let the record show that the member is doing all this off the top of his head.

Mr. Deans: I am not doing it off the top of my head. I happened to get the research office to look for it, so now I am telling you that I will create 2.6 million man-days of employment with the building of the houses and I will create 7.8 million man-days of employment in subsidiary industries.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He is counting on his fingers.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: You couldn't create a half day's work for yourself if you tried.

Mr. Deans: Now I want to ask you something. Isn't that a better programme than yours? Can you produce a single job for me? Can you give me a statistic—anyone of you sitting under the gallery—can you give me a statistic to compare with that in the manufacturing sector? Can you show me one single job?

Mr. Roy: Well, he's got a job.

Mr. Deans: Can you show me one single job?

Mr. Stokes: Come on, Allan. You are a superminister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Remember when I used man-days and your party laughed?

Mr. Stokes: You couldn't prove it. We can.

Mr. Deans: I can prove it.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The member for Wentworth has the floor. Order.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The instant economist.

Mr. Deans: Those are the first statistics you have heard tonight. Now there you are.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Deans: So now I put to you—

Mr. Chairman: Let's get on with the debate.

Mr. Deans: I am putting the proposition to you this way: You have no justification for your bill. We can't support it on this side of the House—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Shame.

Mr. Deans: —but what I want to do is, I will make you an offer you can't refuse. I will provide you with the programme that will create 10 million man-days of work.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You know where those offers come from.

Mr. Stokes: How can you refuse?

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): You mean "person" days.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, what is this "man"? What do you mean? It's "person" days?

Mr. Deans: I will provide you with the opportunity—

Mr. Martel: Why doesn't the minister give us one figure to work with?

Mr. Deans: Tell me, Mr. Minister, are you interested in creating employment?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Who isn't?

Mr. Deans: Are you interested in creating employment, both in the area of the greatest social need and in the subsidiary industries and manufacturing?

Hon. Mr. Meen: That's the whole thrust of the budget, to get the economy turned around.

Mr. Martel: Show us how many jobs you're going to create.

Mr. Deans: Are you interested in using a programme that won't cost the Province of Ontario one red cent?

An hon. member: The stimulation of the economy.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, is this still the Retail Sales Tax Act?

Mr. Deans: It sure is. What's the matter? Are you getting a bit worried?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Holy cow!

An hon. member: Are you finding it hard to follow?

Mr. Ferrier: It's the \$400 million you're giving to your fat cat friends.

Mr. Deans: What I'm saying to you is, how about allowing us to invest \$400 million in 20,000 mortgages at six per cent for people earning less than \$10,000 a year? We'll create 10 million man-days of employment in the period of time it takes to build the 20,000 units. Can you better that?

Mr. Martel: The minister certainly won't because he won't be here.

Mr. Deans: How can you refuse? There's an offer you can't refuse. Are you telling me you don't want to give people out there houses at a cost they can afford? Are you telling me you'd rather give the money to your corporate friends?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Because we want them to be able to buy the houses. We want to create jobs.

Mr. Deans: Are you telling me you can create more jobs than I'm telling you I can create with the same amount of money?

Hon. Mr. Meen: You can't substantiate yours any more than I can.

Mr. Cassidy: He certainly can.

Mr. Stokes: You refute those figures.

Mr. Martel: You haven't put a figure on the floor yet tonight.

Mr. Deans: It takes 130 man-days to build a house.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What about the woman-days?

Mr. Deans: I don't need your interjections because they're not appreciated by anyone.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's awful. Wait till women's lib finds out what you said.

Mr. Deans: It takes 130 man-days to build a house. You get 20,000 houses for \$400 million. You can charge six per cent interest on the mortgages. You can recover every penny plus interest. You can create 10 million man-days of employment, 2.6 million of them directly attributable to the building of the house and 7.8 million of them in industry related to house building.

Mr. Martel: That's 180,000.

Mr. Deans: Do you want a programme that will work?

Hon. Mr. Meen: We've got one that will work. This is our programme.

Mr. Deans: Do you want a programme that will stimulate industry? Do you want a programme that will stimulate your manufacturing friends' concerns?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You can't charge six per cent or five per cent.

Mr. Deans: You can do it at four per cent. You can give the money away. You can give them the mortgage money and just get it back and you wouldn't have lost as much.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Come on, Mr. Chairman, let's get back to the bill.

Mr. Deans: Can you do better?

Hon. Mr. Meen: We've got a great programme right here. Why don't you let it work? Let's just see how it will go.

Mr. Deans: No.

Hon. Mr. Meen: You're sceptics. You don't believe that what we're proposing will work.

Mr. Deans: I'm telling you that what I've just suggested to you would be more of a stimulus to the economy.

Hon. Mr. Meen: That's your opinion.

Mr. Deans: No, it's not only my opinion. It's shared by the member for Sudbury East.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Oh, well, the great expert.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: In fact, I wouldn't be surprised if the member for—

Mr. Stokes: It sure would help the lumber industry in the north.

Mr. Deans: —Thunder Bay agrees with me.

Mr. Martel: We can make nickel-plated nails.

Mr. G. Nixon: Let's have a little order.

Mr. Deans: You don't want these people to get the houses? You don't want these people to get low-mortgage houses? You'd rather give the money away.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Will you speak to the minister, please?

Mr. Deans: I'm speaking to him.

Mr. Chairman: Speak to the minister. The minister is not on that side of the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Speak to the minister through the Chair will you, please, from now on?

Mr. Roy: Speak to the Chair.

Mr. Deans: Let me ask you, Mr. Chairman. Wouldn't you like to give a chance to these young families who can't get accommodation in the Province of Ontario?

Mr. Chairman: It is not the Chairman's job to express opinions.

Mr. Deans: Can I take it from that that you wouldn't like—

Mr. Chairman: You're not taking anything from that. The Chairman is neutral in this case.

Mr. Ferrier: He's trying to do something good for York North.

Mr. Deans: I see. Then, through the neutral Chairman, is there anybody in this House who wouldn't like to see 20,000 six per cent mortgages available?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Wouldn't it be great?

Mr. Deans: Is there anybody in this House who would rather give the \$400 million to industry? Give it away without any guarantees of results?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: There's a \$1,500 grant to stimulate housing.

Hon. Mr. Meen: How would you like it?

Mr. Deans: I'm asking if there is anybody who would rather give it to industry without any guarantees of results?

Hon. Mr. Meen: No more private loans.

Mr. Deans: There are no guarantees from this minister. He said so. He can't produce a single statistic, not one.

Hon. Mr. Meen: It is the incentive.

Mr. Deans: Is there anyone who doubts—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, through you, is there anyone who doubts that the increased purchasing resulting from these additional man-hours of work—person-hours of work—wouldn't be a stimulus to the economy? Is there anyone who doubts that? Is there anyone who doubts that those additional 10 million person-hours of employment with all of the earning that goes with it, wouldn't stimu-

late every sector of the economy with the purchasing that would be undertaken?

Mr. Roy: You have a receptive minister now, ask him the question.

Mr. Deans: I am asking you. Is there anyone in the House who would deny that it makes more sense to invest the \$400 million and have it returned to the province over a period of time?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: You don't want housing and you know it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth is getting repetitious now. He has asked the same question.

Mr. Deans: No, no, it is a different question.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, you are.

Mr. Deans: It just sounds the same.

Mr. Chairman: You are getting repetitious.

Mr. Ferrier: The Chair is becoming argumentative.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: Well, I have to tell you that there is an opportunity for you to do some good, and it will win you as many friends as this will. It's a better offer than you have made tonight. There are more statistics involved there—

Hon. Mr. Meen: That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. Deans: I will take them up. In fact, you give me the money and I will do it; I will make it work.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I wouldn't trust you with the money; no offence intended.

Mr. Cassidy: The electors will decide that. They will judge your stewardship.

Mr. Deans: I have got to tell you—I put to you that this programme would create more stimulation—

Mr. Stokes: Put it to him.

Mr. Deans: —more purchasing, more employment, would meet a greater social need, and would return to the province every dollar plus interest. Now, don't you think that makes more sense than this giveaway?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: And you adopt that programme. We will trust you.

Mr. Chairman: Is the hon. member for Ottawa Centre speaking on Mr. Renwick's amendment?

Mr. Cassidy: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I just want to make two or three comments; I don't want to speak for a long time about this. I have been listening with concern to the debate and watching with concern the kind of policy the government is seeking to adopt, and I have been trying to work out in my mind how it is that a remission of sales tax over a period of 2½ years can be thought to help the economic situation of the Province of Ontario in this current year. In addition, I have been trying to work out how it is that a remission which is designed to increase the purchases of investment equipment will help to create jobs in Ontario for that part of the investment equipment which is imported from other parts of the world. This is an important question.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That same point was made by many of your colleagues.

Mr. Cassidy: As a matter of fact, at a good guess, about one-half of the machinery and the equipment that is used in Ontario is manufactured abroad; it comes in from Sweden, West Germany—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: We have heard all that. If you were in the House you would have heard that all afternoon.

Mr. Cassidy: I was busy downstairs, as a matter of fact. I think it is a valid point and can be raised right now.

Mr. Ferrier: Call that fellow to order.

Mr. Cassidy: Has the minister answered it?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Would the member for Ottawa Centre speak through the Chairman, please?

Mr. Cassidy: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps you can shut up the member for Prince Edward-Lennox, who should concentrate on his sheep.

Mr. Roy: On what?

Mr. Cassidy: On his sheep.

Mr. Roy: Is he one of those?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: So you are insulting sheep farmers now, are you?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: No, Mr. Chairman, there is a serious problem here. If there was any stimulus to the machinery industry created by this particular remission of tax, half of it at the very least would be felt in the machinery industry of the United States, of Japan, of Sweden, of West Germany, of Britain, and of other nations which provide the investment equipment which is used here in this country.

Ontario is not even a heavy producer of investment goods. We have a certain number, but if you go down to the warehouses and the showrooms on King St., and out in the east end and the west end where this kind of equipment is shown off, the minister knows very well that this equipment is in large measure produced abroad and brought into Canada, because we are not as intensive in the engineering trades and in the machinery trades as we are in certain other fields. In one or two areas, such as paper equipment, we are outstanding, but in many areas we do not produce the kind of equipment that is needed.

Secondly, this stimulus is spread over a 2½-year period and will not be concentrated during the time when, according to the Treasurer's analysis, we need the extra employment, which is this year.

Thirdly, there has been nothing said by the minister up until now, both from what I have said and from what I understand he has said, to indicate there will be any discernible change in the level of investment by private industry during 1975. In other words, quite apart from the question about whether additional jobs will be created in the production of goods and services once the equipment is installed, Mr. Chairman, there is the question of whether there will be additional jobs created in the machinery-producing industries this year. I suggest the moneys that will be paid out this year will be moneys that will simply be a subsidy or a gift to industry, for their investment intentions were already formulated at the time of the budget, and there will be no change in them.

It is possible to argue that next year, or the year after, there might be a few extra pieces of equipment purchased out of this \$418 million. There might, in fact, be as many as 100 or 200, maybe even 300 jobs created in the machinery industry because of this particular measure, but that's a paltry response. That's a paltry kind of return on the hundreds of millions of dollars which it is proposed to spend in order to give this particular gift.

Can the minister explain something to me?

I'll sit down at this point and try to get an answer from him to this. It struck me that it may be that Bill Kelly and his friends have been talking to the cabinet and suggesting that it's about time that some solicitude was shown the private industry because of the need to go and hit them for the 1975 election.

Mr. Ferrier: They've already been hit.

Mr. Cassidy: Maybe they've already been hit, but they want to hit them again.

Mr. G. Nixon: Get off the old gutter talk.

Mr. Cassidy: What? It is not gutter talk, as a matter of fact. There has been a quid pro quo, and you know it. There has been a quid pro quo with private industry. It has gone on. Tollgating has been going on, and it works both ways.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Vicious innuendoes and slurs.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, the members back there, from their response, are simply confirming the fact that before every election the bagmen for the Conservative Party go around and they say to their erstwhile friends: "Here's the government business you've had. Here's what we've done for you; now it's your turn to come back and deliver to us." They tell them the amount of contracts they've had and they strike a percentage on that particular figure and they say: "Okay now. Hand over. Deliver."

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Hogwash.

Mr. G. Nixon: Shame.

Mr. Ferrier: That is the tollgating.

Mr. Cassidy: That is the tollgating that goes ahead.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Shame on you.

Mr. Cassidy: There's a kind of a tollgating that occurs with the manufacturing industries as well, but I ask myself—

An hon. member: You'd better.

Mr. Cassidy: It's true. You know it. What I ask myself though, is this—

An hon. member: That's what Shouldice said.

Mr. Cassidy: In committee, right now, we're passing legislation which will limit the amount of money that can be given by any corporation to a maximum of \$8,000 in an election year and \$4,000 in an off year. That

election bill is going to get passed. It's been promised by the Premier and I have every confidence it will come back and get passed here within the next week or two.

If that is the case, and if the \$15,000 that was being collected from some contractors and the \$25,000, \$30,000 and \$50,000 that was being collected from some large firms will no longer be accessible to the government; if there is a kind of rough measure of equality imposed on industry after this election expenses bill is passed, then what need is there for you to gratuitously hand out \$400 million to these guys in order to ensure their support in the 1975 election? The reward is incommensurate with the returns that are expected, I would suggest, in this particular case.

Hon. Mr. Meen: You know not whereof you speak.

Mr. Cassidy: It's true.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: You are twisting the truth. You distort and twist the truth.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, the point has been made that the economic effects from this particular piece of legislation are indiscernible, cannot be discerned; that past experience has indicated that there is very little if any impact; that there is no guarantee that jobs will result in return for the moneys that are being given out; that the most likely place these funds will go is into the profits of the corporations; that the reason that companies are not investing is because of the fact that they don't see adequate demand in order to justify their increased investment; and if there was more demand here in this province, then you would see the investment that the Treasurer and his sidekick, the Minister of Revenue, appear to find wanting.

All of these things have been said, Mr. Chairman, and we are simply groping and trying to find some explanation, regardless of all of those facts, for the government insisting on giving a \$400 million piece of giveaway to the private manufacturing and construction sector.

The member for Wentworth said, at some length, that you ought to be putting the money into housing. I subscribe to every word that he says. If you intended to confine the benefits to job creation in the manufacturing sector, then I would have to ask the minister why is it that this opportunity of directing industrial development into eastern and northern Ontario was simply bypassed. It would have been possible—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: You don't want development there. The member for Sudbury called them giveaway programmes; now you are for it.

Mr. Cassidy: I'm just saying that if you insist on giving it to manufacturing then you should see that the jobs are guaranteed to be created, and you should talk about the location of those particular industrial—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That comes under the ODC programme.

Mr. Cassidy: The ODC thing isn't working, and you know it.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Sure it is.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It is working in my riding.

Mr. Cassidy: It is not working in most parts of eastern Ontario, and I am sure it is not working in the north.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: The ODC has a sum of \$30 million or \$40 million a year to play around with in the form of loans. This is a giveaway. These are funds that are given as an incentive to industry. The ODC, the EODC, the NODC has nothing at all to compare with this, Mr. Chairman. One has to ask oneself, what kind of priorities are there in this government when on the one hand they give loans ostensibly to direct industry to various parts of the province, the results of which are that most industry continues to concentrate down here around Metro Toronto, while on the other hand, when it comes to an industry locating in the areas that are overdeveloped, like Metro Toronto, they give giveaways in the form of the remissions of taxes to the tune of \$400 million.

There is an extraordinary solicitude for the private sector which is reflected in this particular piece of legislation. That is why we simply cannot go along with it. We look to the government—in vain, I fear—to withdraw this particular measure and to bring in measures which are effective, which will have an immediate result and which will create jobs that we can measure and see this year, when they are needed, when unemployment is at such a high level.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any more speakers to the amendment?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, since it is almost 10:30, I would move the adjournment

of the debate. I would move that the committee rise—

Mr. Chairman: If you'd just excuse me for a minute, I wonder if we could not dispense with your amendment tonight. We have an amendment to be moved by the member for Welland South; if there are no more speakers on your amendment, we could go on to his and he could adjourn the debate. Is that agreeable?

Mr. Renwick: As long as I understand what the procedure is.

Mr. Chairman: The procedure will be that we are finished if there are no more speakers on your amendment.

Mr. Renwick: No.

Mr. Chairman: Okay. I'll accept your motion to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Cassidy: We should have an answer from the minister, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Chairman, the member for Ottawa Centre has raised some points which we've been chewing over here for hours now. I guess he hasn't had a chance to hear the whole debate. I gather he was down at the other committee. But he really is missing the point when he is talking about the creation of jobs.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): What's new?

Hon. Mr. Meen: We are talking about a credit on the purchase of machinery. The hon. member, I think, may not be all that far off, for all I know, when he pulls out of the air a figure of 50-50 for heavy machinery that would be imported as opposed to heavy machinery that would be manufactured here—

Mr. Cassidy: That's right, so half the jobs created would be outside Canada.

Hon. Mr. Meen: —and which would generate employment directly. But the point the Treasurer is making in his budget is not that the manufacture of that machinery will generate jobs, but rather that that machinery, be it manufactured here in Ontario or be it imported, is then going to go into a factory that will continue to employ people—not just today, not just tomorrow, not just through the period of time during which this is a credit, but for years to come. It will be modern machinery, producing new products on the market in better competition on the foreign market, where the Treasurer estimates a 25 per cent effect from this and in the long run a very handsome return to the province.

Hon. Mr. Meen moves the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will proceed with consideration of the taxing bills as previously announced.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 21, 1975

Retail Sales Tax Amendment Act, in committee	1053
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	1083



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, April 22, 1975
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 22, 1975

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, April 22, will certainly go down as a very important day in the lives of many school children from north-western Ontario, because today we have had three visiting groups from that particular area. This morning, sir, we had 35 grade 8 students from the Pinewood Senior Public School at Dryden, and later on we had 21 grade 8 students from the Keewatin Public School. In the west gallery this afternoon we have 35 grade 8 students from the Central Public School at Sioux Lookout. I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that all these groups have been very ably and financially assisted through the government's Young Travellers programme.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): It was my idea.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The Sioux Lookout group is being escorted by Mr. Barry Jones, Mr. Beal and Mrs. Smith, and I know that all members will join me in giving them a warm welcome to Queen's Park.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased this afternoon to introduce to the members of the House a group of ladies from that great town of Oakville, from that great riding of Halton East, who are with us this afternoon. These ladies are newcomers to the town of Oakville who have come down to witness the proceedings here at Queen's Park.

Mr. J. Lane (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and to the members of the House 35 grades 7 and 8 students in the east gallery from Assignack Central School, Manitowaning, on Manitoulin Island. I hope you and all of the members will give them a welcome to this House.

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen, in the absence of our good friend the member for Welland South (Mr. Haggerty), I would like at this time to welcome to the Legislature 45 ladies of the Women's Liberal Association from the

great Welland riding. I would ask the hon. members to give them a royal welcome indeed.

Also, Mr. Speaker, it is an honour and a privilege to welcome here this afternoon 40 students from the grade 10 class of Welland High and Vocational School. Mr. Simpson is in charge of these students. I am very proud indeed to be the Welland representative in the Ontario Legislature for the last 24 years. I would like to congratulate these young people on their initiative in visiting the Legislature, which is an indication of their interest in the workings of the democratic system. It shows that they care about their great Province of Ontario, the province of opportunity.

May I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members join me in welcoming my young friends from the Welland High and Vocational School?

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): That's the best speech the member has ever made.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Speaker would also like to draw to the attention of the members that there is a group of young people from the Cobourg Collegiate Institute West, under the leadership of Mr. Paul Forhan, in our Speaker's gallery this afternoon, and we bid them welcome.

Statements by the ministry.

1973 BLUE BOOK

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present to the House today the publication 1973 Municipal Financial Information or, as it is more commonly called, the 1973 blue book. The blue book contains a great deal of information on the fiscal activities of local governments, summarized from the financial reports of municipalities. The 1973 publication includes, for the first time, an historical analysis of municipal financial activities which should be of interest to all readers. The blue book for 1973 has been printed in a single volume rather than in 11 volumes as in previous years.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions. The hon. member for Kitchener.

AMBULANCE SERVICES

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I have a question of the Chairman of Management Board of Cabinet with respect to information received from the Civil Service Association of Ontario concerning the amalgamation of ambulance services in Metro Toronto. Is the minister able to make a statement with respect to the information which he has received from a goodly number of members of the civil service who are concerned with this particular project, and is he prepared to meet with their representatives hopefully, to resolve the difficulties in the situation?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, following consideration of the material at hand, I will respond and make a statement with regard to that situation.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary, the member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: Can we be assured that the government will meet with these people before it issues an order in council dealing with the amalgamation? Can the minister tell us if there is an order in council in regard to this coming out in the next few weeks?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, there is no such order in council.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): By way of supplementary, when does the minister intend to make the statement, since the ambulance drivers and the CSAO are obviously quite agitated?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: As soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Kitchener have further questions?

RENT INCREASES

Mr. Breithaupt: I have a question of the Minister of Housing, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the present level of complaints received by the Metro Toronto Landlord and Tenant Bureau. Can the minister advise whether, in view of the large number of complaints that that office is handling and the others around the province, he is prepared now to reconsider the proposals with respect to a rental review board, which has been called for on this side of the House by both opposition parties, to attempt to resolve some of these problems?

Hon. D. R. Irvine (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise all hon. members that I'm not prepared at this time to have a rent review board or rent controls, as I've stated many times in the past. I still hold to the same position. I believe supply is the answer and we're endeavouring to have that supply. We'll have it by the end of this year.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary, the member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Is the minister prepared, on behalf of the government, to permit or to agree to permit a municipality to inaugurate on a trial basis a rent review procedure within its own municipality if it does so by private bill?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely not prepared to allow a municipality to do this. I think all we have to do is to check the many editorials and news media articles—

Mr. Deans: Where is municipal autonomy?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —which show very clearly that rent review boards or rent controls will not work in the Province of Ontario any more than they have worked in other places in Canada.

Mr. Deans: Rent review has not been tried.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Rent review boards and rent controls have not worked anywhere in North America. They have not worked in Great Britain and will not work in Ontario.

Mr. Breithaupt: We are not asking for rent control.

Mr. Deans: Where does dictatorial action end and municipal autonomy begin?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Etobicoke.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Is the minister aware there is a marked difference between rent controls and a rent review board, and will the minister not reconsider his position in view of the plight of many people here in Metropolitan Toronto?

Mr. Speaker: The question has been answered. The member for Parkdale.

Mr. J. Dukuza (Parkdale): Will the minister, in view of his commitment some time ago that he would personally review some rent increases, review 12 cases which I have collected from Parkdale riding—12 people who live at 190 Jameson, whose rent increases

have reached up to 30 per cent in six months —if I send him over the details?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I have said to the other hon. members and I will say it to the hon. member now, I am prepared to look at cases that appear to be unjustified as far as rent increases are concerned, but I am certainly not going to investigate every person who feels he has had a rent increase which is not justified, because they haven't got the facts to back it up. If the member wishes to forward the information to me, I'd be happy to receive it.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): What is the minister going to look at then?

Mr. Deans: The trouble is they cannot get the facts.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for St. George.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware of the fact that his deputy has publicly invited members of the public to bring forward their complaints to him? Is the minister's position different from his at this time?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I think the member for St. George should have recognized what I have said here many times before. I am quite prepared to receive, either by way of delegation or by way of submission, written or by phone call, someone's complaints in regard to rent increases, or rent control, or a rent review board, whatever it may be. I am still prepared to do that.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): What good does it do? He has no law. He has no control. He washed his hands of it.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: My deputy, my parliamentary assistant, my secretary and everybody else has said the same thing. We are going to review the situation from time to time.

Mr. Cassidy: That's a pile of bull.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I again tell the member for St. George, in my opinion it is not practical to invoke either a rent review board or rent controls at this time.

Mrs. Campbell: Could the minister then tell this House, in view of his previous answers in precise terms, how many units is he going to see built in Toronto or Metro Toronto by the end of the year to overcome this problem, which is his answer to the problem?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. That is a more general question.

The member for Scarborough West.

Mrs. Campbell: Well it's his answer, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: I want to ask the minister: What right does he think he has as minister to impose such selective discrimination on the renters of Ontario by allowing a chosen few who happen to reach their MPPs to put illegitimate rent increases before the minister for review, but deny to all the others who don't reach their MPPs the right to a similar review?

Mr. Deans: What is the difference?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, to the leader of the NDP, may I say this, as the Minister of Housing I have every right to bring forth programmes, new initiatives and to take any action I consider necessary to make sure that we have housing for the people of Ontario.

Mr. Breithaupt: Doesn't he think this is necessary?

Mr. Lewis: But the minister is discriminating in this case. He allows himself to review but no one else to review.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I want to say, Mr. Speaker, to the leader of the NDP, he doesn't know what he is talking about in the way of discrimination. I am not discriminating against anybody.

Mr. Deans: The minister is incompetent. He should be replaced. He is incompetent.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Order.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I have read somewhere—

Mr. Lewis: He is agitated by the statement that he did nothing for the renters of Ontario, isn't he?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Who is agitated over there?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Will the hon. gentleman sit down. Order please. The member for Kitchener with further questions.

PART-TIME JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Mr. Breithaupt: A question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker. Following the special

report with respect to part-time justices of the peace that has come to light today, can the Attorney General advise us, how many JPs are there, in fact, on this kind of programme, and when is he going to modernize the system to remove the part-time justices of the peace situation and put justices of the peace properly on reasonable salaries, as requested by the McRuer report four years ago?

Hon. J. T. Clement (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Mr. Speaker, the most up-to-date figures I have, from last August, indicate there were 648 fee-earning justices of the peace qualified to discharge their duties in this province at that time.

I am well aware, as is the member, of the recommendations of Mr. McRuer. Forgetting for a moment the fiscal restraints on us all, the ultimate would be to have full-time justices of the peace serve round the clock because, as the member knows, their services are required on a 24-hour basis.

Mr. Roy: The province has it now.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Under the Criminal Code, as the member knows, the accused has the right to be brought before a justice of the peace very shortly after his apprehension and, in fact, must be, before 24 hours have expired following his arrest.

Many areas of the province would not support the concept of a full-time JP round the clock and it is in that type of situation that the fee-earning JPs have been very valuable. There are other areas—Metropolitan Toronto for example—where full-time justices of the peace are on duty, in effect, around the 24-hour period. The per capita cost for fee-earning JPs in Metro is significantly lower than in other areas of Ontario because they do have the full-time salaried JPs on duty in certain Metropolitan areas.

What I am saying in essence, Mr. Speaker, is that it seems at the present time there is a necessity for a blending of the two. When there is a fee-earning JP who is receiving X dollars per year to equal or exceed what a full-time man would get I would agree that probably one must substitute one for the other. I would like to point out that for most of the JPs who earn substantial fees, those are gross, out of which they must pay their secretarial staffs.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I'll just say that in 1973-1974 there were only five out of 394 who billed in excess of \$20,000 for that year. The individual referred to in today's article in the Star was one of the five.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the Attorney General tell us why this anachronistic system is allowed to continue, notwithstanding the criticism levelled in this House on many occasions; notwithstanding the opinions held by the minister's esteemed predecessor, Mr. Wishart; notwithstanding the recent recommendations by His Honour Judge Pringle, who caustically commented in the Landmark report that the least the minister could do for the JP out in the peninsula was to give him enough money to let him buy a filing cabinet? Surely the time has come for the minister to get the party hacks off the roll and give a full-time job to people at a reasonable wage.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question has been placed.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Is the member for Downsview applying for the job?

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): I don't mind that. It's when we have part-time registrars of the Supreme Court who don't know which way is up but the member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson) recommended them.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Bullbrook: The one the minister had before quit.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Roy: The minister wouldn't know a writ from second base.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Ottawa Centre with a supplementary.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware that the fees paid to bailiffs in the small claims courts ranged as high as \$60,000 in 1973 and may be higher this year? What plans does the minister have to put these jobs on a salary basis rather than having this antiquated system prevail?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, sight unseen, I would deny that any bailiff received \$60,000 in fees in the small claims court in any one year.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I couldn't hear the hon. member's question because of the

noise in my left ear here. I understand it was not in order.

Mr. Cassidy: Yes, it was.

Mr. Speaker: We are talking about JPs. I understand this is about bailiffs and that's a different question completely.

Mr. Cassidy: It is also under the inspector of legal offices, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: That has nothing to do with the original question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: If the member's question had to do with what the member said, and judging from what has reached my ear here, it is not supplementary. The member may ask it again as a new question.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is this a true supplementary? The member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question of the minister: Does he have any plans to retire JPs when they reach the age of 65?

Hon. Mr. Clement: No, I do not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: That was not inherent in the first question—

Mr. Gaunt: I thought it was.

Mr. Speaker: Is the member for Ottawa East's question a supplementary?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Roy: I have a supplementary to the minister's reply, I believe, that there are about 648 part-time justices of the peace across the province. My first question is, has the number increased since 1968, since the McRuer report suggested there was an invitation to a conflict of interest between a justice of the peace and the police to get their business? If there has been an increase, surely there are not 648 areas in the province where we could not have full-time people in light of the fact that some of them are paid \$30,000 a year?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, I did not quote the figures for 1968. I thought I had made that clear. These are the most recent figures, as of August, 1974.

Mr. Roy: Are they greater than in 1968?

Hon. Mr. Clement: I don't know what the 1968 figures are, so I cannot make that assertion. I simply say the article in the Star today, which referred to that JP, went on to say that he had paid some, I believe, \$12,000 out of those gross fees for certain secretarial services performed by staff for whom he was responsible; therefore, he presumably netted \$17,000 or \$18,000 a year.

I can say that there are not 648 geographic areas because in many large areas where we do have part-time, fee-earning justices of the peace—

Mr. Breithaupt: Like Brampton.

Hon. Mr. Clement: —there are many on duty over the 24-hour period.

Mr. Roy: In Brampton we could have full-time people.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Maybe we could, and maybe we couldn't. I share the member's concern; if a person is available 24 hours a day, that is a very decided advantage over those full-timers who work, say, 9 to 5. We still have to supplement them by a blended system. In a large area like Metropolitan Toronto we do have full-time, salary-earning JPs available around the clock; and that would be the ultimate. But there is no saving in having that sort of a justice of the peace in Rainy River or remote areas of the province where they don't have the demands on them 24 hours a day. Therefore, we have to utilize the services of a part-time, fee-earning, justice of the peace.

Mr. Roy: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: No. Order please. This is becoming strictly a debate.

The member for Kitchener with further questions.

Mr. Roy: That was a leading question, Mr. Speaker. Can I put my case?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Does the member for Kitchener have any further questions?

Mr. Breithaupt: No.

Mr. W. Hodgson (North York): Sit down when the Speaker calls order.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Cassidy: On a point of order.

Mr. Lewis: There is a point of order.

Mr. Cassidy: Since my words were challenged by the minister, I would point out that in 1973 the fees paid to bailiff W. B. Vasey in Scarborough were \$58,000; and the fees paid to small claims clerk F. B. Brown in Scarborough were approximately \$62,000.

Hon. Mr. Clement: He has three bailiffs assisting him and three secretaries.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

An hon. member: That's how they let the old Tories fade away.

Mr. Singer: The one in St. Catharines cannot even afford—

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Scarborough West.

PORTRAYAL OF VIOLENCE BY COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY

Mr. Lewis: I want to ask the Premier, if I may, about the 1971 study to which I referred yesterday, perhaps not entirely accurately describing its contents—I don't really know, because I haven't seen the study—which however, is apparently in the hands of the government and I gather the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman) has refused to make it public.

Since the study bears directly on attitudes toward sex and violence in movies and contains a review of literature on public exposure to sex and violence in newspapers, on television and on film, wouldn't the Premier think it perhaps in the public interest that a study for which Ontario has paid \$17,000 or better should be tabled?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with the report, nor have I read it. I believe the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations dealt with the matter yesterday, and I would suggest that the member ask him about the report when he returns to the House.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary, the member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary, if I could, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. In fact, the minister did not deal with it yesterday—through no fault of his own; he wasn't asked. I am asking the Premier, as the person who appointed the LaMarsh commission and as a

person who talks much about permissiveness and such matters, does he not think this kind of expenditure of public funds in an area where he himself has expressed concern should then become a public document, rather than this endless secrecy about government or commission studies, which I just don't understand.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'm not sure on just what basis the study was made, whether it is confidential or not confidential, or whether the results of the study would be appropriate for distribution.

Mr. Roy: He said \$22,000.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will find out and discuss it with the minister. I just haven't read the study myself. I don't know whether it deals with permissiveness. I have made a few observations about that in the past two or three years; and I could again today, if the member would like me to.

Mr. Lewis: I am sure he could.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Is that a threat or a promise?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Carleton East. Supplementary?

Mr. P. Taylor (Carleton East): Supplementary to the Premier: Can the Premier say whether or not his government has at any time requested in writing that the federal government undertake such a survey as Miss LaMarsh will be doing?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can't recall personally communicating to the Prime Minister—I'm sure I'm right in this—or any other minister requesting such a study be made. I really think that if they felt there was need for such a study, they have the capacity to make this determination themselves. If the member for Carleton East really is saying that perhaps it is their responsibility to do this and they should have provided the leadership, rather than the Province of Ontario, he'll get no argument from me. But I just state the fact that they have not, and we are.

Mr. Roy: Did the Premier ever approach them?

An hon. member: No leadership.

Mr. Roy: Did the Premier ever approach the feds?

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He can talk against it as much as he wants. I am delighted every time he opens his mouth about it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Public concern is the only motivation we have.

Mr. Roy: Credibility is the Premier's problem.

Mr. Speaker: Order please; the hon. member for Scarborough West has the floor.

LAKE SIMCOE PROPERTY DISPUTE

Mr. Lewis: What is the Minister of Natural Resources now going to do about the furor he's created in the Beyak land case?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: What am I going to do? Well, Mr. Speaker, I am meeting this afternoon with the reeve of the township of Georgina. I understand there has been some solidarity expressed among that particular council and—

Mr. Lewis: Solidarity?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, within the council.

Mr. Lewis: I think one could call it that, yes.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: So I want to get his views. I will listen to him before making any decision.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary. How is it that the minister's parliamentary assistant, excellent chap that he is, the member for Parry Sound (Mr. Maeck) and—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Only the minister is not applauding.

Mr. Lewis: —a man whom the minister so casually betrayed but an excellent fellow nonetheless—how is it that the minister would have him put in writing that no licence of occupation would be granted before consultations with the municipality, which specifically requested the minister not to grant the licence, and before the end of litigation, which was continuing? How does the minister issue a licence in direct contravention of what his parliamentary assistant has written to the party involved?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the hon. member, if he would go

into depth in that particular file, he would find the reasons for it.

Mr. Lewis: I have.

An hon. member: What are the reasons?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I would point out to him that my parliamentary assistant, and I was very pleased he recognized his talents because I think he is one of the finest—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Why doesn't the minister recognize it?

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Why does the minister overrule him then?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —parliamentary assistants that this government has, and I recognize him for it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that commitment was given last November by my parliamentary assistant—

Mr. Lewis: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —that we would withhold any further decision until the court case was completed or at least taken forward. Since that time, Mr. Slan has been on my parliamentary assistant's back, literally; he has phoned him on numerous occasions. He has had his lawyer phone him.

Mr. Lewis: He is a citizen demanding redress.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: My parliamentary assistant is tired of carrying him on his back. But it came to a point when Mr. Slan indicated to the public that we would be making a decision and he demanded a decision from us. This was the decision we were prepared to deal with last November provided he went along with the court case. That has never come about and it's been about two years in the coming.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? The member for Scarborough West has a supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have one. Is the minister meeting this afternoon or whenever because he is now prepared to reconsider the decision he gave, which flies in the face of the municipal solidarity and other requests which have been made of him?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It's not a change of pace, Mr. Speaker. It may be new information come to light in the public interest and I'm prepared to listen to that.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview with a supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: That's an interesting way to describe a retreat.

Mr. Singer: Would the minister explain why, in face of the positive undertaking in that letter—and I read the letter—that there would be consultation with the municipal council before any decision was taken, he made a decision without consulting with the municipal council and flew in the face of the municipal council's positive opinion?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I was led to believe there was this consultation with the municipal representatives.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

RENT INCREASES

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I have a question of the Minister of Housing in, I hope, a non-combative way, if that's possible.

Mr. Breithaupt: It will never happen.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Pray continue.

Mr. Deans: The minister won't understand it anyway.

Mr. Lewis: If members of the Legislature bring to the minister cases of what appear to be unreasonable rent increases and he is prepared to review them—although I know he cannot reduce the rents—would he be prepared, where he felt it legitimate, to recommend to the landlord a reduction in rent or make a suggestion that the rent was too high?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at the audacity of the leader of the NDP again. I have just sent him an article—

Mr. Lewis: I said non-combative. What's wrong with the minister?

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Don't fight back.

Mr. Lewis: Why is the minister turning my normal restraint into aggression?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I am starting off very quietly. I am trying to restrain myself because I know the member's nerves are at a really high key these days.

Mr. Lewis: I am as relaxed as can be.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I don't know why, because he won't be around for too long. Mr. Speaker, I have just passed 15 letters—

Mr. Deans: I think the minister should resign. I think the job is too much for him.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —or so over to the leader of the NDP—

Mr. Stokes: Why the facade? Answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —saying to him that there wasn't enough information provided.

An hon. member: Look who's talking.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: It looks to me as though they are form letters that maybe the member for Parkdale provided to some people in his riding. I'm not sure.

Mr. Deans: I don't think the minister understands the problem.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: In any event, the idea is—I also pointed out to the leader of the NDP that he should check the Star of April 22 in which it said the poor are the ones who lose when we have rent review boards and rent controls.

Mr. Breithaupt: We are not asking for rent control.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Can the member not understand? How many times do we have to go over this deal? I am trying to ask him again to understand that we're looking after the poor of Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is looking after the poor in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Yes, and we're going to protect them by not putting them into a worse box, as the poor have been in London, England, where they had rent controls and rent reviews. All I'm saying to you, Mr. Speaker, and the leader of the NDP—

Mr. Deans: What is the minister doing?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —is that as a socialist he has no idea how to provide housing for Ontario. Why doesn't he recognize it?

Mr. Deans: That applause was pretty weak.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is this a supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, it is.

Mr. Speaker: I'm sorry; I was asking the member for Parkdale.

Mr. Duszta: Mr. Speaker, what the minister said doesn't meet fully with what I have done. I have gone around this apartment

building after receiving a call from one of the residents of an apartment that his rent went up by 33.7 per cent.

An hon. member: What's the question?

Mr. Foulds: It's a point of privilege.

Mr. Duksza: I think I have given him enough information. I have responded to a need from my constituents. I see no reason for the minister to imply that I have done anything wrong.

Mr. Foulds: Resign.

Mr. Speaker: I accept the member for Parkdale's explanation. The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: It was a point of privilege not a question.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I couldn't hear it.

Mr. Deans: The minister doesn't hear very much very clearly.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the member for Scarborough West wish to proceed?

Mr. Lewis: Forgive me.

Mr. Deans: The minister aggravates me so.

Mr. Lewis: I don't care what Beland Honderich's editorial said.

Mr. Deans: He is really incompetent.

Mr. Lewis: My colleague from Parkdale will deal with the minister.

Mr. Deans: The minister should be replaced.

Mr. Lewis: The member is quite right about that.

Mr. Deans: The Minister of Housing is the worst minister in the government.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Will the hon. member for Scarborough West please continue and will the other people please hold their silence. Thank you very much.

Mr. Lewis: The comments being made were to the point. I want to try to ask him again, and I don't understand why it is impossible to elicit from him a commonsense, reasonable reply—

An hon. member: Because he doesn't know what it means.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: The member has had that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: If members of the Legislature bring to the minister individual instances of rent increases which he then judges to be too high—I am assuming a reasonable judgement—would he, under those circumstances, approach a landlord to reduce the rent or would he indicate himself what the rent reduction might be? That is all I am asking.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, again the leader of the NDP is only about three months behind the times. I have indicated to every member of this House that I have done that in the past and will continue to do so on a selective basis in the future.

Mr. Lewis: The minister would do that, okay.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: But not with that kind of nonsense the member gave me today.

Mr. Lewis: Well then, by way of supplementary, if the minister is prepared to engage in what is called a rental review and suggest a reduction of rents, why will he not allow that to be done by authoritative bodies on behalf of all the renters in Ontario rather than just a selected few?

An hon. member: Tell him.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, let the members of the NDP pound themselves into the ground, because that is exactly what they are doing when they talk about a rent review board or rent controls. They will never, never in the world convince me that is the way to provide accommodation for the people of Ontario or any other part of this country.

Mr. Foulds: The minister deliberately misunderstands the point.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I am saying to the members that this government will not, as far as I am concerned, subject the people to rent controls which we know won't work, or to a rent review board which has the same authority as rent controls. I am asking the members to understand the fact that the Province of Ontario has said it will supply housing if it gets co-operation from the federal and other related governments.

Mr. Deans: The minister is not doing that either. His whole housing programme is a flop.

An hon. member: Quiet fellows, quiet.

Mr. Lewis: The Minister of Housing is an impossible minister. He is probably a nice person, but an impossible minister.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: The leader of the NDP is an impossible member.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Rainy River.

PRE-ELECTION LITERATURE

Mr. Reid: May I ask a question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker? Is the Premier aware of a document that has been circulating in regard to the upcoming provincial election which says, and I quote: "The government is alienating practically every segment of the people of the province due to policies regarding teachers, public servants, organized labour, rural people—"

Mr. Foulds: Question?

An hon. member: What's the question?

Mr. Reid: "—and alienating municipal reeves, mayors and councils regarding zoning and land severance?"

Mr. Singer: He has already asked it.

Mr. Reid: Has the Premier seen that document?

Mr. Roy: Or the Premier's office?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted if the hon. member would send me a copy of it. It sounds more like a speech by the leader of the Liberal Party than a document. I mean it sounds like that rather positive, constructive way the Liberal Party is approaching all the issues in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: Careful, it could be a Tory who said it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't know. I know that the members may even find that it was sent out or distributed by somebody who is not totally content as a party member. I recognize that the member has a supplementary question, or he is attempting to make a point—

Mr. Lewis: Just be careful, it is Roy McMurtry.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and will probably tell me that it came from a member even. So, if I haven't destroyed the suspense of who it comes from, all he has to do is tell me who sent it out. All the member has to do is tell me who sent it out.

Mr. Martel: William Kelly.

Mr. Reid: A supplementary: In response to the Premier's question, Mr. Speaker, this is a document sent out to all Ontario PC members of Parliament from the federal government.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): In the federal government.

An hon. member: By the federal party.

ASBESTOS IN THUNDER BAY HARBOUR

Mr. Foulds: A question of the Attorney General: In view of the fact that the provincial government has had access to the NASA earth resources satellite photographs since 1973, which clearly show effluent containing asbestos from Reserve Mining in Silver Bay, Minn., finds its way into Thunder Bay and into Port Arthur's drinking water supply, is the minister considering taking action against Reserve Mining of Minnesota under the Boundary Waters Treaty Act of 1909 which prohibits the transboundary movement of pollutants?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't aware of the matter or the study referred to by the member. If he will send me some information on it, I will take a look at it. I wasn't aware of what he meant to speak of until this moment.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, I have one question of clarification as a supplementary. If the information bears fruit, would the ministry be prepared to lay such an action in view of the fact that the federal government has said pretty clearly in the House of Commons last week that it is a provincial responsibility?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether that Act referred to by the member confers jurisdiction on the Province of Ontario to bring such an action or not. I would have to take the opinion of my law officers. If, in their considered opinion, they felt success was a distinct likelihood, then presumably we would proceed in that direction. But there are so many "ifs" in the question, because I am not familiar with the facts, that I would say I would want to look at it before I would be in a position to advise the member and the members of the House validly as to what action we might consider.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa East.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS ON ORDER PAPER

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question directed to the Premier. It involves the right of members of this House to get accurate information pertaining to questions on the order paper. I had a question, Mr. Speaker, dealing with the private members of the Conservative caucus who were sent outside Canada on behalf of a ministry or agency since Oct. 21, 1971. The response to my question was from one ministry only, the Ministry of Natural Resources, and it involved the member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan) going to some horticultural garden inspection and costing \$57.92.

Would the Premier undertake, first of all, to see to it that all ministries and agencies respond accurately to this type of question. And could the Premier explain who paid for the trip for four members, the member for Scarborough Centre, the member for Humber (Mr. Leluk), the member for Dovercourt (Mr. G. Nixon), and the member for Lanark (Mr. Wiseman), to Taiwan and who paid for the trip for the member for Prescott and Russell (Mr. Belanger) to Louisiana? Would the Premier undertake to get me that information?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Why doesn't the member ask the question?

Mr. Roy: That was the question. Wasn't the Treasurer listening?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to get all of this information for the hon. member. I think he will be surprised at just how little, if any, private members have travelled at the request of a ministry.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Cochrane South.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He may only find one.

NATURAL RESOURCES SCIENCE CENTRE

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism. Has his ministry had an opportunity now to review the study by Raymond Moriyama on the natural resources science centre proposed for Timmins. If they have had a chance to review it, what position are they taking in the ministry about going ahead with this project?

Hon. C. Bennett (Ministry of Industry and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, yes, we have had

an opportunity to look over the report that was submitted on the Timmins science centre. As he knows, as the member for that area, we have been having discussions with the municipal council as to the availability of the best location for the establishment of the science centre in Timmins. I have made it very clear to the mayor that until we get some indication from the municipal council as to exactly how we can acquire the land and if it is going to be made available we are not in the position to go ahead with any further announcements on the science centre.

Mr. Ferrier: Supplementary: Has the ministry made a definite decision that it must be the Hollinger property or is it prepared to look at other sites as far as that project is concerned?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, the report that we have on the science centre for Timmins very clearly involves some of the structures that are presently on the Hollinger site. Obviously, if we are to move away from that site, the project takes on an entirely different view and a whole different type of scheme will have to be designed for the Timmins area.

I repeat, the plan basically would be for the Hollinger site. If we move away from it, it will take time to sit down again with the municipal council, with the chamber of commerce and other interested groups to try to decide how we would approach the subject and in what other location it would serve the northern part of the province even to a greater extent.

Mr. P. J. Yakubuski (Renfrew South): Kirkland Lake would make quite an acceptable site.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kent.

CANADIAN BOOK WHOLESALE CO.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): I have a question of the Minister of Culture and Recreation. Is he concerned by the latest erosion of the Canadian publishing industry, whereby six months ago after a takeover of the Canadian Book Wholesale, at which time it was promised that all orders would be filled by Canadian agents, the company has turned around now and stated that all orders will be filled in the United States with the Canadian Book Wholesale offices only billing and collecting for orders shipped from the United States? Since the government indicated some concern about the book publishing industry two years ago, when a royal commission re-

port came out, is the minister prepared to do anything about this situation, particularly in view of the fact that 56 Canadians are employed and are being laid off at the present time since the United States takeover of this company?

Hon. R. Welch (Minister of Culture and Recreation): What was the name of that company again?

Mr. Spence: The Canadian Book Wholesale Co. in Scarborough Centre here in Metropolitan Toronto.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, there are many points covered in the hon. member's question. It is a very legitimate question—in fact a very important one. I'd like the opportunity to review it, and I'd be glad to provide the member with the information he requests.

Mr. Spence: I will send the publication over to the minister.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay.

MERCURY POLLUTION

Mr. Stokes: I have a question of the Premier. Has it ever been established by any ministry of the government as to whether or not the majority of the high content of mercury in fish in northwestern Ontario was attributable to an industrial source as opposed to natural leaching? If so, in view of the tremendous social and health consequences that it poses for many residents of northwestern Ontario, is the government contemplating recovering at least a portion of the cost of assisting those people from the offending company?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be more appropriate if the member for Thunder Bay were to direct that question to the Minister of the Environment.

Mr. Stokes: May I do that then?

Mr. Speaker: Would you redirect it?

Hon. W. Newman (Minister of the Environment): Would the member repeat his question, please?

Mr. Martel: That's an alert group over there.

Mr. Stokes: In view of the high content of mercury in fish and the economic and health consequences that it poses for many

people in northwestern Ontario who rely heavily on fish as their main diet, has the ministry determined whether or not the high incidence of mercury in fish was attributable to natural leaching or to some industrial undertaking? If the ministry has come to that conclusion, does it intend to recover at least a portion of the cost from the offending company?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, that's a very good question. Some of the mercury is in natural form in some of the lakes, as the hon. member well knows, and some of it came from industrial sources which have been cleaned up by ministerial orders. It's no longer being allowed by the companies to flow out with wastes.

As for compensation, I believe this matter or substitution of some other form of protection is under discussion at this point in time. I believe the member could ask the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. I think he and the Minister of Natural Resources are going up there or are meeting with the native people in the very near future.

Mr. Stokes: Supplementary, just a quick one: Does the minister intend to ask the offending company to assist with the problems, which might solve some of the concerns of the native people in those areas?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, this would all be part of our deliberations.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

QUINN ENTERPRISES

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Revenue. Could the Minister of Revenue advise whether he or his department has considered the possibility or the probability of prosecuting Quinn for failure to transmit tax collected by him, as has been done in the case of many people who have failed to transmit? If not, why the delay? Has he consulted the law officers of the Crown to figure out the proper method of proceeding with such prosecution?

Hon. A. K. Meen (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, the question of tax collection is something I don't think I'm free to discuss fully in the House.

Mr. Roy: Why not?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I can say that the ministry has taken the necessary steps to protect its

interests. Of course in the action by Clarkson which has one of its staff as the receiver and who is, therefore, operating the Quinn Enterprises operation, our interests are known and we are in touch with him and he is conversant with the nature of the interests of the ministry.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, wouldn't the minister agree that when a person resident in Ontario is able to finance his business by borrowing through tax arrears at nine per cent when he couldn't do it through the bank, the least he deserves from the government of Ontario is that appropriate charges be laid against him under the appropriate statute?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, I have not considered that kind of action at the moment, but I certainly will take a look at whatever provisions there are in the Act.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

COST OF LAND FOR H.O.M.E. PROJECTS

Mr. Deans: Thank you Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Housing. Is the minister prepared to table in the House all of the costs related to the acquisition and development of the lands used under the HOME programme in Bramalea, in Hamilton, and in Saltfleet Mountain, and the equivalent price charged or appropriated against the lands for the purpose of rental?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: For what purpose, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Deans: For the rental of the land.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I haven't got any reason at this particular time not to table that information. I wonder why the hon. member is asking the question—

Mr. Deans: I am sure he does.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I will look into it and find out whether or not I will table it. There may be something of significance that would be good to table, but maybe not. Generally, when the hon. member asks a question, there is not too much of importance in it. I'll determine that.

Mr. Lewis: Will the minister stop this? He is very rude, extremely rude.

Hon. S. B. Handleman (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Relations): We apologize!

Hon. Mr. Meen: We are broken up.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I would like to know whether the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, now he is here, is going to table the report which was the subject of discussion in this House yesterday?

Hon. Mr. Meen: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Lewis: Sure it is a point of order.

Mr. Deans: It's a question he answered outside.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I take that as a question rather than a point of order, and at the present time the only answer I can give the hon. member is, no, I haven't even had an opportunity to read it yet.

Mr. Deans: What difference does that make?

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Mr. Lewis: Excuse me. On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order please! The hon. member asked a question after the question period had expired.

Mr. Lewis: I would like to put a point of order which may be more in order.

Mr. Speaker: We will try it. What is the point of order?

Mr. Lewis: Thank you for letting me try it. I want to know whether it is appropriate for the minister of the Crown outside the House to say no, he will not table a given report, and then to give a rather different interpretation, a lesser interpretation inside the House. Do you not think the Legislature deserves the same courtesy? Can I ask the Speaker to have the minister inform us specifically of his intentions?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. That is beyond the Speaker's control. It is not a point of order; there is nothing out of order in the proceedings of the House.

Mr. Lewis: Can I have a copy of the report?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: No.

Mr. Lewis: No? Why not?

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.
Motions.

Mr. Lewis: Table it. We challenge the minister to table it. What is in that report that is causing him such anxiety? I had better be with the minister when he reads it, as a matter of fact.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It would be a contest to see who falls asleep first.

Mr. Lewis: Table it, then, if it's that kind of a document.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Introduction of bills.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH ACT

Mr. Martel moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act for the promotion and protection of the Health and Safety of Persons engaged in Occupations.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to consolidate matters dealing with health and safety of workers and place them under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Labour. The bill also establishes a department to be part of the Ministry of Labour which is responsible for research and the setting and enforcing of standards to protect workers.

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day, I beg to inform the House that I have received a notice from the member for Ottawa East—

Order please! With considerable background noise in the Legislature, it is difficult to transact the business of the House.

I beg to inform the House that I received a notice from the member for Ottawa East that he is dissatisfied with the answer given to him by the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch), concerning a list of architects, which was asked on March 26. The member for Ottawa East intends to raise this question again at the adjournment proceedings at 10:30 this evening.

The same member has also filed notice that he is dissatisfied with the answer of the same minister, the Provincial Secretary for Social Development, to his question of April 8 concerning the government involvement with the Ottawa teachers' strike.

Further, I have received a notice from the member for Port Arthur that he is dissatisfied with the answer given by the Minister of

the Environment on Thursday, April 17, concerning asbestos fibres in Thunder Bay harbour. The member for Port Arthur intends to raise the matter at the appropriate time on the adjournment of the House this evening.

These three matters will be debated at 10:30 this evening.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House. The second order, House in committee of the whole.

RETAIL SALES TAX AMENDMENT ACT (concluded)

House in committee on Bill 30, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

On section 4:

Mr. Chairman: I believe we were dealing with Mr. Renwick's amendment. With the permission of the House, to refresh the memories of the members of the committee, I will repeat his amendment:

That section 4 of Bill 30 be amended to delete from subsection 3, paragraph 49, and renumbering paragraph 49a to be paragraph 49 and renumbering paragraph 49a to be 49.

The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): The member for St. David (Mrs. Scrivener) isn't here. I was going to reassure her that I will not run in her riding, since I understand she has certain fears about that, Mr. Chairman.

I wanted to bring to the Minister of Revenue's (Mr. Meen) attention the tables that appeared in the budget document itself and ask him, as an errand boy for the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), to maybe draw the matter to the Treasurer's attention, since by now we despair of getting any substantive reply to this amendment from the minister himself.

The figures on public and private investment that were included in the estimates for the Ontario economy, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The Chair is having difficulty in hearing the hon. member. I'm wondering if we could have a little more order in the committee. Order, please.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): There are a lot of unruly Tories in the House today.

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Chairman, the member called the minister an errand boy for the Treasurer. That is certainly improper.

Mr. Cassidy: It's true.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: The Treasurer has come in to hear the bill debated.

Mr. Cassidy: Oh, the Treasurer is here. I'm glad to see that. Maybe the Treasurer will have some comments, Mr. Chairman. I don't want to recapitulate the comments that were made last night, but I would point out to the Treasurer and to the Minister of Revenue that the area of investment which is expected to lag the most in 1975 is the area of residential construction. And in 1974 the spending on residential construction was estimated at \$3 billion. That was anticipated at \$3.3 billion in 1975, an increase of only 10 per cent. In fact, with the increase in construction costs, it would probably be a drop in real terms.

Non-residential construction under this government is expected to rise by 24 per cent in 1975, or by a total of \$1 billion from \$4.2 billion in 1974 to \$5.2 billion in 1975. That's an increase of \$1 billion, compared to an increase of only \$300 million in residential construction. The capital investment in machinery and equipment in 1975 was anticipated to be \$5 billion, an increase of 16 per cent, or an increase of \$700 million.

I've searched in vain, Mr. Chairman, to find out whether the figures that are given in these tables are predicated on the budget having been passed and the reduction of sales tax being in force or not; I just don't know what the case is there. But I suspect that even if the assumption was that the budget was in force, the additional spending on machinery and equipment which might be triggered by this measure, if the Treasurer had his way—although we doubt it might take place—but if it were triggered by that it would take place mainly in 1976 and not in 1975. It seems to me that most of the 16 per cent increase in machinery and equipment investment anticipated for this year would be because of investment intentions already formed at the time the budget came into force.

If that is the case, Mr. Chairman, one has to ask why is it that the government is willing to devote \$400 million in incentive or investment or whatever you want to call it to the area of machinery and equipment investment on the one hand when it does so little in the area of residential investment, which is rising by only 10 per cent? What sense of social priorities exists at a time of a very sharp housing crisis in the province when non-residential construction—which is shopping plazas, highrise office buildings and that

kind of thing—increases by \$1 billion and the amount being spent on residential construction rises by only \$300 million?

That is one of the reasons I'm concerned, Mr. Chairman, because it seems to go contrary to the emphasis or the direction taken by the minister in his budget. The minister seems to stimulate the machinery investment sector. We are saying it is the residential construction sector which could create jobs now, which would meet a social need now and which could help us get out of our economic problems now. We should do it while there is slack in that particular industry rather than ship jobs abroad by additional spending, if in fact any such occurred in machinery investment.

I also wanted to bring briefly to the minister's attention some rather surprising remarks made in February by the Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell). We know the Minister of Energy is not a heavyweight within the government; I'm not sure for whom he speaks, apart from himself.

It was a most surprising speech as he said he believes there is little support for doctrinaire socialism in Ontario. He said, "I have become convinced that there is equally little hostility to some government involvement in business when the people are satisfied that it serves their ends."

He goes on to talk in quite discursive detail about public power; about the Syn-crude deal which he calls the wave of the future; about the degree of public ownership in oil, steel, automobiles, transportation and in other major industries in North America, Britain, Europe, Australia and the United States. It is really quite a glowing panegyric to the idea that there is a place for the public sector to go into areas which this government has traditionally reserved for the private sector.

The reason I raise that, Mr. Chairman, is that the minister is sent out as a stalking horse in order to see what the reaction might be to these particular comments and in so doing the government is acknowledging that, as the Minister of Energy says: "Canada is an island which is quite out of step with the rest of the world." You don't have to accuse the New Democratic Party of this province of being ahead of its time. If anything we may even be behind our time by comparison with other provinces and other countries. An island in a sea of change is what the minister had to say.

One has to ask what is it about this government that when you have \$400 million and you've decided you want to put it into

industry you put it in the form of a give-away which goes into industrial profits rather than in the form of an investment which will benefit the public over the long term by giving public participation in this investment which is being made.

If you were adamant about putting it into industrial investment, if you believe there is a genuine need for these funds in order to aid productivity and that kind of thing, it seems to me the public should get a return for those funds. The return should be in the form of some kind of equity or some kind of participation.

Better still, public initiative should be taken in order to create industries in this province which the private sector is not creating now. Public initiative and public funds should be used in order to take industry to parts of the province where the economic opportunities are not the same as those which exist here in the golden heart of Ontario's economy, within a 75-mile radius of Queen's Park.

Those are the two points I wanted to raise, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Energy is flirting with socialism. The Minister of Revenue says it is anathema, as does the Treasurer, and as a consequence is giving money out, unbidden, unsolicited one might even say, to private industry in quantities that probably surprises them. The purpose of that is probably linked to the anticipated decline of corporate profits this year from the exceptionally high rate they reached in 1974 far more than to any economic purposes.

We simply find this whole give-away operation unacceptable. We think that lines ought to be drawn between this party and the government party. We think it's very clear that it isn't just the government party which supports this kind of unsolicited, unqualified, untied, no-strings-attached handout to the private sector; but it bears mentioning, Mr. Chairman, that that is also true of the Liberal opposition. Last night during the course of the debate there was not a peep of protest against this measure from any member of the Liberal opposition.

Hon. A. K. Meen (Minister of Revenue): Sure, they are supporting it.

Mr. Cassidy: They are just as much in bed with the corporate sector as is the government. It's the same kind of—

Hon. Mr. Meen: They see the wisdom of it.

Mr. Cassidy: They are in bed with them in the same way the Tories were in bed with the Liberals over similar kinds of concessions

to the corporate sector up in Ottawa in the years between 1972 and 1974.

We deplored it in Ottawa. We deplore it here. We believe there are far better means by which you could spend your money and we will not support this kind of handout.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Your whole objection is deplorable.

Mr. Cassidy: The whole objection is deplorable? Well, you can feel that way. I realize the minister disagrees with me, and he will take this to the public. The Minister of Housing (Mr. Irvine) will take his position on tenants to the public and the Minister of Revenue his position on handouts to big business and industry to the public, and we will see what the public judgement is when the time comes for the reckoning in a few months.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I had an opportunity overnight to give some further thought to the problem of what we are trying to express to the government. I want to try very briefly to synopsise what the position of this party is as distinct from the mythology of industry, the mythology of the federal Minister of Finance, the mythology of the provincial Treasurer in Ontario and the mythology of some of the leaders of the major segments of industry in the Province of Ontario.

There is no question whatsoever that the economy must operate at a level which will produce the kinds of jobs which will permit satisfying work for those in the labour force and will increase the number of jobs in order to provide jobs that are satisfying to those who are entering the labour force and protect those already in the labour force from the elimination of their jobs by obsolescence and other means. There is no question about that.

The mythology part of it, of course, is that government must in some way grant tax concessions to industry, of inordinately and excessively large amounts on aggregate bases, for the purpose of achieving that basic end. If I can just recapitulate, it is the kind of mythology which is reiterated time and time again by finance ministers, including this minister in his budget this year and in the provisions which he has to extend the period for the fast write-off provisions. Here are the words of the federal Minister of Finance when he gave his budget on May 6, 1974, which of course the federal

Conservative Party permitted the Liberal Party to get away with because of the non-sensical economic programmes of the federal branch of the Conservative Party. The Minister of Finance at that time said, and I quote simply to pick up the trend of what I was trying to say last night:

The first element in our strategy against inflation has been and continues to be the expansion of supply. The central features of that policy have been in place for some time. Our fiscal and monetary policies have been designed to bring the economy up to full capacity growth. We have taken measures to increase the capability of the economy to produce efficiently the goods and services which are needed. This not only increases our production capacity but it also creates remunerative and satisfying jobs, relieves shortages and reduces cost. The reduction of taxes on manufacturing and processing is clearly bringing about just such a massive increase in capacity.

The tax exemption which is being granted by the government in the course of the bill which is now before us and which amounts to \$108 million over the balance of this year and \$410 million over the life of the programme, falls within that so-called reduction of taxes on manufacturing and processing to which the Minister of Finance of the federal government refers.

That is mythology. We can't ever seem to break through to the government that that is mythology, because the government listens only to the constant and continuous remarks which are made by bankers and by leaders of industry, in various parts of the country but mainly in the Province of Ontario.

I refer specifically to the statement by Page Wadsworth, the chairman of the board of the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, at the annual meeting on Dec. 10, 1974, as another way of stating the same kind of mythology:

It is quite clear that only by having an adequate rate of investment can we guarantee the existence of a sufficient degree of productive potential to give us continued growth and prosperity for the future. [It's a trite saying and we don't disagree with it.] In fact, dealing with the short-term outlook, there is far too often a tendency to ignore the implication of various policies and developments for longer-term trends.

Over the past two decades, the three levels of government, either at the initiative of the people of Canada or, more frequently, through their own initiative [which

is a delightful phrase] have greatly enlarged their role in Canadian society. Their increased share of the gross national product is to an important extent attributable to the very sharp rise in government revenues, which has resulted from a tax structure with an enormously powerful revenue-generating capacity.

I go on to quote a little bit further on.

I have already referred to the major challenge we face in the provision of an assured flow of capital to improve Canada's ability to produce. Over the longer term, there is only one criterion which can ensure the expansion of capacity—a fair return on savings and investment within a relatively stable economic and political framework.

The Canadian economy is now in the midst of an investment boom following insufficient capital outlays in the 1967-1972 period. With the benefit of hindsight the lack of investment in that period was the most undesirable occurrence with serious implications for both growth and price performance. Major contributing factors to the atmosphere of uncertainty that caused this situation were the federal government's stop-go economic policies and the drawn-out decisions on tax reform.

We do not want government-made uncertainty, for we have enough uncertainties as it is. When one considers that capital requirements may be in the order of \$500 billion over the next decade, responsible actions by all levels of government and society are an absolute necessity. Current federal-provincial squabbles over resource dollars are not in the spirit of the co-operation which is so desperately needed. The resource industries have traditionally been the backbone of our economy and a lack of sufficient new investment in this area could lead to serious shortages and problems in the years to come.

What Page Wadsworth is obviously saying is, simply, that there is going to be a continuing boom in capital investment because of the demand which is being generated in the economy by the people who are in the economy. That does not require this kind of excessive handout to industry in the Province of Ontario for them to meet the very demand which will be generated by causes other than the reduction in taxes.

I turn now, very briefly, to the remarks which were made by Howard Hart, the president of the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association, at the annual meeting of that associa-

tion in January of this year. He states the situation very carefully and very clearly. He doesn't bemoan the need for tax incentives to be granted to that industry:

CPPA is currently engaged in compiling its annual survey of the capacity to be added in the Canadian industry. It indicates that there will be an average annual growth of 2.7 per cent between 1974 and 1977. The increase is spread through the various product groups and is occurring almost entirely in existing mills. This is a modest increase, similar in proportion to that going forward in other major producing countries. It is considerably below the long-term average increase of about five per cent in the world paper and paper-board consumption. The current situation is, therefore, quite different from that which we faced in 1970 when a large number of new mills were being completed around the world, just as demand reached a temporary plateau. Having entered earlier downturns with a bad case of oversupply, we entered this one running full.

My own estimate is that the average operating rate for the industry overall in 1975 will exceed 90 per cent of effective capacity. I see 1975 as the year in which the buyers and sellers of pulp and paper around the world will move to supply long-term supply arrangements that will be advantageous in the years ahead. I see this particularly in the current thinking of customers in the European community.

Only six months ago we were dealing with the problems of shortages. We will likely have to do so again early next year and thereafter until such time as our products generate a rate of return sufficient to justify major increases in manufacturing capacity. In the meantime, 1975 will be a normal and satisfactory year for pulp and paper operations—not as strong as we would like it, but certainly not bad.

He faces up to the fact that on a world market what they depend upon is the price their products can generate, which will determine ultimately whether or not they will expand the capacity of the pulp and paper industry in the Province of Ontario and elsewhere through Canada.

We all know what happened. We read it day in and day out in the press at the period of time. It had nothing to do with the government expenditures; nothing to do with tax measures. Bad judgement caused an over-capacity in the pulp and paper industry during the period to which references were

made, in the latter part of the 1960's and in 1970.

That industry is quite capable of looking after itself. It doesn't need this kind of incentive with respect to the increase in capacity. Operators know very well that if they apply the kind of intelligence in the oligopolistic market they have in Canada and the major control which they have over substantial segments of the newsprint market in the United States, they know very well that their capacity will adjust in terms of the prices they will get for their products. And they know very well they do not need tax transfers by way of tax concessions through the taxation system, either of this province or of the federal government.

What do we come to then? We come to the mining industry. And we find that Alfred Powis, the president of Noranda, brings himself before the Canadian Club on Feb. 3, approaching the assignment with something of abject terror: He says: "The fact that I am standing up here today is a tribute to the powers of persuasion of the chairman."

If, in fact, the president of Noranda has a sense of abject terror when he is speaking to the Canadian Club after the results of the Noranda Corp. in its Canadian operations and its worldwide operations during the year 1974, then you can imagine what would happen to him if, in fact, he had had a bad year.

If he was an object of abject terror in January of this year after the results of the mining operations of the Noranda Co. in 1974, I suggest to the minister that I don't know how he would describe himself if the Noranda empire had a bad year. There is no conceivable way that he could describe himself in any other terms.

What does he have to say? He has a most ambivalent term about their decision. He decries, as they all decry, government deficit. He calls for a decrease in government expenditure.

Do you know what they call for all the time? They call for not only the tax concessions to themselves, which are reverse forms of transfer payments, they are calling for a decrease in the transfer payments which are the cause of and the major reason for deficits in the governmental budgets across the country.

Why are the transfer payments necessary? Because the people in the country in the lower quintiles—the lowest 20 per cent or the lowest 40 per cent of the country—don't have the kind of incomes, the kind of jobs, the kind of opportunities which would in-

crease the kind of demands so that it would be possible for those industries to get by without this kind of concession. You just mark my words.

What they are saying is cut back the government expenditures insofar as they are transfer payments to the lower two quintiles of our population in order that they can exist; but give us further and more tax concessions and we will be fine because government then will cease to intrude upon us.

Mr. Powis goes on and makes this particular ambivalent statement about their own capital investment position. There is no explanation, mind you. He decries ideological statements, but there is not a single fact in the whole of the speech. He says this about Noranda's capital investment programme, after the kind of year which they had in 1974:

Noranda's situation may be fairly typical of what is happening. Looking at 1975, we found ourselves facing a sort of bad news-good news situation.

The bad news was that in the face of declining cash flow, the inadequacy of depreciation charges to cover needed replacements and the depressed state of the capital markets, we found it necessary to eliminate \$100 million from capital spending previously planned for 1975.

The good news was that with the impact of taxes and inflation on the economics of new development, we had little difficulty in finding projects which were worthy candidates for elimination.

If you could tell me what that particular ambivalent statement means, I would certainly like to have your explanation of it.

Then there was the cry of doom to the Canadian Club. There are a lot of workers who attend those Canadian Club luncheons in the Royal York Hotel or wherever the meetings are now held. His cry of doom is:

While the mining industry's problems are serious enough in themselves, in my mind they raise a number of questions of a very much more fundamental nature. Except in terms of degree, are the problems of public and political perceptions referred to earlier unique to the resources industries? Are the problems which compelled curtailment of our 1975 capital programme unique to Noranda, or for that matter to the resource industries? [Beautifully open-ended questions.]

With profits in disrepute and investor confidence shattered, how can the private sector finance the very large expenditures

needed in the years ahead? In fact, does it make any sense for corporations to embark on risky new projects when comparable assets are selling at a fraction of replacement cost on the stock markets?

Under the conditions we face in Canada today, will the private sector be able to do the job expected of it in the years ahead? If the private sector is to be crippled, what is going to take its place; and is this really what Canadians want? If the vitality of our economic institutions is being eroded, are our social and political institutions secure?

What a cry of gloom. Why does the government listen to this kind of rot from a man who heads one of the most successful mining operations, centred in Canada and operating throughout the world?

He goes on:

In the short run, business capital spending is supposed to be the main source of strength in the Canadian economy in 1975. If Noranda's current experience is being widely duplicated, this is going to be a year most of us will wish never happened.

About the only benefit which could flow from this might be a renewed public appreciation of the value of profits.

In strident terms, that's the message this government took. That's the message the federal government took. Do you know what he's saying? He's saying very, very clearly: "Unless you grant us more concessions, our business is going to contract and contract and contract. The anxiety which will be caused by the loss of jobs, by the depression of the economy, will continue, unless governments give us more and more tax concessions." In fact, from their point of view, eliminate taxes entirely. And then he said: "We will all come to the final realization of the value of profit in our community."

What a lot of rot; and why this government falls for it, I can't understand.

I'm going to end my remarks asking whether or not this minister, or his colleague the Treasurer of the province, would at least do what the Minister of Finance in Ottawa, when forced by the New Democratic Party prior to the last election, agreed to do. That is to provide a method in the Act by which a standing committee of this Legislature could review the result of a monitoring system introduced by this government to find out what jobs will be produced, what industrial capacity will be expanded, to what extent will jobs be lost because of the introduction of technological changes which will eliminate jobs.

What effect will these reductions have on the prices of the end products that these companies manufacture? Is it going to be possible, in any way, to discern how much of the additional revenues that may be generated by these companies, or of the taxes that may be paid, will be paid to foreign countries because most of the companies to which we are referring are substantially owned, in a very real sense, abroad?

Are you prepared to give consideration to that kind of problem? Are you prepared to indicate these things, as was done finally in the federal House before the last election—and I don't believe the committee has yet met to assess the report that came out in late November last year about the investment intentions of the 200 largest corporations in the country.

By way of refreshing the minds of the Treasurer and of the Minister of Revenue, I want to refer briefly to the result of the New Democratic Party intervention in the House of Commons on this very issue prior to the last federal election. On May 29, 1973, in tabling the ways and means motions, the hon. John Turner announced his intention to submit an interim report by April 1, 1974, on the effect of the tax concessions, and undertook "to provide an early occasion for this House to re-examine these tax incentives upon the request of 60 members."

His actual quotation was:

I am firmly convinced that these manufacturing incentives are vital to our national interests for reasons I have indicated on numerous previous occasions. However, I have been carefully following the public debate on this matter, and I am anxious to do everything reasonably possible to meet the legitimate concern that have been expressed about the various aspects of these proposals without impairing their effectiveness in achieving our objectives.

Hence, I wish to announce that it is my intention to put before this House, by April 1, of next year, an interim report based on the review and monitoring procedure which I described earlier. This will give members an early opportunity to begin to assess the results of these measures on the basis of facts and figures. Members will also have an opportunity to make constructive suggestions before the final report is submitted by the end of 1974. In this context, the government will include in the legislation a provision whereby Parliament will have a fresh opportunity to consider the incentives measures, upon the request of 60 members of this House—

And, of course, in this assembly 20 members of this House would be quite adequate for that purpose.

—and after the measures have been in force for a reasonable period of time, namely after April 1, 1974, the government will take the steps necessary to provide an early occasion for this House to re-examine these tax incentives and, if the House so decided, the measures would be withdrawn thereafter in whole or in part.

He went on at some length, and I don't intend to set out in detail the actual review procedure which was provided in the appropriate section of the Act. As far as I understand it, there is no correlative provision in the Corporations Tax Act of the Province of Ontario providing for such a review, and there certainly isn't one in the Retail Sales Tax Act which is before us for consideration.

That's my first request to the minister, amongst the many others that we have made in the course of the debate last night.

I would simply like to say that the position of the New Democratic Party is and always has been that if you provide the individual citizens in Canada in the Province of Ontario with the kind of economic livelihood which can be provided by providing the kinds of funds which are required to enable the lower 40 per cent, the lower two quintiles of the population in the Province of Ontario and in Canada to live properly, you will provide all of the demand which you need to provide for a domestically-oriented industry which will not be at the whim of the export market but to which the export markets will be a significant and important, but not dominating, part of the industrial trade and the mineral trade and the pulp and paper trade—in short, of the basic industries in the Province of Ontario.

We cannot allow and we cannot agree to these constant reverse transfer payments by way of tax concessions without any study of any kind. Consider, Mr. Chairman, the attempted studies, the attempted provisions which have been made, the long, drawn-out concern that has been expressed over the so-called poverty level, over the level that people need just to subsist, over the lower limits of the GAINS programme which has been introduced finally into the Province of Ontario; that problem has been studied to death. The problem of the working poor, the problem of the single-parent family, the problem of elderly people on pension, the problems that are faced by people who are unemployable; all of those problems have been studied to death in order to provide

them with a mere pittance of the number of dollars required in this economy.

And yet on the other hand, listening to men like Powis, listening to the bankers in their addresses from time to time, listening to the bankers in their addresses from time to time, listening to the whole mythology of the federal government, without even a single indication of any study to support any of the information which is available, you grant these fantastic concessions.

When we ask that social planning studies and other studies done by the government in the Ministry of Community and Social Services be tabled, they are usually tabled. At the federal level, all kinds of studies—the poverty study—are tabled. But when we ask the government of the Province of Ontario to justify in number of jobs, in price decreases, in support for export-oriented industries, in support of employment and its commitment that the replacement of obsolete equipment by technological equipment will not eliminate jobs; when we ask for that kind of information, you can read the budget from beginning to end and you can read the answers of the Treasurer and of the ministers to questions which have been put to them, and we have absolutely nothing.

All I am saying to the minister is to reorient the economic thinking of this government away from what the banks are saying and away from what the major components of industry are saying. Get around to understanding that these tax concessions are transfer payments to industry in excessively inordinate amounts, and that they are not required by industry; and that that same industry is calling for the elimination of government deficits, by the only way it sees as possible, which is to eliminate the transfer payments to those persons who need the transfer payments to maintain their relatively insecure economic position in our society. When that time comes you will begin to understand what we are talking about. As I said before, it is a difficult argument; it's hard to make. It's very difficult to be understood, but our position, and the position of this caucus, is so totally different from the conception of the provincial Progressive Conservative government in the Province of Ontario and the federal government at Ottawa, that we have taken up the time of the House in order to clearly state to you where we differ fundamentally and in essence from the attitude of the Tory government towards industry.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Chairman, I can see, just as clearly as the member for Riverdale and all the members would have me see, I suppose, the very clear difference between the two parties, the NDP on the one hand and the government on the other.

The NDP would hand out money without any particular recognition of the capacity of that same money if used in other ways to create jobs, to create a better balance of payments on the foreign market. The member for Riverdale refers to the reduction in tax on the purchase of production machinery by way of concessions, and calls them transfer payments. They're nothing of the sort. They're related to acquisition of manufacturing equipment, which by its very nature will create new jobs, new products, enable our industries to compete better in foreign markets, improve our balance of payments, improve the lot of Ontarians in every respect; and enhance and support the other thrusts which the Treasurer has put forth in his budget.

I think it's an extremely myopic approach. One would think the hon. member was wearing blinkers to hear him talk in terms of transfer payments on something as fundamental as the generation of new jobs and the expansion of industry and commerce to put ourselves in a better position in the economy. Not just here in Ontario; we can't live in isolation. We don't live in isolation from the rest of Canada, and we don't live in Canada in isolation from the rest of the world, as he would have us believe. The forces in the marketplace around the world affect us—they affect us adversely in many respects—and we've got to be able to compete in order to sell our wares. If we don't sell our wares it makes it even tougher for our people at home to get jobs—

Mr. Renwick: They don't need your concessions.

Hon. Mr. Meen: —to be able to have the money to be able to buy the properties they want and to be able to live the way we would want to have them all live.

Mr. Renwick: They don't need taxpayers' money in order to compete, and that is what you are giving them.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Mr. Renwick: It is a private-enterprise economy.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. The hon. minister has the floor. Order.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I listened very politely to the member for Riverdale throughout most

of his remarks, and I would ask him to extend the same kind of courtesy to me.

Mr. Renwick: I apologize, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The suggestion that he made for modification of the Act for some sort of standing committee to review the effect of the Act is an interesting one, although I don't think it need be in the Act. Any kind of select committee set up for the purpose some day could have those as its terms of reference. I think it is rather interesting.

He talked for three quarters of an hour without ever giving the Treasurer, who was in his seat, an opportunity to respond to some of the many questions that have been raised throughout this debate yesterday and today. Now, I regret to say, the Treasurer has had to leave as he did have another meeting to attend. I had hoped he would be able to stay to the end—

Mr. Renwick: All the Treasurer had to do was to stand up and we would have been delighted to hear from him.

Hon. Mr. Meen: No, he was never given the opportunity.

Mr. Renwick: I have never heard of his being that immodest.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The member didn't even direct one remark to him; he was quite clearly in his seat and listening to what the member was saying.

Mr. Cassidy: He could have entered the debate 10 minutes after it began.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I would suggest to the members that the federal approach where they agreed to set up this committee—whether it has ever been asked for, I don't know; but I can tell you that the committee, I am advised, has not met to determine the effect of the federal budgetary proposals of last year. So whether it's of any use or not, I don't propose to accept the amendment until that sort of thing is brought into the Act.

Mr. Cassidy: That is because the Tories are so indolent, that is the indolence of your federal colleagues.

Hon. Mr. Meen: But I think it would be appropriate at some time in the future to review the effects of budgetary frontal attacks on the economy, as we are making them in this budget. It would be interesting to analyse the Treasurer's various thrusts here. I am not unmindful of the fact that the Ministry

of Treasury and Economics has staff that presumably are doing this on an ongoing basis. But it would be nice to know just what the effect was, from sources such as the business community. I also understand, that the Treasurer, before he finalized his budget in late March and early in April, met with virtually all significant quarters of the business and investment community, and all others who could give him an input.

The Treasurer didn't develop this budget off the top of his head, so to speak, or in isolation just here in government circles. He went much farther afield than that in the level and extent of communication with the business and economic community. Certainly, he went as far as any Treasurer in the past, to the best of my knowledge; I venture to say perhaps further. He has had input from many quarters to determine what the needs were in order to get this economy turned around.

This element we are dealing with in paragraph 48 is for the reduction and removal for a period of time of the retail tax on production equipment. This is the one we are debating at the moment. It is clear that he has taken this route in concert with his other thrusts in his budget. It's one of many, and I therefore do not accept the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Riverdale, that paragraph 49 be deleted.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I hope we may pursue this. It is not really just an interesting proposal; it's already in effect.

I agree that the committee has not been convened in the federal House of Commons to deal with the question of the impact of these tax measures that were introduced some time ago, but at least they did try to monitor the industries that were the beneficiaries of these particular tax advantages.

They sent out a document, a questionnaire, which was to be returned. It asked most of the major questions which had to be asked. True, one can quarrel with the wording of some of the particular questions. One could be concerned that there might be some questions omitted that could be added.

If the minister is at all serious about the suggestion that a standing committee of this assembly or a select committee of this assembly would look into the effect of these concessions, which are granted to industry year in and year out it becomes—after a very short time—such a immovable part of our tax structure, then will he give consideration to the kind of questionnaire that was used by the federal government to obtain information?

Not through the federal government, but directly from the major segments of industry here, to find out to what extent these measures and the correlative measures of the fast write-off provisions to be included by extension in the Corporations Tax Act will produce the kind of results the minister and the government say they will.

We cannot take it any longer on faith that those results flow. You can't either, because you don't have that information—other than a kind of a blind Boy Scout optimism in the way in which this particular system works—and it doesn't work that way. The sooner you learn it the better.

The way to learn it, the way we can all learn it, and then we can have a kind of intelligent debate about it, is to adopt, with the necessary changes, the kind of review procedures, the kind of questionnaires, the tabling of the kind of reports that are an essential ingredient before there can be any intelligent study by elected members of this assembly through a standing committee or through a select committee.

If I may just say a word about the Treasurer. I know he's a very important public member of the ministry. It's his problem. We are in this House performing our function. All he had to do was to indicate he wished to comment in this debate and we would have, out of recognition of the public nature of his duties as a minister of the Crown, gladly granted him an opportunity. He knows it and you know it—and we won't listen to that kind of nonsense.

We've tried to have an intelligent debate on a question the minister wants to keep within narrow mechanical limits. I will give him credit for the fact that he has permitted the debate to be enlarged beyond that mechanical wall. He had very little alternative, but I give him credit for at least listening to the contra-position of this party, which is a major difference, as I have stated, between our party and the government party.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Renwick moves that clause—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): No, the minister hasn't had an opportunity to answer.

Mr. Chairman: Oh, I'm sorry.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I was just going to say, Mr. Chairman, that my ministry does have, within somewhat limited facilities, the capacity to explore with the taxpayers reporting to the ministry certain elements of the administrative side of the taxing statutes. I think I

would like to give some consideration to the possibility of expanding the exploratory nature of various circulars which my ministry sends out to industry, possibly in the interests of covering that end of things. It's a different role, as one can imagine, for the Ministry of Revenue, but it is an interesting one and has direct impact, of course, within the taxing statutes.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, assuming that the minister will give, as he has stated, some thought to it and that he has the capacity in his ministry, if he wishes to use it, to obtain that kind of information which is required, then I would suggest that the appropriate time we might deal with it, both from the point of view of the Retail Sales Tax Act and from the point of view of the Corporations Tax Act, is when the Corporations Tax Act is out in the standing committee of the whole House.

Perhaps we could discuss it at some length there and see whether or not under the Corporation Tax Act, as was done in the federal Income Tax Act, an appropriate amendment couldn't be drawn up to provide the kind of guidance and assistance we need in order to come to grips with this question.

I know the minister disagrees with my conception that these concessions to industry are reverse transfer payments. I know he does. I think it's a viable position, but that is what our position is. The magnitude of the amounts does not disguise the fact that they are transfer payments to industry. They are grants to industry of moneys which would otherwise be collected by the Ministry of Revenue. And in that sense they are direct transfer payments.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Renwick moves—

Mr. Lewis: No, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Just before you put the vote, I want to say to the minister that our reason for voting against the bill on second reading was as much for this clause as it was for the only-interim reduction in the sales tax. We wish that the five per cent be made permanent rather than have a terminal date of Dec. 31, 1975.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Well, in fact, I thought you felt more strongly on this one than you did on the other one.

Mr. Lewis: And we were very profoundly opposed to this as well, so that's why we stood our ground as we did on second reading; and our feelings about this, as you can see, persist into the debate on clause by clause. I was, unfortunately, unable to be here last night, but I have conscientiously read the entire Hansard proceedings of last night. That's quite a contrast—having read that report on pornography this morning and Hansard this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Meen: You must be a fast reader.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Did you notice much difference between the two?

Mr. Lewis: Well, Hansard is a little more erotic, but other than that it was much the same.

Mr. Breithaupt: It's far more explicit.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): There is far more violence in Hansard.

Mr. Lewis: I don't understand some of the processes in the House, and I suppose on an amiable Tuesday afternoon at 10 minutes to 4, when nobody is rushed, I might as well tell you parts of what I don't understand. I don't understand the process in the House that has the Minister of Revenue adopt the pretence that he is responsible purely for the mechanical collection of a tax, the kind of simple arrangement of enforcing or administering a statute, and is not at all responsible for the interpretation of that statute or a debate on the contents in ways beyond those that are purely mechanical. It's a very strange conception of parliament and a very strange conception of the ministerial role and I have never quite understood it. I suppose it's possible to say that the Treasurer fashions his budget in conjunction with a small coterie, probably a group of four. The same people who option land in Spencerville probably pull the budget together without sharing it with their colleagues until it is given to the Legislature with the full panoply of press and attention.

It seems to me, to the minister, through the Chair, that after the budget becomes fact and we move into a debate on the substantive legislation, the tax legislation, there is kind of a political and moral obligation to engage in matters of substance as well as matters of trivia. It becomes an obligation of the Minister of Revenue to be able to give the substantive arguments behind the government proposal for certain tax legislation without always hiding behind the proposition that he is merely the administrator perhaps.

In a sense you do yourself a great injustice because you understand, as much as anybody understands, the import of the bill. You have sat in cabinet and talked with the Treasurer and others about the reasons for the various statutory changes. You have discussed privately and at formal cabinet meetings, I am sure ad nauseam, the various economic decisions that have been made and the rationales which underlie them.

You would do that because you are naturally a curious man and you would do that because you're a cabinet minister and you share the confidences of the government. It seems to me most peculiar that the opposition should have to be debating a bill as fundamental as this one and be unable to elicit from you the reasons which underlie the legislative changes. That bothers me. I guess it bothers many of us in this House.

It's not simply an ideological difference. I'm not conveying it well; I'm trying to put it in more appropriate language. I'm not asking you for a clash of ideologies. Yes, we as socialists would not give handouts to corporations needlessly and you as Tories might feel that is a benefit. There's the ideological difference but there is something more important than the ideological difference here.

What is important is the need and obligation of a government to document publicly why it has made certain changes in tax law. The reason for a clause-by-clause debate in this House is to give us the opportunity to learn of the government's rationale, methodology, investigation of the documentation you have, the material you have and the work you have done. That's what this is all about and it offends that you find this process so irrelevant that you look upon this chamber with such contempt that you won't deal seriously in this kind of debate.

Don't smile at me, I tell the minister. If that is the role to which you are rendered by virtue of being a lesser, a kind of junior cabinet minister, fair enough, be man enough to admit it.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I've already said that.

Mr. Lewis: If you have said it, it doesn't mean we have to simply accept it at face value. I read through the Hansard; I don't know—were you embarrassed last night?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Not really.

Mr. Lewis: Not really embarrassed? A little embarrassed? Felt a trifle awkward? Thought to yourself, "How come I'm always the man who carries through the Land Speculation Tax Act and the non-resident Transfer Tax

Act and now the Sales Tax Act? How is it that I inherit the fray? What have I done to deserve the tempest, I, modest, friendly, unassuming Arthur? Why does all of this heat descend on me?" Don't you ever ask yourself that? Where is your self-respect in broad terms? Why isn't it possible for you to deal with us in substantive terms on an item like this? I don't understand the process.

Mr. Chairman, I have some specific questions. I'll wind it up but I want to make this observation in passing, that this debate, this kind of exchange is what destroys this Legislature. It is one of the things the Tories haven't understood in more than the 12 years that I have been here but particularly in the last four years.

This chamber is not used for an intelligent exchange of information. This chamber seems never to be used as a forum where the best that can be within a parliament is seen—a government defending its position on giving its evidence; an opposition probing the evidence and seeking more, and providing an alternative. This chamber is never used for that any more. This chamber is either used—I guess we participate in it too; I know I do—for the hurling of epithets or it is used for the simple position you took last night which is, "I don't know anything. Don't ask me."

For the New Democratic Party it is simply not acceptable. The Treasurer has refused to answer the questions in question period. That's fine; he can get off the hook by saying that. But when the Minister of Revenue is asked questions of the kind we have been asking of you, it is wrong that you will not reply. I assert it categorically. I know you don't agree. It is wrong that you do not reply.

You are delinquent in your cabinet responsibility and you are delinquent in your public responsibility because you know what you are asking us to do and you understand that.

Let me enumerate it for you without having written anything down. You're asking us in this clause to approve for the corporations a special exemption in effect; a special tax remission of \$108 million in this fiscal year and \$410 million by 1977. It is the single biggest economic undertaking in your budget. Fair? Is that true? Is there a single other economic initiative in the budget which approximates \$410 million? No, sir. Even the sales tax reduction to five per cent by Dec. 31, 1975, totals, if memory serves me, only \$330 million—

Hon. Mr. Meen: In that time period.

Mr. Lewis: —in that nine-month period or the 8½, eight and three weeks period. Fair enough. This is in dollar terms the single most dramatic initiative in the entire budget.

Does it not seem inconsistent to you that there should be therefore no evidence to support it? How can that be? To what has power reduced you? To what has this obsession of divine right brought you that you can put through a budgetary change of \$410 million and feel you need account for it to no one? That you can simply account for it by saying with a jocular wave of the arm it will create jobs and stimulate the manufacturing sector?

Do you expect us, as a responsible opposition party, simply to endorse that kind of thing?

You may wish to demean the process. We are not going to demean the process. We understand the way the game is played around here. We know that when we stand, the five of us who do, to call a vote on this issue and divide we will lose. We know that. But don't ask us to abdicate our responsibility as an opposition in precisely the way you abdicate your responsibility as a government.

Of what does the abdication consist? You are not able to tell us, Minister of Revenue, how many jobs this programme is designed to create? It is \$410 million the single strongest initiative of the government and you can't tell us how many jobs it is designed to create. You cannot tell us whether it will create one additional job—\$410 million.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): It will likely eliminate some.

Mr. Lewis: You are not able to give us an appraisal, as my colleagues asked you last night, of the tax credit programme of 1971-1973. You are not able to indicate to us today whether that created jobs or the impact that it had upon the economy.

How can that be? How do you take \$410 million of public money and never feel constrained to give an accounting of that which underpins the programme? You have been getting away with it for time immemorial, but we will not let you get away with it without at least demanding a reply even though we are met with stony silence. It makes no sense, I say to the minister. You don't deal with public matters in that fashion.

My colleague from Riverdale during his remarks last night showed you the increases in employment that have occurred from 1971 to 1973 as the result of your tax credit investment introduced in Ontario. We at least went back and looked at the impact. Did

you? No. We went back and looked at the impact and what did it show? I am working from memory.

In 1971 over 1970, when the tax was introduced, the employment increase as a percentage in manufacturing was 5.1 per cent. In 1971-1972, after the tax credit was provided, employment went to 5.2 per cent as a percentage increase. In other words, the remission of something like \$36 million or \$40 million in tax credit in the first year had resulted in an increase in jobs in the manufacturing sector of one-tenth of one per cent.

Hon. Mr. Meen: It might have gone down.

Mr. Lewis: How do you know it might have gone down? In 1972-1973, after the full impact of the \$90 million in remission had been experienced, the percentage increase in jobs was 2.3 per cent, a dramatic decline from the year before. I know that it seems odd. A government has a public responsibility to provide a case which underpins its tax measures. You have taken the budget document, which should be an economic statement, and turned it into a political manifesto.

You may think that that's a comic thing to do in an election year and you don't care. But governments that are reduced to that kind of activity usually find themselves in trouble. It means that you have lost your judgement, you no longer have a sense of your priorities and you no longer recognize your public responsibilities. You can't tell us how many jobs will be created. You can't tell us whether one job will be created. You can't give an assessment of the previous investment tax credit and whether it created any jobs or its impact.

My colleague from Wentworth last night spelled out to you, item after item, the possible economic consequences of this legislation. You were not able to tell him whether and machinery and equipment would be replacement or new. You were not able to tell him how you arrived at the figures of \$108 million or \$410 million. You weren't able to tell him the Statistics Canada investment intentions on which were based the analysis.

Do you realize that? You bring in a tax of \$410 million and you cannot give us even the arithmetic calculation which arrives at the figure. You were not able to tell him whether more jobs would be created in the country of origin rather than in the province of purchase. You were not able to tell him where that additional money would go, whether it would go into further investment or simply,

as we believe, into the profits of the corporations involved.

Has there ever been such dismal failure in the explanation of a taxing measure as in this case? Do you realize you are giving to one sector of the economy \$410 million, and in no area—not one—have you given us a public accounting, any reason for what you are doing, any indication or prediction of impact?

You are an incorrigibly irresponsible government. You are taking public money and handing it to the corporations without even thinking that you need accountability. At least John Turner, for whom I have relatively little use as a political antagonist, felt enough public responsibility that he said, "If, at the request of 60 members of the House of Commons the whole tax must be reassessed, or if there is a need to monitor it, we'll do that." Not so the provincial Tories. Heaven forbid that anyone in the world should hold you accountable for what you do. You didn't give any money to the GAINS programme; didn't find any money for that; didn't raise that at all—well, \$4 a month, up to \$240 a month in total. And you certainly didn't do more than take some people off the income tax rolls to correspond with what the federal government had already done.

You gave to small business \$15 million, and to large corporations \$410 million. You gave the farmers how much? It must have been in the range of \$15 million to \$20 million.

Mr. G. Samis (Stormont): About \$20 million.

Mr. Lewis: About \$20 million? And to large corporations \$410 million.

Hon. Mr. Meen: They will spend billions to get that.

Mr. Lewis: In every other single tax change you made you gave a documented rationale, but in this tax you gave no rationale at all. As I say, the federal Liberals did a similar thing, but John Turner felt it necessary in the public interest to provide both a monitoring and a rationale. You people here, you have such an indifference to the public and to a sense of public accountability that you have been unable to answer a single question in this entire debate, and that's why you are incorrigibly irresponsible.

Hon. Mr. Meen: That's your opinion.

Mr. Lewis: No, it's not my opinion.

Mr. Deans: It's true.

Mr. Lewis: I read the Hansard last night scrupulously, and you were an awkward and embarrassed man last night. You admitted publicly that you had no answers, and you knew no answers. You said you were the mechanic, you were the man who administered the tax law, and you didn't have to provide any of the answers at all.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): He blamed it on the Treasurer.

Mr. Deans: It proves they shouldn't have split the ministries.

Mr. Lewis: That's what we in this party and in the Legislature, because I'm sure it is shared by all of us in the opposition, call the failure of political leadership in Ontario. You don't understand any longer what political leadership consists of. It consists, in one instance, of bringing in a tax and explaining its rationale. That's what we call the absence of straight talk or candour in Ontario; your unwillingness to be direct and forthright about your intentions and about the reasons for arriving at certain decisions.

Your single greatest tax measure, \$410 million—with which, as my colleague from Wentworth pointed out, you could build 20,000 homes—

Mr. Deans: And get all the money back.

Mr. Lewis: —and get all the money back—the single greatest tax incentive in the budget, you have refused to, in any sense, document. You don't know whether there'll be jobs. You don't know whether we'll lose jobs. You don't know where the additional investment will go, if it goes anywhere. You don't know whether it's replacement machinery. You don't know whether it's new machinery. You don't know of past experience. The minister doesn't know a blessed thing about the tax that he's piloting through in this House; not a blessed thing! You're an apologist for the government and for the corporations whom the government serves.

I don't say that because I'm a New Democrat who says those things easily; I believe it of you. But I see it in this legislation more in evidence than I've seen it for a very long time. And it's all catching up with you—the bad judgement, the arrogance, the lack of public accountability, the absence of political leadership, the prevarication, the dissembling, the deceptions, the refusal to talk straight, the refusal to answer the opposition when asked perfectly legitimate questions, the feeling that any tax measure you wish to bring in you can simply put to the House and pass.

All those things are catching up with you as the Tories scurry to read the polls in response to the budget, to see if anything is changing. Nothing is changing, Mr. Chairman. Nothing changes unless there are changes on all fronts simultaneously. You can't have a good energy conference on Thursday and bring in a tax like this two weeks later, and expect public favours suddenly to adorn you.

Those are the reasons, very simply, why we're opposing this section of the bill. I've simply tried to summarize the position which my colleagues have put well and avidly. I'm not going to try to prolong it, because you, sir, as a minister, are neutered. You are a politically impotent minister. You take this portfolio and you hurl it in the face of the opposition by saying "I am the ritual mechanic. Ask me no questions, I have no answers."

Well, you don't forgive a tax of \$410 million to one small sector of the economy and provide no answers. And the violence that you do to the legislative process in reducing debate to this kind of thing, is the same violence you do to yourself politically by removing public trust. And that's what you are doing.

You think no one listens; you think no one cares. But these things are cumulative, my friend. This clause is a totally unacceptable clause. This tax change is a perfidious change. You are incorrigibly irresponsible, I repeat, to persist in its implementation without answering a single, legitimate question put to you by the opposition when, in fact, you have some of the answers and refuse to share them with us or with the public; or, indeed, with those few back-benchers who are here to support you.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Chairman, I don't propose to repeat the arguments that I advanced last night, and which the member for Scarborough West seems to have conveniently disregarded. I have outlined the reasoning behind this section, as it is part of the overall thrust of the budget. It is not a give-away programme. The corporations will have to spend billions to recover this kind of money over this period of time.

The intention is to create an incentive to get these purchases, these companies, these business expansions going at a period of time. It is essential to the economy of Ontario that a shot in the arm be given to them.

Mr. Deans: To the economy of Ontario, yes.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I don't consider myself an apologist for the government on this bill, nor in any role in which I happen to work as the administrator of a taxing statute. I said last night that there were times that it would be nice if the Minister of Revenue and the Treasurer were wrapped up as one and the same person, as they are in some jurisdictions in Canada. I guess, from the other side of it, from the administrative side, there is too much work then to be reposed in one man. I find myself pretty busy looking after the administration of the various taxing statutes. The hon. member for Scarborough West is nodding his head.

The difficulty, of course, is that these taxing statutes, being budgetary matters, are matters which implement decisions by the Treasurer. I think, perhaps, the member for Scarborough West is also accurate when he says a relatively small group of people make the decisions as to the various fronts upon which the province will move in its endeavour to turn the economy around to get things rolling again.

I have not had the benefit of all the discussions the Treasurer and his colleagues and staff in Treasury and Economics have had in talking to the business community, and so I don't feel that I know all of the background resulting from which have come the various thrusts. So it is \$400 million; that is a lot of money; it is a lot of money. When you consider the overall budget of the province, it is five per cent. So, it is a significant amount. But it means for the companies to get this money, they have to spend an enormous amount in plant expansion.

Mr. Deans: None of it here.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Now that isn't so.

Mr. Deans: That is so.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The member for Ottawa Centre—

Mr. Deans: He was wrong. There is 80 per cent purchased outside.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The member for Ottawa Centre—and he is an economist—the member for Ottawa Centre suggested that it was maybe 50-50.

Mr. Deans: It is 80-20.

Hon. Mr. Meen: —between purchases here and across the line. Whatever the percentage, there will be substantial purchases made here of production machinery.

Mr. Deans: There will not.

Hon. Mr. Meen: In addition, as I pointed out to him and to the member for Wentworth, they're losing sight of the fact that whether the production-related machinery is purchased here in Canada or is purchased elsewhere, it would certainly be purchased here in Canada if it were available here in Canada.

Mr. Deans: But the time limit that you have allowed won't permit the companies to tool up in time to make it.

Hon. Mr. Meen: If it's purchased elsewhere and brought into Ontario, then of course more jobs are created because no manufacturer in his right mind is going to buy machinery that isn't going to be put to use. And it will require people to operate those machines; it will require other products to transport them; and there will be the retailing of them and their ultimate use all the way through the economy.

It's an extremely narrow-visioned approach which the hon. members opposite have taken in attacking this part of the Treasurer's budget. I'm convinced—and I'm no apologist when I'm saying this—I'm convinced that this part, however expensive it may be, will play a very significant part in helping turn this economy around.

Mr. Lewis: Before debate closes, I want to try to clarify something, because I don't follow the logic. The \$410 million represents a remission of seven per cent on the purchase of machinery and equipment. If you divide seven into \$410 million, that works out to about \$60 million on a percentage point. And if it's \$60 million on a percentage point it's \$6 billion on 100 per cent. Is that correct? So what you are assuming is the purchase of \$6 billion worth of machinery and equipment by 1977, for which the corporations will recapture some \$410 million. All right, you don't need to be a blessed genius to know that. But let me tell you something: Do you know how much the investment intentions are of all the corporations in all the sectors for this year? Do you know that?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Do you?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I do. Do you? No. You're only the Minister of Revenue. Why should you know? Well, it ranges between \$17 billion and \$19 billion. That's what it is. That includes everything. That includes every sector. It doesn't apply merely to manufacturing. What you have done is you have isolated certain portions of manufacturing to which this exemption would apply—and you may be right. I don't know quite how your arithme-

tic was done. I wish I did. If you saw \$15 billion this year, \$21 billion the next year and X the year after, I wish I knew how you arrived at the \$6 billion for manufacturing machinery and equipment. But I don't, because you won't share that with us.

What you're saying is that the corporations will recapture \$410 million. What we're saying to you is, what guarantee do you have that the \$410 million will be reinvested in the purchase of further machinery and equipment to create new jobs? You see, you're engaging in a neat sleight of hand in this debate—it's not deliberately misleading, but it's a sleight of hand.

The \$6 billion figure, on which the \$410 million estimate is made, is a figure that is already committed. Those investment intentions are registered. They represent nothing new. So don't talk to us about the billions that the corporations have to spend. They have already made their decisions to spend that money.

The big question is then, will the \$410 million which you are giving back to them be ploughed into the economy? And we're saying, on the basis of past experience and on the basis of what we know, it will not be ploughed back into the economy. It will go to the profit coffers of those corporations and be dispensed largely to the shareholders. That's what was learned in the United States, that's what was learned federally and that's what was learned between 1971 and 1973 in your investment tax credit. And you haven't any answer for that. You haven't any answer for that at all.

Hon. Mr. Meen: There is the corporations tax, among other things.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, I see. You are going to take some of it back through the corporations tax. If you want to take it back through the corporations tax, then raise the tax by one point or by two points and recover it for the province. What we are really saying and what my colleagues have put to you very neatly, and I think unanswerably, is that you have no knowledge of this.

It's kind of amusing that nobody has brought to you the Statistics Canada material on investment intentions in order to see how figures relate to the total investment intentions. The first thing that occurred to this caucus as to look at the Statistics Canada figures. You would think that as the minister piloting through the legislation you might have the same interest, but you don't. You simply take on face value the assumptions that have been placed in your hand to pilot

through and you refuse to give us any answers. I just didn't want anybody in the world to think upon reading Hansard that somehow the seven per cent was stimulating billions of dollars of investment.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Well, it is.

Mr. Lewis: That's all committed, all of it. Just look at your investment intention statistics. It is all committed. What you have to be able to tell us is how come. What are they going to do with the \$410 million? What guarantees have you on that score? And you haven't a thing to say to us—not a word.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I said it.

Mr. Lewis: You have hope and you have the commitment that comes with being a corporate appendage.

Mr. Deans: Faith, hope and charity.

Mr. Lewis: But you have no knowledge, no documentation and no evidence. So don't ask us to support the cost.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): You don't have a dog's chance.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: What was that? Can I repeat that?

Mr. Stokes: No.

Mr. Lewis: My colleague from Thunder Bay has some of the finest, the most exquisite railroad expressions, all of them worthy of a report on obscenity, which this Legislature has ever heard.

Mr. Breithaupt: John Colombo would like to hear them.

Mr. Lewis: One day, Mr. Chairman, as a way of bringing some life to this chamber, I am going to list them for you, epigram by epigram, colourful or otherwise. Then I shall retire, because I shall have to retire.

Mr. Breithaupt: With example.

Mr. Lewis: But I would not wish the chamber to go through life without having heard of the railroadees to which others of us are subjected during the course of these debates. It won't get you off the hook though. Your friend, the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handelman) there doesn't even find his blood running when he reads a report on pornography. What use to waste upon him

the jewels that fall from the member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour—

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, might I just ask before you put this is it presumed that as a result of the vote to be taken this section will be dealt with, or is there still the opportunity to deal with it? We have a few points.

Mr. Chairman: The Chair indicated last night that we would consider Mr. Renwick's amendment first and then we would consider Mr. Haggerty's on the same section.

Mr. Breithaupt: That is fine, Mr. Chairman. There was one other point that I just wanted to raise as a matter of information. So perhaps we can then carry on. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of Mr. Renwick's motion will say "aye."

All those opposed will say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Shall this vote be stacked?

Mr. Deans: No, we will vote on it.

Mr. Lewis: This one we will vote on now.

Mr. Chairman: Call in the members.

The committee divided on Mr. Renwick's amendment which was negatived on the following vote:

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 13, the "nays" are 63.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

We have another amendment to the section.

Mr. Haggerty has moved that section 4, subsection 3, be amended to include a new subsection following the preamble "but no exemption may be claimed under this paragraph for any machinery or equipment," and subsection (e) to read (f), "which is imported into Canada if such machinery or equipment—"

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): On a point of order, sir. A point of order.

Mr. Chairman: I think the Chair—

Mr. Bullbrook: I'm putting a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: The Chair should be able to finish reading the amendment first.

Mr. Bullbrook: No, because the point of order takes precedence over the motion that you are putting at the present time. I understood that the vote was to be on Mr. Renwick's motion only.

Mr. Chairman: That's right.

Mr. Bullbrook: I want to know whether my colleague wants to speak to his own motion.

Mr. Chairman: If the hon. member had been listening, the Chair gave the concurrence that we would entertain any debate on Mr. Haggerty's motion, so I shall continue reading the motion as put by Mr. Haggerty: "which is imported into Canada if such machinery or equipment for the same purpose can be manufactured in Canada."

The member for Welland South.

Mr. Haggerty: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The purpose of the amendment—

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Does the member for Sarnia have a point of order now?

Mr. Haggerty: —is to ensure that the province, through the Ministry of Revenue, provides the motives to maintain present employment and to increase employment wherever possible, and particularly to establishing guidelines for the manufacturing and purchasing of production machinery when such production machinery can be produced and manufactured here in Canada.

I talked previously, before the division bells rang, with the minister and my main concern was with paragraph 49, which deals with the fabrication of equipment. Dealing with the fabrication of equipment, I could interpret the section here to mean that any company could bring in fabricated equipment to perhaps construct or build a new mine in Ontario, and I think this type of production equipment could be produced in Ontario, again creating jobs.

I'm also concerned about the problems that we have in labour disputes here in Ontario, for example in the automobile industry, where companies, perhaps not too happy with a labour dispute, will pull out the production machinery and back it goes to the States—of course, again creating unemployment here in Ontario. I think there should be some guidelines put into the bill to protect employment here in Ontario.

I think it was some two years ago that one of the ministers came in with a similar

bill. In introducing the bill, he stated that "with this type of a programme we are going to produce some 42,000 jobs." To this day I haven't seen those 42,000 jobs. In this bill, hopefully, it is to increase employment—but I think there have to be guidelines to protect the Canadian workers who can produce such equipment.

I am well aware that there is equipment that cannot be produced in Canada. I can think of computerized machinery, such as lathes, drills, jigs, milling machines, and of that type of production machinery. But, I am sure we do have skilled tradesmen here in Canada, and particularly in Ontario, who can produce much of the machinery we are talking about. I would like to see the minister provide guidelines or some direction to the industry to say that if they are going to get into the market buying new machinery, then buy here in Ontario or in Canada and protect the Canadian labour force.

Mr. Chairman: Does any other member want to speak on the amendment? Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Chairman, at the moment I don't have a copy of the amendment which the hon. member did provide. But I had a chance to look at it, and I want to thank him for giving me the opportunity to reflect on its significance during the period when we were waiting to take the last vote.

Although I found myself in very considerable sympathy with the hon. member and the view he is expressing as to buy Canadian, buy locally wherever possible, I am concerned that that kind of amendment would be, first of all, difficult if not impossible to administer. There would be cases in which, if it were established that similar machinery was available in Canada, it might well be the delivery time on that equipment was impossibly long and far off and couldn't meet the schedule of the Canadian manufacturer whom we were attempting to assist in getting further production machinery in operation. It might be that it was of inferior quality. I think we have to leave that sort of thing up to our Canadian manufacturers to buy locally wherever we can.

I understand—though I don't have the particulars of this—that there are certain tariffs on foreign-produced machinery. I think it would be a matter for the federal government to determine whether tariffs were sufficiently large and of great enough significance as to operate as an appropriate incentive to our people to buy locally where the equipment is available. It might just be that

in the interest of getting on with establishment of a new product line, or the installation of a new piece of machinery, that it would be necessary to go afield beyond Canada, although we would certainly hope that they would buy locally.

So, as I say, I find myself in complete sympathy with the member's suggestion. I regret that at this stage, at any rate, I don't see a way in which we can build an amendment into this section that would accomplish that without considerably hampering the operation of the section itself. I think both he and I are in agreement that the section itself is good. We should give it a try, and I don't think we want to put any impediments in its way.

Mr. Chairman: Does any other member wish to speak on this before the question?

All those in favour of Mr. Haggerty's amendment say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

I declare the amendment lost.

Anything before section 5?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I made a suggestion to the minister last night—

Mr. Chairman: Order, the member for Waterloo North has the floor.

Mr. Renwick: I am sorry.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): This is on section 4, paragraph 49(d), (e), and (f). It has to do with the requirements for the exemption form when equipment over \$500 is rented.

Mr. Renwick: We are not there yet.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I am sorry. Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. Could the member repeat that? I missed his reference. What's he talking about?

Mr. Good: It's 49(d), I think it's carried right through, regarding the necessity for an exemption form for any machinery rented, that is machinery over \$500 in value, during the period from April 7 until Jan. 1, 1977.

It has been drawn to my attention that the procedure initially laid down for the signing of these exemption forms will require an individual exemption for each piece of machinery rented. This exemption form must be signed by an officer of the company renting the piece of machinery and as well as the renter.

One particular company in my riding rents over 100 pieces of equipment a day to the contractors in the area. It's Suntract Rentals. They find this a most cumbersome procedure. They now have to have a duplication on every bill of rental as well as an exemption form signed by an officer of the renting company.

I have spoken to the minister's officials and I believe they are looking into the matter to see if they can find a less cumbersome manner of doing it. I draw this to the minister's attention so that he will give priority action to this so that there will not be undue hardship on these large rental companies having to try to get an exemption form signed by an officer of the rental contractor when the machine may be picked up by some employee of the business.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Chairman, I agree. I think we should have some adjustment on that form and I confirm what the member has been saying. We are looking at this and I would hope we can come up with an appropriate amendment to the form to do that.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale. Just a minute. Do you want to speak on the same?

Mr. C. J. S. Apps (Kingston and the Islands): On the same thing. I would like to ask the minister if on rental agreements signed prior to April 8 with payments made after April 8, you would have to pay that tax still.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The tax would be calculated up to and including April 7, at the rate of seven per cent, Mr. Chairman. Thereafter it would be apportioned from that date, April 8, and on to the next rental payment date at the rate of five per cent. It would be five per cent through the balance of the term right through to the end of this year or to the end of the rental period whichever first occurred.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on item (f) of this particular clause I had suggested and provided the minister with a copy of a proposed amendment to that clause.

One of the conditions of obtaining the exemption is provided in item (f) and I don't think it is sufficiently broadly drawn. It does not refer to the direction for the fabrication or manufacture of products, which is of equal force in obtaining the qualification for the elimination of the tax as a contract for the rental or acquisition of the

equipment. I had thought from what the minister said last night that he was perhaps inclined to accept it.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to accept it, subject to a small amendment. I take it that we haven't yet passed subsection (3) of section 4? Since we are still debating this with, perhaps, the member for Riverdale's concurrence I could read this because I have made a minor amendment in it. I have only one copy. I don't know whether he has a copy in front of him?

Mr. Renwick: Yes, I have.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I will deliver this to you in a moment, Mr. Chairman, if I may.

Hon. Mr. Meen moves that clause 4 of Bill 30 be amended by amending item (f) of paragraph 49 to read as follows:

If the contract for the rental or acquisition of which, or the direction for the fabrication or manufacture of which, is in the option of the minister made for the purpose of obtaining the exemption conferred by this paragraph in substitution for or as the result of the cancellation of a substantially similar contract entered into or direction made or given before April 8, 1975.

Do you have a copy now, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Renwick: Not of yours.

Mr. Chairman: I have a copy of Mr. Renwick's amendment.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I don't think the chairman has a copy of this as I have just read it. He is most welcome to have my copy. I might just explain that the words added at the bottom simply lock in with the first reference to the amendment proposed by the member for Riverdale. We find that satisfactory and I think it is an improvement in the Act.

Mr. Renwick: I find that quite satisfactory. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment? Carried.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Can we now move on to section 5 of the bill?

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, before we move on to section 5, might I ask the minister to clarify section 4 (5) relating to vessels under 500 gross tons? In checking the Act, Mr. Chairman, I find there's an exemption given to commercial

fishing boats and their construction. The explanatory note on this particular subsection indicates that an exemption is going to be given to commercial vessels of less than 500 tons for repairs and refitting.

I just wonder if the minister could clarify this for me, as I do have a small but very active shipyard in my riding that builds tugs for the CNR; it built the Maid of the Mist and so forth. Will there be an exemption on the actual construction, or is it simply on the refitting?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I think the section says: "Vessels, as defined by the minister that do not exceed 500 tons gross and that are operated for commercial purposes, repairs to such vessels, and machinery or equipment purchased to refit such vessels." I would have to read that in the context of the entire section. I think that's a total exemption, rather than just referring to repairs.

It came about because it came to my attention there were a number of vessels of less than 500 tons that were operating in competition with other vessels that were over 500 tons. One was exempt from the beginning and for all its repairs. The other, less than 500 tons, performing essentially the same service, was subject to tax, not only on its purchase but on all its repairs.

It seemed unfair to apply the tax in that rather heavy-handed fashion, so what I'm proposing here is that we simply designate them as tax-exempt if they're beneath that tonnage and operated for commercial purposes; then the two vessels, one of 250 tons, say, and one of more than 500 tons, would be treated the same way; would be both free of tax.

Mr. Paterson: For purpose of clarification, the word "refit" means the manufacture of a new ship, rather than the refitting of an existing one?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I would have to check that, but I believe that's right. Under section 66, it would apply to the initial vessel as well as to all refitting and repairs.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I didn't wish to interrupt the member for Essex South when he moved to that particular clause. I think that what the minister says is quite clear because the way it is worded in the Act, referring to vessels over 500 tons, would cover both the construction of the vessels as well as the repairs.

If I may revert to paragraph 49a about returnable containers to be used to hold milk that is sold at a retail sale in Ontario,

that's another exemption. I noticed in the regulations, which appeared in the Gazette within the last few days, that there was a definition of returnable containers in its broad context. Is there any relationship between that definition and the limited application of the exemption that's provided in this Act?

As I read the returnable container definition that was in the Gazette of a week or two ago, it was very broadly expressed, and I wondered whether the minister was going to begin to move to exempt all returnable containers from sales tax.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I don't have a copy of that regulation before me but I think the intention was the exemption from retail sales tax of any container for which a deposit was charged would act as an incentive to have it returned, whether it was re-useable or whether it was simply returned for recycling. The old definition for the application of tax was based on the re-useable side rather than returnable. I made a statement in the House a few weeks ago when we first brought that forward. Members will recall the difficulty we were having with deposits on things like beer cans and that was really what started it in the interests of the environment.

Section 4 agreed to.

On section 5:

Mr. Chairman: The minister has an amendment on section 5.

Hon. Mr. Meen moves that clause (b) of subsection 1 of the enactment of section 11, proposed in section 5 of the bill, be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

(b) the aggregate of:

(1) three per cent of the tax collected by the vendor in such period, and shown in a return that is made in accordance with this Act and the regulations and in which the tax shown to have been so collected is \$67 or more.

(2) \$2 for each return with respect to tax collected by the vendor in such period that is made in accordance with this Act and the regulations, and in which the tax shown to have been so collected exceeds \$2 and is less than \$67, and

(3) the tax collected by the vendor in such period and shown on a return that is made in accordance with this Act and the regulations and in which the tax shown to have been collected does not exceed \$2.

Mr. Renwick: I take it it is still subject to the \$500 limitation?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Yes, it is, Mr. Chairman. This is a refinement of the original section, if I can find my notes on this. Mr. Chairman, do you already have a copy of that amendment?

Mr. Chairman: I have a copy.

Mr. Breithaupt: Perhaps while you are looking for your notes, you could advise us quickly as to the numbers of persons who are presently in the category of those who will be able to make a claim. Secondly, how many do you expect will be achieving the maximum figure of the \$500 amount?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Off the top of my head, the following would apply, Mr. Chairman. There are roughly 131,000 retail merchants. Of those, I believe, about 10,000 or so would achieve the maximum; 121,000 or so, give or take, would be ones operating within this range of \$2 minimum to \$500 a year.

I have an extra copy of this amendment. Does the member for Kitchener have a copy?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, he has a copy.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, I have one, thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Has the member for Riverdale?

Mr. Renwick: I don't need one, thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Does section 5 carry as amended?

Section 5 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Is there anything further? On any further clause, section, subsection? Shall the bill be reported?

Mr. Renwick: If I may, let me briefly make a comment. I am delighted to see the lien disappear for the tax and I notice the transitional provision with respect to that disappearance of that lien. I am rather intrigued by the provision of section 10 of the bill.

Mr. Chairman: Just a minute. Do all sections before section 10 carry?

Sections 6 to 9, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 10:

Mr. Renwick: I am really intrigued by section 10 because that was a recommendation made by the Smith committee back in 1967, I believe. I am curious—it's really idle curiosity—as to why the minister in 1975, so

many years later, could decide to make the change which was recommended by the Smith committee. It is such a momentous change changing the three per cent to the four per cent.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Perhaps it is the fact that the Minister of Revenue of this present day happens to have been a member of the select committee that reviewed the Smith report.

Section 10 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any other section any member wishes to speak on? If not, shall the bill be reported?

Sections 11 to 13, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 30, as amended, reported.

Hon. Mr. Meen moves the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report one bill with certain amendments and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THIRD READING

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill 30, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Meen moves second reading of Bill 33, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, there are just a few comments to make with respect to this bill. I don't think it will bring the problems and the detailed consideration that Bill 30 has, but there are a few points of clarification which perhaps the minister can refer to in his response so that we may not have to have this bill go into committee.

I understand that the amendments proposed here are with respect particularly to what is called off-highway use. This, I pre-

sume, Mr. Speaker, involves not only the use of various fuels with respect, say, to operations in a logging camp or the use of a generator for electricity in a rural or northern part of the province. It also involves, for example, the purchase, perhaps by a hospital, of certain requirements in fuel or, indeed, even the operation of a fork-lift truck that may be done by some manufacturing company all within the confines, either the building or grounds, of that company.

What we are particularly looking at, then, is the off-highway user, whomever or wherever that may be. Perhaps the minister could give us some further examples of the kinds of parties that are going to be able to benefit by this particular reduction in the tax and clarify for us just the procedures that he intends to follow. I notice that, of course, there are certain certificates of registration which are going to be required and I think it would be worthwhile if we could have some comment from the minister to elucidate exactly the sorts of things that he has in mind.

It may be that if we go to committee there will be certain further comments, but we on this side of the House are prepared to accept this bill as a refund, and a worthwhile one with respect to the particular areas in off-road use that hope to be benefited by the bill.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I would have hoped that when the minister was considering the Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act, because of the high cost of fuel in northern Ontario he would have considered reducing a portion of the 19-cents-per-gallon tax in those areas of the province where it's altogether too high.

Hon. A. K. Meen (Minister of Revenue): This is diesel fuel.

Mr. Stokes: This is diesel fuel. Has it anything to do with heating oil?

Hon. Mr. Meen: There is no tax on heating oil.

Mr. Stokes: What about a situation where a mining company, as was the case recently or within the past couple of years in the Timmins area had to generate all of its electric energy by diesel generation?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I know the case. This would exempt them.

Mr. Stokes: It is totally exempt now. How would the minister differentiate between a

motor vehicle operated by gas and one operated by diesel? There are a good many trucks used in the mining industry, as is the case in the forest industry, which are propelled by gas motors. Some of the larger units are propelled by diesel fuel. Is there any differentiation between the two? Is the minister lowering the exemption, or are they completely exempt, too? Are those which use gasoline as a means of propulsion completely exempt at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Meen: They are exempt now, I believe.

Mr. Stokes: All the minister is doing then is bringing the Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act to apply in the same way where the fuel is diesel oil and give them the same kind of consideration that presently exists for those propelled by gasoline?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I think that is essentially correct.

Mr. Stokes: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): The concern which was expressed in our caucus about this bill was not, of course, with respect to the present exemption as I understand it, which exists for farmers and for commercial fishermen. Perhaps the minister would nod and indicate that exemption.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I'm sorry; I didn't hear the question.

Mr. Renwick: I said our concern, as expressed in our caucus, was not with respect to this bill so far as it applies to the exemption already granted for farmers and commercial fishermen; nor, necessarily, for institutional users or those engaged in the maintenance or construction of roads.

We were concerned as to the extent of the loss of revenue which, of the \$19 million, will be attributed to industrial users including the manufacturing, mining, forestry and construction industries. It would appear to us that a substantial portion of the \$19 million as set out in the budget statement on page 11 as the tax relief will be because of the relief of the tax to the industrial users. This was our major concern with respect to the bill. I know my colleague, the member for Sudbury, has other comments he wishes to make about it.

Mr. Stokes: Could the minister give us a breakdown of the \$19 million and how he hopes it will effect a savings?

Hon. Mr. Meen: All right, when I reply.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any other members who wish to speak first of all? The minister can answer the questions all at once.

Mr. Stokes: When he replies? The debate is over when he replies.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): I'm not sure if this is the bill that applies to a mine way out in the middle of nowhere which has to generate power by means of diesel fuel. I'm not sure whether or not this would apply to that situation.

There is a mine in my riding which, as I understand it, had operated and then closed down after the minister put this tax on. Now it may be in a position to reopen. If it is to help the Texmont mine or similar places which are way out from the major centres and have to generate their power by diesel I think, in this situation, it has some beneficial effect. In terms of the large scoop trams and the diesel equipment that are used underground in some of the big mines like Inco or Texasgulf, I don't suppose they need any more of a tax break than they have now. They've got enough exemptions to look after anybody. But in terms of the little operation—and I think of that Texmont operation—it's good for them. I think the move is worthwhile in that regard.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the implementation of this bill. It's one of the continuing thrusts of the government to put gifts into the hands of various large corporations. They are going to be the major benefactors of this exemption from the motor vehicle fuel tax.

Even though there is a red herring drawn across the trail that hospitals and educational institutions will also have a saving, I think that thrust would have no validity in that there is really no money to be saved. It does not cost the province of Ontario any money to charge a tax on heating fuel for a school because it is, in fact, only a transfer payment. There really is no expense or saving to the province as it relates to this particular bill. This was put in, as I see it, as a ruse to try to confuse the opposition into accepting that the government was, in fact, trying to relieve expenses on hospitals and schools and various other institutions.

The major benefactors are going to be, as my friend from Cochrane South said, the large corporations who use an extraordinary amount of fuel in mining operations and woods operations. If we take a look at how the mining companies and the logging companies have been doing in the past, they have been doing quite well lately. I think the incentive the minister is supplying here is really unwarranted in that this will just turn into another \$19 million of excess profits in the hands of companies such as the International Nickel Co., whose profits last year were something like \$330 million, an increase of better than \$100 million over the previous 12-month period.

Any company that can increase its profits by better than 35 per cent in a one-year period certainly doesn't need a handout from the taxpayers of the Province of Ontario. For this purpose, then, I will have to vote and reject the implementation of this bill.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any other hon. members to speak to this? The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): I'm not a northern member, Mr. Speaker, and I don't know the north nearly as well as I would like to, even though I have been through it on a number of occasions, but one has to ask oneself that if the government intends to enter into this field of motor vehicle tax, and if it intends to take an action that affects the north, why is it that the consumers of the north are left out of this particular measure?

Why has the government dallied so long in arriving at an equality of prices for gasoline between people who are in northern Ontario and people who are in the rest of Ontario? Why should people in my part of the province, for example, pay anywhere from two or three cents to as much as about 17 and 25 cents a gallon less for our gasoline than people up in the north? Why doesn't the government intervene in order to ensure this kind of equality between the northern part of the province and the rest of the province?

The minister has heard me talk on a number of occasions of the way in which eastern and northern Ontario tend to get forgotten by the government and left behind. This is a particular instance where eastern Ontario benefits from the lower prices which are available through south-central and south-western Ontario as well, and northern Ontario is left out.

It's colder up there. The distances are longer. The incomes are nothing to write home about. People have to rely on their automobiles because in most parts of the north there are no alternative forms of transportation such as public transportation. A car is an essential and yet they are penalized—

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I fail to see that this has anything to do with this particular Act.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, this is a means of reducing the cost of off-highway transportation, mainly in the north, and I'm suggesting that the bill—

Mr. Speaker: That is what the bill is.

Mr. Cassidy: —should be extended to include the cost of on-highway transportation in the north.

Mr. Speaker: Of course we can't deal with that in this bill. This bill has nothing to say about that. We were discussing the principle of this bill, not some bill which the member may wish to introduce privately.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I'm suggesting that the principle of the bill is flawed because it benefits only corporate users of fuel in the north and does not benefit—

Mr. Speaker: The member may only discuss the principle of this bill.

Mr. Cassidy: I think I made the point and I hope the minister will be given enough leeway by the Speaker in order to reply to it. The question always comes up in this House—who protects the consumers? Who protects the people in the north? Who protects the tenants? We know who protects the corporate interests—it's the government; whether it is the Retail Sales Tax bill or this particular bill. Let's see the government stand up for some consumers for a change.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any other members who wish to speak to this? The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Speaker, when I heard the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) announce this, when he read that great budget of his, I was amazed. I thought, at last. I read that clause which says "provide for full refund of tax on fuel used for industrial and institutional purposes and not in the operation of a motor vehicle on the highway or for recreation or pleasure."

Do you know who is going to benefit, Mr. Speaker? Inco, Falconbridge, Abitibi, Brown Forest. It's another straight giveaway. I'm not sure, maybe it's going to create jobs, but I don't really think so.

One has to be amazed, because I looked at Inco's profit statement. The profit as reported for the last year was, I believe, \$330 million after tax; which means the profit was probably in the neighbourhood of \$500 million. And the government is going to bestow some more largess; yet another write-off to go with the one-third off the top for depletion, depreciation, exploration, new equipment and capital. That isn't enough for the Tories' friends. We just give some more. I don't know why they just don't give them the province. If the Tories had their way, they would say: "Here, take it, lock, stock and barrel. Don't even pay a cent tax on it."

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): How ridiculous can he get?

Mr. Martel: That's what they are doing. I've been here now—

Mr. Carruthers: I am going to have to get out. I can't listen to this.

Mr. Martel: It wouldn't be a bad idea if the member did get out because he's not benefiting the province at all.

Mr. Cassidy: Let him just keep on going.

Mr. Renwick: Does that mean the member for Durham is resigning?

Mr. Germa: He'll make sure he comes back for his pay cheque.

Mr. Carruthers: I earn mine.

Mr. Martel: I don't know how he earns it, but I have heard that cry whenever I have complained about the lack of taxes the mining companies are paying. I heard that cry many years ago when they used to pay one per cent of the total of the value of production. All those members over there used to say I didn't know what I was talking about.

I can recall last year the Treasurer standing in his place and saying: "We're going to increase taxes against the mining corporations at last." For six years, like dogs in a manger, they followed; and now here we have some more. I guess it's just another way of bestowing on the companies yet another handout. I guess that's to offset the problem that the federal government might be taking a shot at them through the royalty

payment; maybe this is a way of getting some of the money back to them.

What is the purpose? Does the minister intend to tell us what the real intent of this is other than, hopefully, somehow to fill up the Tory coffers?

Mr. L. Maeck (Parry Sound): For shame.

Mr. Martel: It is true.

Mr. Carruthers: That doesn't become the member at all.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I can't see any other reason. We build the roads for them. I say to my friend, the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Maeck), we build roads to resources, we build the roads for them and now we are not even going to tax them to use the roads.

There is something awfully perverse over there. Perverse is the word. We build roads for the mining corporations and we build roads for the pulp and paper industry. And now, with that largess not being sufficient, we then say: "You are not going to pay fuel tax." That's perverse, and I am not sure what the minister's response is going to be as to why he is doing this.

One might suspect that the reason is: "They don't use the highways, and therefore we don't tax them as other users of highways." But, in fact, we build many of the roads they are utilizing in the north—particularly the pulp and paper industry, also for many of the mining industries. We'll drive a road in for them. There is the roads to resources programme and so on.

Mr. Stokes: Sort of a shared thing.

Mr. Martel: Yes, kind of a shared thing. We don't have much of a share though. The only benefit we get is to pay.

Mr. Maeck: Is the member for Sudbury East asking us not to do that any more?

Mr. Martel: No. I suggest frequently that we do it—that we stop developing town-sites and build a road to tap a resource,

even if it meant 50 or 60 miles, one hour's travel. But I am saying once you build it and you put it in place, surely to God there is an onus on those people to pay for the usage of that road. Just as we, who drive across great distances of northern Ontario and the other highways, pay a fuel tax. Surely, that makes abundant sense. But you don't build them a road and then say: "You use it for nothing." We charge a tax for all the other industries in northern Ontario who are using those roads.

In fact there is an interesting report that has come across our desks from the Ontario Motor League, which I just started to go through. It says that the taxpayer in Ontario is taking a real lacing on fuel tax. I don't know if the ministry's people have read that report—a great green volume that just came across our desks within the last week. It says we are overpaying for the use of the highways in Ontario, considering the amount of tax we pay.

Here we are building roads and we are not even going to charge them. We are going to give it all back to them and say: "Here, we are going to allow you to use them and we are not going to charge you a cent." That is what disturbs me. We are building many of them. If they were building them themselves it might be a horse of a different colour, but in many instances they are not.

So I would urge the minister to reconsider and remove this from the list of legislation we are considering, because it is merely a handout to the corporate sector.

Mr. Speaker: Do any other members wish to speak to this bill on second reading?

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member for Windsor West will leave it until after 8 o'clock.

Mr. Bounsall moves the adjournment of the debate.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 22, 1975

1973 blue book, statement by Mr. McKeough	1087
Ambulance services, questions of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Reid, Mr. Lewis	1088
Rent increases, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Deans, Mr. Braithwaite, Mr. Dukszta, Mrs. Campbell, Mr. Lewis	1088
Part-time justices of the peace, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Singer, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. Roy	1089
Portrayal of violence by communications industry, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis, Mr. P. Taylor	1092
Lake Simcoe property dispute, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer	1093
Rent increases, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Lewis	1094
Pre-election literature, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Reid	1096
Asbestos in Thunder Bay harbour, question of Mr. Clement: Mr. Foulds	1096
Replies to questions on order paper, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Roy	1097
Natural resources science centre, questions of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Ferrier	1097
Canadian Book Wholesale Co., question of Mr. Welch: Mr. Spence	1097
Mercury pollution, questions of Mr. Davis and Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Stokes	1098
Quinn Enterprises, questions of Mr. Meen: Mr. Singer	1098
Cost of land for HOME projects, question of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Deans	1099
Occupational Health Act, Mr. Martel, first reading	1100
Retail Sales Tax Amendment Act, reported	1100
Third reading	1120
Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Amendment Act, Mr. Meen, on second reading	1120
Recess, 6 o'clock	1124



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, April 22, 1975

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 22, 1975

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX AMENDMENT ACT

(concluded)

Mr. Speaker: When we rose at 6 o'clock, we were considering second reading of Bill 33. I believe the member for Windsor West was about to address the assembly.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In speaking to this bill, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act, I find there is nothing very much in the bill that I can support. There might be small pieces that I can support, but mainly I can see no need for this Act coming in at all, bearing in mind the persons and corporations that this Act alone benefits.

Relief from paying tax on gasoline and diesel fuel is given already to farmers and commercial fishermen—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): And Quinn Enterprises.

Mr. Bounsall: And Quinn Enterprises; that's right. We will have something to say later about Quinn Trucking in one of the exemptions they have here.

The Act proposes to give this tax credit to institutions, including hospitals and schools. Well, I don't find this is much of a step forward. It is taking money out of one pocket and putting it in the other pocket. With respect to the heating of a school, a hospital and so on, it does decrease the institution's expenditures and it does decrease the government's revenue, but the net total expenditure position is still the same in terms of real money to spend on services. They simply don't pay the tax and their budgets must decrease by the amount that they don't pay. There is no real net saving to anyone here.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Doesn't the member think schools and hospitals are deserving?

Mr. Bounsall: Yes, but I am saying it makes no difference—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Who pays for the bill anyway?

Mr. Bounsall: It makes no difference, if I might reply—

Mr. W. Hodgson: Is the member opposed to schools and hospitals receiving the rebate?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): It was never used for heating anyway.

An hon. member: How stupid can you get?

Hon. A. K. Meen (Minister of Revenue): There was never any tax on it.

Mr. Stokes: That's right. So how can they benefit?

Mr. W. Hodgson: The NDP are against it, eh? Okay.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor West has the floor.

Mr. Bounsall: If these institutions pay no tax now, then the budget papers erroneously include them among institutional users; there's a note on page 29 of the Ontario budget statement that is incorrect.

But, as I say, if there is a decrease to any of those institutions, if they are being relieved of this tax, it is only money coming out of one Ontario government pocket and going into another Ontario government pocket. It means no more or no less funds for that government institution to provide more services to people. It makes no difference whatsoever in terms of the effective operation of that institution whether or not **the funds are here.**

In terms of the particular school it might make a very slight difference to the municipality if they pay 45 per cent of the total school budget, but it's pretty darned slight. In terms of the provincial government's contribution, it makes no difference at all.

Mr. W. Hodgson: There is quite a bit of difference.

Mr. Bounsall: If that was all the bill provided and we were dealing with that part of the bill, I suppose one could calculate that slight amount of saving on school budgets that would be passed on to the taxpayer of the municipality from such relief.

We could be in favour of this bill if that's all it did.

But what it proposes to do is to relieve from paying that gasoline tax and diesel fuel tax all those industrial users in the mining, forestry and construction industries, and all those people engaged in maintenance and construction of roads—all those contractors to whom the Ontario government gives out contracts to maintain or build roads in the province. We don't feel they need this tax relief.

All this will do is turn up on the profit balances of the companies, many of which over the last year have shown spectacular increases in percentage profits well beyond any other year of operation. They don't need this tax relief. This additional tax relief simply will not cause them to produce more jobs nor cause them to operate any more efficiently but will allow them to pay out a higher profit and make spectacularly higher percentage profits than were shown in the previous year.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I feel I cannot support this bill. There are other sections of the bill which to me are rather interesting. As should occur in any sort of tax bill, we did have a penalty on a person for unpaid taxes. One could in the past take a lien against the property of someone who did not pay taxes or penalties. We're proposing not only to remove that possibility of taking a lien against the property of someone who is required to pay tax, but has not paid it or has not paid the penalty for not paying the taxes we're also going to relieve the payment of any interest on those unpaid taxes as well where the minister considers it equitable to do so.

I can see no reason for either of these. The minister is really tempting all payers of this tax—

Mr. W. Hodgson: The member is trying to justify his opposition to the reduction of the sales tax. That's all he is trying to do.

Mr. Bounsall: No, we're not.

Mr. W. Hodgson: His party is already on the record—

Mr. Bounsall: What we are doing is attempting—

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): The sales tax bill has gone. Doesn't the member know that's gone?

Mr. Martel: Give them another slice of pie.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Where has he been for the last two days?

Mr. Martel: Trying to fill the Tory coffers for the election?

Mr. W. Hodgson: We're all ready. This is going to haunt the member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Bounsall: We are tempting and encouraging those few payees left who pay the motor vehicle fuel tax to not pay it because we could take that amount as a lien against their property but now in this bill we're saying we definitely can't. In addition, we're saying we can remit the interest as well. They can let their bills go unpaid for a while, plead special circumstances before the minister and they won't have any interest. That's zero, free borrowing, from the Province of Ontario with that provision.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Don't try to catch up with it.

Mr. Bounsall: There's no way we can see why those who have to pay this motor vehicle fuel tax should be allowed, as a special group, the possibility of getting zero interest loans from the Province of Ontario.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I find I can't support the bill. I find too many parts of it which are unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Essex South.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): I would ask the minister, before I commence any remarks, whether or not this in effect takes the tax off the fuel used by bulldozer and earth-moving operators? I have a nod of assent and this fortifies my position in supporting the particular bill.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): I hope that's the position of the member's party.

Mr. Paterson: Yes, I believe it is.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): He says it is. If he says it, it is.

Mr. Paterson: Two or three days ago, I recall, this tax was first imposed upon people using earth-moving equipment for digging aggregates and so forth for the house-building industry. I know in one case it cost a small business firm approximately \$25,000 in tax and almost put that small company out of business.

I'm glad to see this is relieved and companies such as this can now bring aggregates to the market for the housing business and so forth at a little lower price. I think this

is what is attempted in this bill. It's not all large corporations which are going to benefit; there are a lot of small contractors which are going to be relieved of this particular responsibility.

I know someone has interjected here something about the greenhouse industry. I don't believe there is any tax as such on natural gas for use in those premises. This is a matter we are currently negotiating with the Ministry of Energy. I realize it is not contained in the bill, but this is a very serious situation with these growers.

If this is to help relieve the tax and lower the cost for people in the construction business to get on with building houses and industrial parks and so forth, I think it is a very worthwhile measure.

Mr. Germa: How about Inco?

Mr. Speaker: Any other hon. member? The member for Welland South?

Mr. Haggerty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just have a question of clarification of section 5. The repeal of section 17 removes from the Act the lien against the property of a registrant for unpaid taxes and penalties. The proposed section 17 will enable the minister, where he considers it equitable to do so, to relieve against the payment of any interest provided for in this Act.

Let us take, for example, Quinn Enterprises, which has been raised here in the last couple of days in the Legislature. Does this apply to them when they owe some \$200,000 in fuel tax?

Hon. Mr. Meen: No, it does not.

Mr. Bounsall: It could, though, couldn't it?

Mr. Haggerty: The minister said he is removing the lien.

Hon. Mr. Meen: That's got nothing to do with it. I'll explain it later on.

Mr. Haggerty: The point is that it says that the minister is removing the lien. I think he indicated in the House the other day that he does have a lien against the property at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I don't ordinarily do this, Mr. Speaker, but if I could interject I would explain to the hon. member that there are liens and there are liens. In this case, the lien we are talking about is a lien for unpaid taxes. It is automatically on the property of a vendor if he sells the property. The purchaser of that business would have to get a lien clearance certificate from my ministry.

However, if as happens in the Quinn case, there is evidence of unpaid taxes, then the minister may execute a warrant and lodge the warrant with the sheriff thereby, in effect, imposing a lien on the property, but it is a different kind of lien altogether.

The removal of this kind of lien by no means alters the practice or the availability of the use of a minister's warrant for unpaid taxes or moneys owing in any event. They are not the same thing, as the hon. member for Welland may have erroneously believed them to be.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to speak to this bill? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are a number of points that have been raised. I have just cleared up one of them. If I had known I was going to have the opportunity to reply at this stage, I could have included it all in my formal remarks.

I am not quite sure how the hon. members of the NDP are going to blow when it comes to voting on this. Perhaps the member for Sudbury should talk to his colleague, the member for Cochrane South (Mr. Ferrier), who pointed out one of the advantages of the removal of the diesel tax in certain areas. The member for Cochrane South specifically referred to Texmont Mines, which is a little mine substantially removed from any hydro service as we know hydro service to be. It has had up until now to generate its own electricity by trucking in diesel fuel at a fairly high cost, I expect, for operating its diesel electric generators.

Mr. Stokes: And where was the minister when they needed his help?

Hon. Mr. Meen: It seemed unwise, unfair and unjust to impose a tax on diesel fuel used in an internal combustion engine for that purpose when a similar mining operation perhaps in an adjacent property—or not too far away, and certainly adjacent in the sense of being competitive in the market—might very well have access to hydro-electric service and be able to buy that power at substantially lesser cost.

Mr. Stokes: The member for Cochrane South raised that with the minister and he offered no assistance whatsoever. He waited until after they closed.

Mr. Martel: The minister is grasping at straws.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Martel: Why doesn't the minister talk about Inco and Abitibi, the ones who get the real benefit?

Hon. Mr. Meen: In bringing some substantial measure of equity into the taxing picture, as the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) indicated he was doing in his budget, this is one of these areas in which, by the removal of tax in such quarters, we bring a form of equity. Texmont Mines has indicated, for one, as I understand it, that given—

Mr. Stokes: Where was the minister when we needed him?

Hon. Mr. Meen: —this kind of treatment it might just reopen. Who knows?

Mr. Stokes: They closed two years ago.

Hon. Mr. Meen: If they do, the member for Thunder Bay can thank us, not the member for Sudbury.

Mr. Stokes: They closed two years ago. The government is two years too late.

Mr. Bounsall: We begged them to open that up and give them that relief two or three years ago.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I've forgotten who it was. I think it was the member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt) who asked me what general areas would benefit by the removal of the tax. I have collected some information that may be of some use to the hon. members.

For example, in the general construction field and building construction using excavation machinery, bulldozers, cranes, earth-moving equipment, and that kind of machinery, there would be about \$1.1 million in tax saved.

In road construction, graders and bulldozers—and I mentioned earlier to the member for Essex South, that earth-moving equipment would fall into that category—there would be a saving of about \$4.2 million.

In the mining industry—with Texmont as an example—there are electric generators, hauling equipment, hoists and that sort of diesel-driven equipment; there would be a saving estimated at about \$1.8 million.

In lumbering, including pulp and paper, there is machinery like diesel-driven log skidders. I would emphasize the unlicensed hauling equipment, electric generators again, personnel carriers, tree harvesters, diesel-powered sawmills and similar milling equipment; there would be a saving of about \$1.4 million.

Mr. Stokes: How are the institutions going to benefit?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Yes, I'll answer that. Municipalities and public utilities get their heating free, but they do have certain other areas of activity in the remote parts of the province. That's a relatively small item. That's estimated at \$300,000; but it still is significant.

Mr. Stokes: What about the institutions?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Institutional use is relatively small. It's \$100,000. Some of the institutions use diesel-electric generators for standby power and that's the kind of thing where they would save on having to pay tax on the fuel.

Mr. Martel: He's digging a pit to fall into.

Mr. Cassidy: Put Florence Nightingale up as a front for Inco.

Hon. Mr. Meen: In commercial use, the northern tourist camps have electric generators in ski resorts and diesel-powered tows and equipment such as that, landscaping equipment; basic commercial installations would be about \$500,000.

Mr. Cassidy: Is that a social priority or what?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Miscellaneous manufacturing would include such things as on-site unlicensed vehicles, diesel-powered machinery and gas turbines for the pumping of the gas itself through gas pipelines and diesel generators, it would be about \$1.1 million.

In all, it makes a total of some \$10.5 million of diesel tax that we would not apply in those areas.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest the real intent of this section is to bring some kind of equity to an otherwise rather confused area in which services standing side by side might find themselves in a position where one was being taxed and the other wasn't.

Mr. Martel: Side by side, 500 miles apart.

Hon. Mr. Meen: What we're trying to do is rationalize the whole picture of taxation at a relatively small expense.

There are other provisions in this bill, Mr. Speaker. I suppose I'm tempted to call them housekeeping. They implement some of the other statements by the Treasurer as basically bringing a more rational approach to the taxation picture in the fuel end of things. When we go into committee of the whole House later on the hon. members may have

some questions on these particular sections; I think we can deal more appropriately with them at that time.

Mr. Martel: What a weak answer.

Mr. Speaker: The motion, then, is for second reading of Bill 33. Shall this motion carry?

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Did I hear "no"?

The House divided on the motion for second reading of Bill 33, which was approved on the following vote:

AYES	NAYS
Allan	Bounsall
Apps	Burr
Bales	Cassidy
Belanger	Foulds
Birch	Germa
Brunelle	Lawlor
Campbell	Martel
Carruthers	Renwick
Deacon	Samis
Eaton	Shulman
Evans	Stokes—11.
Ewen	
Gilbertson	
Good	
Grossman	
Haggerty	
Hamilton	
Henderson	
Hodgson	
(Victoria-Haliburton)	
Hodgson	
(York North)	
Irvine	
Kennedy	
Lane	
Leluk	
Maeck	
McKeough	
Meen	
Morrow	
Newman	
(Windsor-Walkerville)	
Newman	
(Ontario South)	
Nixon	
(Dovercourt)	
Nuttall	
Parrott	
Paterson	
Riddell	

AYES

Root
Roy
Ruston
Scrivener
Smith
(Simcoe East)
Smith
(Hamilton Mountain)
Spence
Stewart
Taylor
(Prince Edward-Lennox)
Taylor
(Carleton East)
Villeneuve
Walker
Wardle
Winkler
Wiseman
Yakabuski—51.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 51, the "nays" 11.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

GASOLINE TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Meen moves second reading of Bill 34, An Act to amend the Gasoline Tax Act, 1973.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, strangely enough, we in this caucus don't have any serious objection to this bill. I would ask one question of the minister: Why is this particular bill made retroactive to Oct. 1, 1973?

Mr. Stokes: Oct. 30.

Mr. Renwick: Oct. 30, 1973.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Foulds) wish to speak? The member for Sudbury.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words on Bill 34, An Act to amend the Gasoline Tax Act. I'm sorry to see the government failed to take advantage of a situation which would have gone a long way

to help other aspects of society when they were tinkering with the taxation of vehicles which use propane or butane or other forms of manufactured or natural gas. This is precisely what the bill deals with.

I'd like to ask the minister why he didn't follow the lead of that great Province of British Columbia.

Mr. G. Samis (Stormont): Wonderful place.

Mr. Martel: Always in the forefront.

Mr. Germa: It seems to me that British Columbia has to keep breaking new ground in order to pull the rest of Canada with it. And I'm talking now about the problem which burning of fuels is causing in the Province of Ontario. Specifically, I'm talking about the great metropolitan area of Toronto, which is now choking to death on carbon monoxide from the emissions of automobiles. Here was a wonderful opportunity for the Minister of Revenue or the Treasurer to do a job that the Minister of the Environment (Mr. W. Newman) has been unable to do, and that is to clean up the atmosphere in our major metropolitan areas.

Does the minister know—and he probably doesn't know—that the Province of British Columbia has introduced special legislation which will provide an incentive to induce motorists and truckers to use propane and butane in automobiles and trucks? I'm sure the minister doesn't know that this product is 100 per cent combustible and does not have the effluent which comes from the burning of diesel and gasoline fuels. In one simple stroke, he could have cleaned up the mess that we see going along in our large metropolitan areas.

An hon. member: We do it now.

Mr. Germa: No, they do the opposite. They are not supplying any incentive whatsoever for automobiles or trucks to convert to a clean-burning fuel.

Mr. Samis: The minister is a person choker.

Mr. Germa: He's a person choker.

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): He is choking on his speech now. That is the pause that refreshes.

Mr. Germa: I should like to point out that the Province of Manitoba has also taken steps to encourage people to convert to a cleaner fuel. Under the legislation before us, it would appear there is going to be a tax

of 19 cents per gallon on butane or propane or manufactured gas, whereas in British Columbia the tax would be 10 cents, and that is the province where one gets the most incentive to use a cleaner fuel. Alberta has a tax rate on this product of 15 cents per gallon and Manitoba is at 17 cents.

So there are at least three provinces which have seen the light of day and have taken steps to try to get motorists away from diesel and gasoline. I'd like to ask the minister why he didn't take into consideration the environment when he is levying taxes? One of the simplest ways to clean up the environment is by incentive. It appears he cannot legislate people into mending their ways, but I'm sure if he put a carrot in front of them they will chase the carrot for their own benefit and for the benefit of all the people surrounding them. I would ask the minister to respond to that suggestion.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I think the point made by the hon. member for Sudbury is a very good one, particularly in view of the fact that there are fewer Btu in a gallon of liquefied petroleum gas and butane than there are in a gallon of gasoline and cars do not travel as far per gallon on those. Therefore, if he is trying to base the tax on the amount of use of a highway that a vehicle makes, than the minister really logically should reduce the amount per gallon, because the car will not travel as far. In addition to the other features of an incentive, it isn't there to provide the same amount per gallon tax on the propane and the butane.

I would also add that in the case of diesel, although the objectionable qualities of smell are there, the actual residue of gases is far less harmful than it is in gasoline, yet the amount of tax per gallon is a good deal more. It is 25 cents a gallon instead of 19 cents a gallon charged on gasoline. Diesel certainly is charged a good deal more than the 19 cents a gallon. I think diesel is about 25 cents a gallon.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Diesel is 25 cents.

Mr. Deacon: That's right. The reason for that, I suppose, is the fact that you get better mileage on diesel but, at the same time, the 1976 emission standards are met by diesel motors. Certainly they are in the case of an automobile. We should be encouraging that first vis-à-vis gasoline and certainly even encouraging more propane and butane. I would ask the minister to consider amending this

tax so that propane and butane and natural gas which have a lower Btu content and, therefore, will not propel a vehicle as far, be well below that of gasoline on a per-gallon basis.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the member for Sudbury and my colleague from York Centre and I really wonder why this particular amendment, in fact, even included propelling a vehicle on the highway. I would think, Mr. Speaker, that in any event there are very few motor vehicles being propelled on the highway by natural or manufactured gas or liquefied petroleum.

In fact, the tax involved, in view of the work or possibly the bureaucracy and the system of collecting tax for so few vehicles, is really peanuts. There is really no money in it. I would think the savings of the income or the revenue from taxing these particular vehicles would be extremely small. As I understand it, most of these vehicles which are using this type of gas or this type of fuel are in the experimental stage.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Not by any means.

Mr. Roy: I recall, Mr. Speaker, that Pollution Probe in Ottawa for a number of years was experimenting with vans that were using, I think, propane. They were suggesting there is a kit involved to make the exchange. As I understand it, there are still not many vehicles. For the minister to tax them, I would suggest, is inconsistent with the policy of this government, especially in large metropolitan areas, to curb pollution.

I would have thought, if we are talking about consistent policy emanating from a government, surely he wouldn't even have had to add in there vehicles which are working on the highway. I would have thought the amendment, framed the way it is now, is really not necessary. He could take out vehicles propelled on the highway.

Mr. Speaker: Do any other hon. member wish to speak to this? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, A number of questions were asked. I think I may have missed the last one as I was speaking momentarily with the House leader. But if I have missed any points I will be pleased to come back to them.

The hon. member for Riverdale asked about the retroactivity of the legislation to Oct. 30, 1973. That's the effective date of the last amendment to the Act, as a result of which I think some confusion arose as to whether the tax was intended to be applied to natural gas off-highway. So we've made it retroactive to that time. As I would observe, the retroactive aspect provision is included here to remove any doubt as to the taxable status of gases used in stationary engines. I emphasize stationary.

Although some of the hon. members, including the hon. member for York Centre, have indicated some justification for special treatment of the use of LPG on the highway, we are not, at this stage anyway, moving with this amendment to treat that problem. In any event, it was following the amendment which came into force on Oct. 30, 1973, that the ministry became aware that there was a significant increase in the use of LPG or gas-driven turbines and the like off-highway, which it had never intended to tax. So this is really a clarification of that position to make sure it is abundantly clear in the bill.

The member for York Centre was speaking about the tax applied to LPG when used on-highway, and I asked my staff just to verify that for me. It's likewise 19 cents a gallon, as with conventional gasoline. I do agree that you have roughly 100,000 Btu in a gallon of LPG, and about 155,000 Btu I believe is the figure for first-grade, and roughly the same for second-grade gasoline. So there is a significant difference. If the efficiency of the motor can be assumed to be the same, then one would get two-thirds of the mileage with LPG that one would with conventional gasoline carburetion.

I suppose that's something we should look at because I, too, would be interested in cleaning up the environment. At this stage, there isn't any tremendous use in terms of percentage or in terms of mileage of LPG for motor vehicles. Frankly, I would like to encourage it. I think it's a matter that we should be considering as some kind of incentive. That doesn't overcome the entire problem. Various fuels have various Btu ratings.

I'm not sure—well maybe we can deal with it. But under the administrative side of dealing with fuels and applying taxes to them based, not on gallonage—something that you can physically measure in terms of weight or in terms of volume—but rather in terms of their Btu component, which means a constant surveillance and testing of the various fuels, it might well be some-

thing that we would worry about. I don't for one minute suggest that it is insurmountable. Indeed, I think that's the kind of problem we should tackle.

Mr. Deacon: Would the minister move it down to 10 cents a gallon?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Well, if one were to apportion it, I would suppose two-thirds of 19 is around 12½ cents, or something of that sort. On the other hand, maybe we should go the other way and increase the gasoline tax to 25 or 26 cents to retain the same ratio. I'm really being facetious on that score.

Mr. Roy: Fortunately, he won't get a chance to.

Mr. Deacon: Let's encourage the use of propane.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Well, of course. As I say, I'm not in a position to suggest that we do that tonight. But the relationship of taxes to the energy content of fuels, particularly in the interest of an incentive in that area, would be something I think we could well look at.

I guess I have answered the member for Sudbury's question when he was asking about reference to the environment. Certainly I am as concerned as he is about environment, but this bill is not aimed specifically at that score.

Mr. Speaker: I guess I have run out of the notes that I made from listening to the hon. members opposite and I wonder—have I covered the points? There may be one point from the member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Roy: Yes, I would like to know from the minister—he seems to be versed in Btu and this type of thing—would he have any idea how many vehicles or what percentage of vehicles in this province are operating on liquefied or natural manufactured gas—liquefied petroleum?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Not in the terms of people, but we do know that we collect \$300,000 in tax from the sale of LPG in motor vehicles. That's the figure my staff have given me. That's as I understand the figure.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

Mr. Stokes: I hope the minister knows that No. 2 gas is 78 cents a gallon in Schreiber, Ont., at the present time.

INCOME TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Meen: moves second reading of Bill 35, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): I wish there were some rationality about these bills. I think, according to my merely Euclidean mathematics, never having studied Einstein, that 31 tends to come somehow, as does 32, before 35. But one never knows; the mathematics of the Conservative government allows for a certain relativity as between numbers.

I was primed, in other words, Mr. Speaker, to speak to Bill 31, the Succession Duty Act—and why on earth the minister doesn't bring it forward at this particular time to get it out of the way I don't know. The Income Tax Act is pretty well at the end of the train. We would ask that the Income Tax Act go to committee—and the minister has to so set it by a nod of the head and that's fine.

An hon. member: Standing committee.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Standing committee.

Mr. Lawlor: The standing committee. The basic propositions here in this Act—we'll approve of it, we'll affirm it. It does give some alleviation. It wipes a very considerable number of people off the tax rolls who ought never to have been on the tax rolls in the first place—people who are paying tax of \$64, that type of thing.

As the government moves in this area there is a certain sense of suavity, a certain sense of human responsibility. Many of our fellow citizens making \$5,600 a year or thereabouts ought not and cannot, with the inflationary pressures that they face today, pay income tax on top of it. Nevertheless, the income tax of this country relies—falls fully—upon those people in the brackets from that figure of \$5,600 up to \$15,000.

Beyond that there are alleviations. I mean there are expense accounts; there are a hundred things with respect to investments in trust; certain benefits being given by way of corporate investment, shareholdings, 20 per cent cutbacks. There's the business of putting your money into annuity payments, various forms of life insurance where the

upper middle class have, through lobbies and through the force of their pressure in legislatures—in the federal House particularly, but here too; this government assents to the same basic philosophy of taxation—these people have the burden lifted from them hic nunc, here and there and everywhere.

But between the figure that the government has alleviated and the \$15,000 figure, that's where the weight falls; that's where the bulk of the revenue for the country comes in. Insofar as income tax represents any kind of weighty taxation scheme at the present time in this province that's where the government gets its revenue from, it is not from the well-to-do. The minister may argue that there are not enough well-to-do. Well, there are enough well-to-do over \$15,000—and I call anyone over that figure well-to-do whatever Onassis may think, bless his soul—

Mr. Stokes: He is not thinking these days.

Mr. Lawor: Well, we will have to go to Niarchos, etc., who is barely thinking, and see where the ripoff comes in the whole situation.

This bill and the Corporations Tax Act are the two bills in which come the election expenses—credits and benefits to individuals in the election—particularly the Corporations Tax Act to which we will have to give very severe scrutiny. I mean, at the present time we are being hung up and, to use the vernacular, screwed by the Conservative government over there with respect to trade union contributions to election expenses and to the ongoing life of particularly the New Democratic Party.

The legislation that we will be facing shortly, and that we have here, gives alleviations to individuals and particularly to corporations as to the ambit and the flexibilities that they have with respect to supporting the old-line parties in their continued inviability, as things stand. And that can't be discussed, Mr. Speaker, with any insightfulness on second reading. It requires committee, where we can enter into the niceties of the legislation.

We agree with the benefits of the tax credit concept as operative here—the expansion thereof and the limits set forth in the budget papers. But as you can expect, Mr. Speaker, we will say with validity, I suggest, that they don't go far enough. With inflationary pressures running at 12, 15 or 20 per cent per annum, they are hitting particular income groups very hard because of the

selectivity involved in their purchasing power. After all, they are not buying stereo sets, you know; they are buying basic, necessary commodities.

The inflationary pressures on the poor are not commensurate with, identical with or comparable to those on the upper middle class, by no means, although the averaging principle operates in this particular field. They suffer the full impact, which I suspect would be closer to 26 or 28 per cent per annum where the real weight of inflationary pressures falls. To the extent that this legislation gives cognizance of that—although it never does in the budget papers, in the statement by the Treasurer nor in the course of the rationalizations that go behind legislation—there is some alleviation, and we are therefore forced necessarily to support the legislation under that particular head.

The several principal matters under the legislation are best scrutinized and dissected in a nice way outside this House, rather than in an overall way within it. So we will not be opposing the legislation. Nevertheless, we would hope to give the minister a fairly scappling time when the committee work begins.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kitchener.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add certain comments with respect to Bill 35 on second reading.

We are, of course, pleased that section 2 sets out the reduction for the particular individuals who had been relieved from federal income tax so that those same benefits would apply to the provincial income tax requirement. The 450,000 low-income individuals who were referred to in the budget speech are, of course, persons whose ability to pay the federal income tax has now been decided as being such that they should not be burdened with this particular requirements. As this Act now parallels the federal legislation, we are obviously pleased to support the relief of income tax payments from the Ontario government's point of view for those particular individuals.

Section 3 deals particularly with those who have been involved with benefits as a result of a convention or treaty entered into by the federal government. There was, of course, that \$5,000 treaty exemption for Americans through the treaty convention that had existed over the past. One wonders, and perhaps the minister may have the opportunity to reply, whether there were any attempts to collect the income tax required from the Province of Ontario from those who were otherwise

relieved from paying taxes. Certainly if the usual withholding provisions were applied, then this amount of tax could be returned from the federal authorities if the individuals involved were relieved from that particular obligation.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, there is that mauve or purple-coloured sheet with the income tax return that allows claims, not only for pensioner credit and sales tax but also for the home occupation costs at Ontario's expense, to be deducted from the federal obligation of paying tax. When that total figure has subtracted from it the two per cent credit for taxable income which is paid, we wind up with a net credit balance that is otherwise claimable by the persons who are completing those tax forms. Obviously, since there has been no federal income tax payable to these persons, there should be no tax credit given by the Province of Ontario. This change in procedure follows along and develops this same kind of balance that we are seeing in dealing with the low-income individuals I have referred to earlier.

Basically, the items in section 3 also parallel federal legislation. The federal government has given credit for individuals who give donations not only to the election campaigns of federal parties but as ordinary party contributions and, as well, as individual items to candidates. In this bill, the provincial government's deduction allowable for election campaign expenses is, of course, deductible from the provincial tax which is payable.

Particularly, from a corporation's point of view, the \$4,000 figure which has been referred to in the legislation is a deduction before the taxable base is struck for the application of federal income tax. With a 12 per cent rate applicable for the collection of tax by the province, this benefit, shall we say, on the \$4,000 base allows some \$480 which is available as a net benefit to a company which contributes that total amount of money. For the individual, in order to get the \$500 total tax deduction, I understand a donation of some \$1,150 would be required.

There is one area I would appreciate the minister referring to and that is with respect to associated corporation rules. It applies not only here but perhaps also in the Corporations Tax Act as something that should be considered since, presumably, associated corporations would be able to maximize their beneficial contributions to political parties by having separate contributions from each of the particularly organized companies.

Certainly there's going to be publicity required for the new election donation pos-

sibilities and for the rules which are now going to apply. I presume the organization of the necessary committee under the Election Expenses Act will provide us with many of the detailed decisions and the approach which should be taken by all political parties to deal with this on a constituency basis.

We are, of course, most aware that in the average constituency organization it may not always be possible to have the lawyer or the chartered accountant as a member of the executive of that association, or as a resource person available to deal with the detailed approach that this and the amendments to the Corporations Tax Act are going to require. We're looking forward, as a result, to the aide-mémoire that at least is going to be provided by the commission, I would hope, to deal with the many kinds of details which are going to arise when political donations come out of the woodwork, out of the dim, dark past and become not only things which should be encouraged but donations which are socially acceptable.

In sections 4 and 5 we deal with the instalment provisions which basically, as I understand it, parallel the federal legislation. Individuals other than farmers and fishermen are going to be allowed, as they were, to pay their two-thirds income tax before Dec. 31 and the remainder by April 30. Now we have the rules changing somewhat so that the wording and the addition of certain terms in this section are, as I understand it, once again going to parallel the federal legislation.

The previous year has been used by these individuals over the past for their current donations to the income tax funds and, presumably, sections 4 and 5 here are going to allow for instalment paying so that the same basis is available for those paying provincial income tax as exists in the federal situation. As a result, we're going to have one area of consistency in the rules and that is certainly to be encouraged.

We are prepared to support the bill. I suggest this will at least be helpful to a number of citizens within the province as they calculate their various tax obligations. We are at least dealing with similar items in the same way, under both Ontario's legislation and that of the federal government.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Speaker, could I just say a few words on that section of the bill having to do with tax credits for donations to political parties? I am sure everyone is aware of what has been going on in the past as far as financing parties is concerned. The major

corporations, by unwritten rule, have made donations on the basis of 60 per cent—40 per cent to the two old-line parties. The party in power gets the 60 per cent and the old-line party not in power, like Tweedledee and Tweedledum, Tweedledum gets 40 per cent.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Breithaupt: Unions don't do it that way.

Mr. Germa: This has resulted, Mr. Speaker, in a complete farce of the whole political process right across this country for the past 100 years. When corporations finance this façade of Tweedledee fighting with Tweedledum, people over here watching this great debate and this great debacle going on get confused and rattled and think there is a contest between two opposing political parties. You and I, Mr. Speaker, who are quite close to the situation know that nothing is further from the truth, that these two parties have been playing a game strictly to bring in the gate and splitting the gate receipts between them.

Mr. Breithaupt: Let us in on the secret.

Mr. Germa: I think there would have been, or there still is, an opportunity here for the minister, if he wants to be truly honest, to clean up this Act, this façade we have had in Canada for 100 years, this wrestling match.

One can watch on TV two huge wrestlers grunting and groaning and struggling and entertaining the people. It's a game, and the government has ruined the political process by perpetuating this game, by allowing corporations and rich individuals to make contributions to two political parties. I think before a contribution should be made, the person should define which political party he is donating to and should be precluded from donating to another political party so that this game will not continue any further in the future.

If there is a philosophical difference between a Liberal and a Conservative, I fail to see it. But at least these people will have to identify as one or the other, and maybe one of them will disappear, so that the campaign then can come down to basic philosophical differences. Then the people in Canada and the people in Ontario will have a realistic choice of the kind of government they are going to get.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They are revolutionaries over there.

Mr. Germa: What is the sense, Mr. Speaker, of having these two parties, who believe philosophically in the capitalistic, free-enterprise, profit-motivated system? What choice do the people have when these people preoccupy all the boob tubes, the newspapers and radio and saturate the whole province with their propaganda?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Germa: The people think they have been subject to an election campaign and it's a farce.

Mr. Breithaupt: A lot of the member's party have done well in cabinet.

Mr. Germa: It's an absolute ruse that these people have been participating in.

Mr. Ruston: A member of that member's party is playing the stock market for profit.

Mr. Germa: There they are. They could, by one stroke of the pen, clean up this façade and put both of these guys in the same bag.

Mr. Breithaupt: Members of his party do all right.

Mr. Germa: I am not fussy which one of the guys comes out of the bag because they are both the same, Tweedledee and Tweedledum. What is the difference between the two people? There is nothing. They are sitting here both—

Mr. Speaker: Order, could we get back to the principle of this bill, please?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: He doesn't understand the bill.

Mr. Germa: I am speaking on the subject of political donations and how dual donations have wrecked the political system in Canada.

Mr. Speaker: That is not what the bill is about. The bill is about certain income tax credits.

Mr. Germa: I am supporting the bill because the bill is a small step to encouraging people to become politically active.

Mr. Ruston: Ontario Hydro is bad enough.

Mr. Germa: I support the principle. At no time did I say I wasn't supporting the bill. I am trying to show the government how it could have made the bill better.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): He really doesn't know

what he is talking about. We have always known it.

Mr. Germa: I support the proposition of individual donations but I don't support the proposition of fat-cat corporations buying power in two political parties at the same time.

Mr. Lawlor: Perfectly right.

Mr. Germa: The government hasn't precluded that from happening and that is precisely what I am talking about. I support the principle of individual donations to a political party, not to two political parties.

Mr. Breithaupt: What about three?

An hon. member: Why does the NDP check them off, then?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Welland South.

Mr. Haggerty: I wasn't going to get into this debate, Mr. Speaker, but after listening to the member for Sudbury—and I do happen to carry a union card yet—I would like to say that I would just as soon have 10 cents from every labour person in my constituency donate to my campaign—

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Voluntary or otherwise?

Mr. Haggerty: —and over a period of four years, I'll tell you, I could run a darned good campaign.

Mr. Breithaupt: If necessary.

Mr. Germa: The member for Welland South gets 40 per cent from Inco. He'd take the 40 per cent and make up the remaining 60 per cent.

Mr. Haggerty: In many cases, you know, it's taken off the paycheque of a person employed in industry without even consulting him—

Mr. Lawlor: He has the full opportunity to make his representation. Come off it.

Mr. Haggerty: If he wants to opt out of it he has to go to the federal NDP—

Mr. Lawlor: Some of the Neanderthal Liberals really deserve to be flagellated. They are worse than the Tories.

Mr. Haggerty: I can tell the hon. member quite a bit about it.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Lawlor: They are purblind backward beggars.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lawlor: What do they think 10 cents will accomplish?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Will the member for Lakeshore restrain himself? Order please. The principle of this particular bill is not where the money comes from.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: That is out of order, and any response to that is out of order. Does the member wish to speak to the principle of this particular bill?

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to the principle of the bill. I'm talking about fund-raising, and I want to tell the members how—

Mr. Speaker: Order please. This has nothing to do with fund-raising. This has to do with income tax deductions.

Mr. Breithaupt: That's fund-raising.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, it affects the income tax. I know of instances in elections where a certain union will support a certain party, in particular the NDP.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. That was discussed in Bill 3. This has to do with income tax deductions.

Mr. Haggerty: This does deal with income tax.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I must point out that Bill 3 had to do with political party financing.

Mr. Ruston: You let the previous speaker speak for 10 minutes. He wasn't on the bill whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. This has to do with deductions from income tax.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, the point I'm trying to make is that there are a number of cases where the unions will go to a certain employee working in industry and say: "Look, we want you to donate two or three weeks of your time—"

Mr. Speaker: This has nothing to do with the Income Tax Act.

Mr. Haggerty: I'm coming to that point.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. You're talking about Bill 3. We're now talking about Bill 35.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, the point I'm trying to bring to your attention is that when they go out and use this method of assisting a political party, they will say to him: "If you take two weeks of your time off from employment, the union will guarantee you two weeks wages." So in a sense the government is losing income tax. They're evading income tax.

Mr. Speaker: That is not the income tax we're talking about. Will you please stick to the principle of this particular bill?

Mr. Ruston: Right on. Right on.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): It's contributions. It's in this bill.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further remarks on this particular bill?

Mr. Haggerty: I'm afraid to continue in case you won't allow me—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member must recognize that he is talking about political party financing and not the deductions from income tax as allowed in this particular bill.

Mr. Haggerty: It's a political contribution to a party; and this is what we're dealing with. If I want to give \$100 to the federal Liberal Party, I can deduct it for income tax purposes. Right?

An hon. member: That's very true.

Mr. Haggerty: I'm suggesting that there are ways that you can get around it by providing free time to a political party. If you lose that time from industry the union will make up the loss of the wages in that they're donating almost \$300 to a political party and not getting anything in return for it; in a sense, there is a loss of income tax to the government. I suppose we could get into this in more detail but the Speaker probably would rule me out of order. I was thinking particularly of the free advertising that is given to the NDP in union papers, and there are no taxes on that.

Mr. Bounsall: There never is any.

Mr. Ruston: Oh, no? The member ought to read them. I get one every month. I know. Don't kid me.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Haggerty: It goes on in almost every party, and if we're going to have equity in the system, then we're going to have to come forward with a different bill.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to speak to this bill? The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on this bill in relation to the comments that were made by the Treasurer in the course of his remarks on the budget and draw to the attention of the assembly what I believe to be one of the fundamental inequities of the distribution of income in the Province of Ontario.

Strangely enough, the proposal which is mirrored in the bill which is now before us was referred to by the Treasurer in terms which need to be clearly understood. He stated that these high tax-free thresholds ensure that Ontario's income tax and tax credit system remain the most generous in Canada. After having spoken about the fact that these persons are not now going to be subject to income tax and therefore they will be entitled to further tax credits, he states that this represents a further significant advance in the total equity of Ontario's tax structure.

What it doesn't deal with, of course, and what is missing entirely from the budget of the Province of Ontario, in any significant sense, is the question of whether or not sufficient people have sufficient income to pay the income tax; or have sufficient income which, together with the credits to which they are entitled, raised them to a point where they can pay the income tax. This bill, you see, Mr. Speaker, deals only with the question of whether or not you have sufficient income and at what marginal level you escape tax.

One of the major problems in the province, one of the problems recognized by the former Treasurer (Mr. White), was the question of income distribution among the people in the province. The former Treasurer stated, and the chairman of the present Ontario Economic Council has emphasized, that one aspect of the assembly of information with which the Ontario Economic Council is concerned is the question of the distribution of personal income in Ontario and the impact which all three levels of government have upon it.

When you consider, Mr. Speaker, the levels of income at which persons in Ontario

are going to be freed of tax, what the Treasurer has stated, so far as I can understand it, in relation to his tax cost of \$11 million, is that it will remove 450,000 individuals from the income tax rolls. That means they are persons paying something less than \$25 a year in personal income tax. They are, on the average, the ones who will be removed from the tax roll; that's how low their income is at the present time.

When you state that you are going to remove those people, Mr. Speaker, you forget that below those people there are still, in the Province of Ontario, a substantial number of persons who are nowhere near the level of income where they will be in a position to make any payments of income tax.

I want to quote to the minister, if I may, some of the figures which were available at the federal level about the distribution of income in Canada. To my mind they are shocking.

I quote from some figures which were used by the hon. Marc Lalonde who is the federal minister responsible in the field of health and welfare. I think the assembly would be interested, and I know the minister would be interested, in this income distribution problem; because as the minister has said, the budget is a package, designed not only to relieve people of taxes but to assist in the distribution of income so that we will have something called a more equal society.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Equality in the taxes.

Mr. Renwick: Listen to the figures. Using the latest family income data available, which is for the year 1972, there was a total of five million families, including couples without children. If we divide the incomes they received into five groups, that is five slices of one million families each in Canada, we will find that 20 per cent of the families, one million of them, received less than \$5,516 a year. Of these one million families, 345,000 received less than \$3,000 a year.

Another 20 per cent, that's the second quintile of one million families, received incomes of from \$5,516 to \$8,941 per annum. Still another 20 per cent, that's the third one million families—the third quintile—received incomes of from \$8,942 to \$11,698.

Of the highest income Canadian families—that's the top two quintiles, the top two million families—40 per cent received more than \$11,698 with half of them having incomes of from \$11,699 to \$15,432 and the other half more than \$15,432. Of the one million

families earning more than \$15,432 there were 190,000 who received more than \$25,000 a year.

Let me state the impressive facts about those particular figures. Twenty per cent of the families in this country were living on less than \$5,516 in 1972. This figure was 49 per cent of average family income in Canada, which means that one-fifth of all Canadian families were required to live on incomes of less than one-half of the national average family income.

Even more striking is the fact that the share of total Canadian family income being received by this bottom 20 per cent of the families was less than six per cent. Twenty per cent of our families received less than six per cent of all family income. Compare this with the fact that the top 20 per cent of Canadian families in 1972 received 39 per cent of all family income.

When we move from families to individuals the discrepancy and the bias is even greater.

I would simply like to draw also to the minister's attention that when we deal with the people who have the lowest income, it is only because of the transfer payments which have been made that they received that six per cent. Without the transfer payments, the lowest 20 per cent of the families in Canada—one million families—would receive only 3.4 per cent of total family income. They are dependent, therefore, for a substantial part of their income on the transfer payments made through the taxation systems in this country.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Can the member break those down for Ontario?

Mr. Renwick: I'm not in a position to break them down.

Hon. Mr. Meen: That would be helpful.

Mr. Renwick: I tried to get the information. I asked the former Treasurer about it but I was unable to get that information. Roughly speaking, it is somewhat slightly better than a division of one-third would produce; slightly better because there has been a slightly higher increment. I hope the minister, with the resources which are at his disposal, might get the exact equivalent of these figures for Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Meen: It would be interesting to compare it, wouldn't it?

Mr. Renwick: It certainly would be very interesting to compare it. The other funda-

mental fact that he drew to the attention of the audience to which the hon. Marc Lalonde was then speaking on that occasion, was to state that the share of family income going to the bottom 20 per cent of Canadian families has not increased nor has the share going to the top 20 per cent decreased, and similarly the shares of the middle 60 per cent have remained relatively constant.

In 1951, the families in the bottom 20 per cent of the income scale received 6.1 per cent of total family income. In 1972, they received 5.9 per cent. Their share did not increase. Taking the families in the top 20 per cent of the income scale, their share of total family income went from 41.1 per cent to 39.1 per cent over the same period, and the share of the 40 per cent just below that went up from 39.4 per cent to 42 per cent. The significant thing is that the shares of family income enjoyed by these several income classes have remained stable over a period of 20 years despite the enormous increases in social security payments.

I am looking forward to the information which the Ontario Economic Council may produce, but let us always remember that when we are removing people from the tax rolls—450,000 of them were removed by eliminating on the average \$25 of provincial income tax—below those persons there is a substantial number of people who are receiving so little income, on the basis of this statistical information, that they pay no tax and will not ever, for practical purposes, be in a position to pay tax.

We've had a series of measures put in front of us dealing with the benefits which are to be received by the corporations through, as my colleagues have pointed out, the motor vehicle fuel tax. Dealing, as we are purporting to deal here, with those persons who have been paying marginal amounts of income tax, nothing in this programme of the government—nothing over the years has indicated during the course of the rule of the provincial government in Ontario that there has been any relative change in the quintiles of the families earning income in Canada. The lowest 20 per cent are still receiving the same relative percentage, relative to those who are in the top 20 per cent.

There has been no significant advance in the determination of the equality of income distribution in the Province of Ontario. The incremental changes which have been made have had the sole result of maintaining the relative levels and not depreciating the persons who are in the lowest quintiles

further than they were depreciated over the long period of time.

I admit—we do not have the research facilities to get it and I haven't been able to get it—that I do not have the Ontario figures, but I am satisfied the Ontario figures will show that after 20 years, if we divide the families into their five quintiles in the Province of Ontario, the relative distribution of income to each of those quintiles will be the same. The only result that has been achieved, without the marginal transfer payments that this government in conjunction with the federal government has carried out, is to maintain the same relative poverty of those in the lowest 20, 40 and 60 per cent of the population.

Those are, to my mind, significant and important policy questions which remain for the government of Ontario, regardless of the party that is in power, because that distribution of income has to change radically and significantly. There has to be a fundamental change in policy and this government has to discard the incremental changes which it is making which lead only to marginal changes in the relative levels.

We will be dealing a little later this evening, of course, with what is left of the remnants of the so-called tax on wealth in the Province of Ontario in the inheritance taxes and in the Succession Duty Act.

It appeared to me to be the appropriate time when we are dealing with the Treasurer's statements in his budget about this income tax cut that we clearly reflect that, while it may remove some persons from liability for income tax, there is nothing in that provision of the budget which will change in any real sense the distribution of income to the lowest 20 per cent and the small percentage which that group received—the small percentage which the lowest 40 per cent received—as compared with the highest 40 per cent in the income distribution of the province.

I think there is a significant policy problem for the government of Ontario when it is considering its expenditure programme. I hark back to what I said earlier, that a substantial part of the expenditure programmes of the provincial government must be and must continue to be in an ever-enlarging scale the kinds of transfer payments, which will guarantee to people the kinds of income which will produce some relatively greater degree of equality in income distribution between the families in the top two quintiles of the population and the families in the

bottom two quintiles, and the individuals in the top two quintiles and the individuals in the bottom two quintiles of the population distribution insofar as it relates to income.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to take part in the debate? The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my remarks to those offered by the member for Riverdale, particularly. I found them particularly interesting. I wonder if I could have a copy of the material from which he was quoting the figures. I wonder if he could also clarify for me, because I wasn't sure whether he was speaking about taxable income or the total family income in the various five quintiles.

Mr. Renwick: Just income. Just income distribution.

Hon. Mr. Meen: This was total income before quotation of tax and before taxable allowances—

Mr. Renwick: That's right; and I will certainly be glad to let the minister have that.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Yes, I would like to see that. I don't know whether we can do a breakout on that as to Ontario, but I would be surprised if the lowest quintile and the second lowest quintile did not demonstrate a somewhat improved factor here in Ontario because of our GAINS programme and our tax credit provisions and so on.

Mr. Renwick: But not in relative terms to the top.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Well, possibly not relative to the top, but I am talking about the assistance to those in the two lowest quintiles. I am sure we are very much better off here in Ontario as a result of our various tax credit programmes—the OTC working for people of all ages, and of course, the GAINS programme working in largest measure, apart from those blind and disabled, in largest measure to those aged 65 and over. So I think that goes a long way toward alleviating the kind of difficulties the hon. member was referring to—

Mr. Cassidy: A long way?

Mr. Lawlor: It goes a tiny way.

Hon. Mr. Meen: —experienced by those in the lowest income brackets, at least here in Ontario.

Mr. Cassidy: A long way—does the minister say that seriously?

Mr. Lawlor: It is a recognition of the problem.

Hon. Mr. Meen: In short, coming back to the basic principles of this bill, we are endeavouring to parallel the measures enacted recently in the federal income tax scheme.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The removal of 450,000 from the tax rolls is, of course, one illustration of the paralleling of the federal government since the last election.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Meen: And, it's at an expense of some \$11 million.

The member for Kitchener was asking about the commission and the guidelines, which we all expect. So, to answer him in short; yes, I expect that commission, when appointed, will be issuing guidelines. I sincerely hope they will issue them soon. As soon as they are appointed and get down to work, I would expect that would be task No. 1, to give all of us some guidelines as to political donations and how we would live within the Elections Act and within the income tax provisions of this Act, which are designed to parallel the federal provisions.

The member for Kitchener referred to corporate donations at 12 per cent working out at \$480; and in the case of individual contributions maximizing at \$1,150, to a total allowable deduction from income tax of \$500 from the 30.5 per cent provincial portion of the tax.

Mr. Speaker, I have told the hon. members that this is one bill I would like to put into the standing committee to be dealt with by the committee when that committee is finished with its deliberations on Bill 3. I want to thank the members from both parties opposite for their support. When the bill has been given second reading, I would request that it be directed to the standing committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: It is the Chair's understanding that this bill will be referred to the standing committee on administration of justice.

Agreed.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 33, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act.

Bill 34, An Act to amend the Gasoline Tax Act, 1973.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, the minister is not prepared to proceed further with his bills because of some technical reasons. I have been in communication one way or another with the House leader of the Liberal Party in an effort to bring the member for Ottawa East in. I would ask if we are able to locate him.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, we have sent for the member.

Mr. Lawlor: Does this mean his high dud-gion is not sufficient unto the day?

Mr. Breithaupt: It would appear that we are ready to adjourn somewhat earlier than might otherwise have been the case. I understand the member for Port Arthur, as well, is on his way; because he, too, wishes to involve himself in the late debate, that might otherwise take place on adjournment with respect to the standing order with which we are all so familiar.

If we could have perhaps one moment, Mr. Speaker, to attempt to locate both of those members, who perhaps are not otherwise aware we were coming on so quickly in this matter and that the House was otherwise adjourning somewhat earlier than might have been presumed, then we could no doubt deal with the particular answers to the questions, which were expected to take some time.

I think that I have attempted, other than to spend the additional few seconds giving those kinds of pauses that do occur in one's speech from time to time, to add—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The late show.

Mr. Breithaupt: —at least, Mr. Speaker, to deal with this particular problem. If the members would otherwise prefer, perhaps this particular matter could be put over on this occasion, if wanted by the members who were involved, to another time.

Mr. Lawlor: Oh, we're just dying to hear the late show, this form of infantile petulance over his bloody questions.

Mr. Breithaupt: If that was not otherwise satisfactory, both with respect to the member for Ottawa East—

Mr. Lawlor: He hasn't got anything better to do than abuse the rules of the House.

Mr. Breithaupt: —and the member for Port Arthur, then perhaps we could deal with the matter directly—

Mr. Lawlor: Every time he doesn't get an answer he goes off and pouts in the corner. Then he drags everybody else back here at night to listen to him and he doesn't show up.

Mr. Breithaupt: —as soon as the member for Ottawa East was available to us, I am aware, Mr. Speaker, of course that our colleague, the member for Lakeshore, is most anxious to enter into the hearing of the details of this area as soon as that is possible.

Hon. Mr. Crossman: He doesn't have anything to say anyway.

Mr. Lawlor: There are too damn many prima donnas around here.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The member should talk.

Mr. Breithaupt: Indeed, he may choose to join in at this time to allow us all the benefit not only of his remarks or his comments during the motion, but also thereafter.

Hon. Mr. Crossman: Someone should send him the Gideon Bible and it would be a lot easier.

An hon. member: Let's adjourn the House.

Mr. Lawlor: Adjourn the House. Cut him off.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I believe I caught a suggestion that this might be postponed to Thursday evening. Is that a proposal?

Mr. Breithaupt: I would suggest it because I presume, Mr. Speaker, that the time for adjournment has come somewhat earlier than might have been expected by the two members who were going to speak on this particular matter.

Mr. Lawlor: We have to sit through the preliminaries.

Hon. Mr. Crossman: It's just a slow clock, that's all.

Mr. Speaker: If this is a proposal, does the hon. House leader have anything to say?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I am certainly grateful for the co-operation I have had this evening.

Mr. Martel: We are always co-operative on this side of the House.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I'm not really terribly concerned about the remarks of the member for Lakeshore. However, I do have some sympathy for his cause this evening. I'm sure that he's prepared to go home now.

Mr. Lawlor: I am not very much concerned about them, either.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He was going to see the chiropractor.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Inasmuch as we have tried to the best of our ability to—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They dredged up the member for Ottawa East somewhere.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —accommodate those within the hours of sitting of this day, I think, Mr. Speaker, with your consent and the consent of the House we might now proceed to that special order.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to standing order 28(a), I deem a motion to adjourn the House to have been made. I now recognize the member for Ottawa East to speak for five minutes on the matter of a list of architects, which question he raised with the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch).

ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES

Mr. Roy: I start with the architects first, do I? Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I never thought that I'd be so—

Mr. Haggerty: Sought after.

Mr. Roy: —sought after and have people waiting for me with breathless anticipation—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: He is not sought after.

Mr. Lawlor: He imposes himself.

Mr. Roy: —including the government House leader. I feel very honoured, Mr. Speaker, to receive this treatment in the House. It doesn't happen to me very often.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Well, let the member not waste his time. He has only got 10 minutes.

Mr. Roy: Quit interrupting me and I'll put it in 10 minutes.

Mr. Deans: Five minutes.

Mr. Roy: I've got 10 minutes total. I've got another one after this.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, we know that very well.

Mr. Deans: I'll see him on Thursday.

Mr. Cassidy: We're debating whether to leave now or later.

Mr. Roy: Would you bring these members under control, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: The clock is running. The member will get on with his speech.

Mr. Lawlor: Did the member hear what I called his position? I called it infantile petulance. Why doesn't he grow up?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has five minutes and one of them has already gone.

Mr. Roy: Is he for real? Is he serious or what is he?

Mr. Lawlor: I am for real. The question is whether the member is imaginary or not. It is a pure piece of delusion.

Mr. Roy: He should go back to the days of Shakespeare and maybe he might fit in. He doesn't fit in here.

Mr. Lawlor: Oh, get on with it. We have to get home.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, at that time I had raised a concern that had been brought to my attention involving the fact that certain architects had been on a list in relation to the construction of a hospital in Hawkesbury. At that time, one particular architect was competent. He was from eastern Ontario, and apparently was wanted by a number of members on that hospital board to participate in that project. Because his name was not on the list, I got in touch with the Minister of Health (Mr. Miller) and apparently he got in touch with the local hospital board and said that these people who were architects could be chosen if they were not, in fact, on the list.

When this architect went back to the board they said there was no way he would be considered if he was not on that list. At that point, I asked him to get in touch with

the member for the area, the member for Prescott and Russell (Mr. Belanger). Apparently he did get in touch with the member for Prescott and Russell and asked why his name was not being considered when he had proved himself in the past. For instance, he had done work on the mall for a hospital in Ottawa and a number of other projects in eastern Ontario and, in fact, projects in the riding of Prescott and Russell.

At the time he approached the member for Prescott and Russell he was advised that he would see about getting him on the list so that he could be given consideration along with the other architects who are on this list.

Unfortunately, during the discussion apparently he was asked if he had made a contribution to the party. Mr. Speaker, I have great admiration and sympathy for the member for Prescott and Russell. I think he was possibly pressured by some of the people in his area, because this particular architect had not contributed and at that point did not end up on the list.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I raise the question is that I wanted from this minister, or the Minister of Health possibly, a statement that that is not a consideration when people are being considered for government work. We have had experience in the past and we have seen not only this government but governments in other provinces which have limited—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Tell us how the Liberals do it. How do the Liberals choose their architects?

Mr. Roy: It's wide open. The Liberals are wide open.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Wide open for the Grits.

Mr. Roy: That's right. The Tories know they have got their lists. Mr. Speaker, I find it important that people should be considered for their competence and their experience—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Come off it. Of all the phonies, this member has to take the cake for all of them.

Mr. Roy: —and not based on whether they have made a contribution to the party.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Who is he trying to kid? We've been around long enough to know. He's still wet behind the ears.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: The comments of these two ministers, Mr. Speaker, clearly indicate I have reason for concern and that they do have their list. Surely, Mr. Speaker, in this province, in 1975, the time has come when government work should not be limited to friends of the party. This has been going on for too long. I think it is incumbent upon a minister when a legitimate complaint is made, that we get some—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: He's as phoney as a \$3 bill and he knows it.

Mr. Roy: —responsible response that these lists will cease and that the criterion for consideration for government work is not contribution to the party but competency and experience in that field.

What is of more concern, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that most of these architects were not from eastern Ontario. Is that just a coincidence? There are a lot of competent architects in eastern Ontario. My point, Mr. Speaker, is I think it is important that the minister make a statement.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Phoney as a \$3 bill.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Roy: He should make a statement that this practice does not exist and that if it did exist it will cease and that directives are sent out to hospital boards or any other agency of the government that these should be open. The basis for choosing people should be competency not whether they made contributions to the party.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member's time has expired.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The member ought to know. Tell us about the prosecution hearings. He is on the federal list of people.

Mr. Roy: These two ministers confirm what I am saying. They do have lists and they follow their lists.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the hon. minister wish to reply?

Mr. J. Riddell (Huron): The Minister of Agriculture should save his energy for the horse and the plough.

Hon. M. Birch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): Mr. Speaker, on March 26 the member for Ottawa East asked the following question:

In the absence of the Minister of Health and the Premier, I would like to ask a question of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development. Would the provincial secretary give an undertaking to this House that the government will cease the practice, when awarding contracts or jobs to architects, under which the architects are chosen on the basis of a list, and that the only way they get on the list is to make a contribution to the Conservative Party? Would she undertake to stop this practice?

Mr. Speaker, at the time I considered that question inappropriate and improper.

Mr. Roy: That is the Speaker's job, not the minister's.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It was also considered improper by the Speaker and was ruled so.

Mr. W. Hodgson: It's like those Liberal members on the CMHC list.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I would like to present the facts to the member.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: Was the member's cigar loaded?

Mr. Lawlor: The member is only a criminal lawyer. He wouldn't get on a list.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: To begin with, Mr. Speaker, there is no such thing as an approved list of architects issued by the Ministry of Health.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Hear that?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: A list of firms was sent by the ministry at the request of the Hawesbury Hospital Board of Governors after a meeting with the administrator and some of the board members. At that meeting, the ministry representative expressed reluctance to name persons as requested by the board. However, the board members indicated they had no knowledge of architects who had built hospitals, and asked for a list of architects who had hospital building experience, preferably in building hospitals around 90 to 120 beds.

The letter from the ministry on Feb. 18, 1975, noted that the choice of firms was a prerogative of the hospital board. The letter says, in part, and I quote:

These are only some of the architects available and, of course, you may have the names of others you may wish to contact. After your board has chosen an architect, the draft terms of agreement must be submitted for ministry approval prior to the hospital formally entering into any contract.

That list included firms from Montreal, North Bay, Collingwood, Ottawa, Sudbury, and four from Toronto. I'm sending over a copy of that letter to the hon. member for Ottawa East.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Very good.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I now recognize the member for Ottawa East concerning the government's handling of the Ottawa teachers' strike, which he raised a few days ago.

OTTAWA TEACHERS' DISPUTE

Mr. Cassidy: He is a bear for punishment, isn't he? Does he want legislation to send them back to work?

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, would you get the member for Ottawa Centre to get hold of himself, or to control himself?

Mr. Cassidy: I fully expect the solution will come from the Liberal Party. They do it on every pretext.

Mr. Roy: Would the member for Ottawa Centre pull himself together, as my friend would say?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Will the member carry on?

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, possibly I can explain the situation. At the time the question was raised about the Ottawa situation, the people had been on strike and the schools had been closed in Ottawa for five weeks.

Mr. Lawlor: It's incredible that the member should have the effrontery, the damned presumption, time after time, to come forward with his questions in this House at this particular time. Has he no sense of feeling for his fellow members?

Mr. Speaker: Will the member for Lakeshore please restrain himself?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Roy: Tell him to pull himself together. His face is red; and he's getting excited.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Give it to him, Pat.

Mr. Roy: Is the member afraid he will lose his seat?

Mr. Lawlor: Who does he think he is; a prima donna?

Mr. Roy: "What are these, so withered and so wild in their attire, that look not like the inhabitants of the earth and yet are on it?"

Mr. Lawlor: Is he going to do a little dance? Get up on the desk and do it. Do the tarantella in the moonlight. Give us a rest. Who does he think he is? Choose some of these members.

Mr. Roy: Does he understand that? I'll recite a bit of Shakespeare. He might understand that.

Mr. Lawlor: Somebody should tell him.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The five minutes is rapidly flitting away. The hon. member should continue. The hon. member for Lakeshore surely should restrain himself.

Mr. Lawlor: Tick away. It couldn't matter less.

Mr. Cassidy: Nothing has been missed.

Mr. Lawlor: Tarantellas in the moonlight.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, the strike in Ottawa has been settled, but the fact remains that in the past year in Ottawa, we've had four strikes on different occasions. These strikes, in fact, can be attributed in large measure to that particular administration over there.

The prime reasons for the strikes, Mr. Speaker, are the ceilings that have been imposed since 1971, the fact that the government has tried to save money on the backs of the teachers and the teachers are trying to catch up. The government has refused, and still refuses consistently to bring in legislation to define the scope of bargaining. Why do they refuse to bring in this legislation?

Mr. Cassidy: When they do, he will oppose it because it doesn't bring in a compulsory arbitration.

Mr. Roy: It seems to us, Mr. Speaker, that the government would have avoided much of this, and strikes right across the province. I see the minister shaking her head. There have been strikes in Windsor and strikes in—

Mr. Deacon: York county.

Mr. Roy: —York county. There have been strikes in Ottawa.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. That has nothing to do with the question that was asked of me in the House.

Mr. Roy: Never mind. I wanted some response from the minister as to what she was going to do.

Mr. Cassidy: That is typical of the member.

Mr. Breithaupt: That's the general background.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, is there a quorum here?

Mr. Speaker: It doesn't matter. The motion to adjourn has been made.

Mr. Roy: You still need a quorum.

Mr. Speaker: You are wasting time. You have now another minute.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We all ought to leave and let him talk into a vacuum. It wouldn't matter anyway.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I feel that the strikes in various areas of the province can be attributed to the government's policies here. And it has not accepted its responsibilities. When the strike started—

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, may I read the question that was asked?

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. minister should not interrupt. There is a very short time, and she will have the opportunity to reply.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: He is 'way off base.

Mr. Roy: I'm right on my question; that's not for the minister to decide, that's for the Speaker to decide.

The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that the first involvement of the government in this strike was to make statements to inflame the situation rather than get the two parties together. In fact, Mr. Speaker, during the seven-week strike—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): The government has inflamed the situation many times.

Mr. Roy: Not this minister, she didn't inflame; she's a gracious lady and all that; but her leader and the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) went around inflaming the teachers and the people in the bargaining process.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: None of that male chauvinism.

Mr. Roy: The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that the talks broke off in two different instances for a period of a week. The government should have been involved at that point, should have tried to get the parties together. Where was the Minister of Education? He was sunning himself in Florida.

Mr. Cassidy: This is like our fighting the Second World War on a sand table.

Mr. Roy: I have nothing against people taking holidays, but this timing, Mr. Speaker, in a situation where we faced the seven-week strike, in my opinion, was highly improper. He should have been there trying to get the parties together. In fact, when he seriously got down to it and got the parties together, the strike was settled.

Mr. Cassidy: When it was on he couldn't stand the heat and he said send them back to compulsory arbitration.

Mr. Roy: But he got involved four weeks too late.

So, Mr. Speaker, even though the strike has been settled, it is important to point out to the government, and to this minister, the reason for strikes across this province and the fact that the ministers should accept their responsibility.

Mr. Bullbrook: Right.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The member is abusing the privileges of the House.

Mr. Roy: In fact, Mr. Speaker, since we've had the seven-week strike, some students have quit school and some other students who were weak stand a strong possibility of losing their year.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Cut him off.

Mr. Roy: I had a situation, for instance, Mr. Speaker, in family court, where some students apparently were getting involved in trouble. The crime rate had increased in that period of time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Roy: There is no way this government should allow the situation to go on this way, it should have accepted its responsibility.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well spoken.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member has expired.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, the question that was asked on April 8 by the hon. member for Ottawa East was, and I quote:

Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary: Would the provincial secretary advise how long the situation in Ottawa is going to be tolerated and what is the deadline for taking action here? Secondly, why has the minister waited so long to intercede personally in this dispute?

Mr. Roy: That's right.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I consider the tirade from across the floor tonight to be totally irrelevant to that particular question.

Mr. Speaker: I now recognize the member—order, please! I recognize the member for Port Arthur concerning asbestos fibres in Thunder Bay; he has five minutes.

Mr. Roy: If the member for Ottawa Centre doesn't interrupt him.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Don't drink that water.

ASBESTOS IN THUNDER BAY HARBOUR

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): The Minister of the Environment has treated the question of asbestos fibres in Port Arthur's drinking water with an irresponsibility that is frightening. Last Thursday's refusal to answer my request for funds for a filtration plant is only the latest in a long series.

I first asked the minister to have his ministry actively involved in asbestos testing in Thunder Bay harbour on Oct. 29, 1974. He reported to the Legislature, on Dec. 17, that samples taken by his ministry indicated that Thunder Bay had one of the lowest counts of 22 Ontario cities sampled. According to the minister, Thunder Bay displayed only 0.87 million asbestos fibres per litre, compared to Sarnia which had the highest level of 3.87 million fibres per litre. At that time the minister indicated that his ministry would ensure that Sarnia had a filtration plant operational by the spring of this year.

What is deceptive about the minister's statement on Dec. 17 is that it is based entirely on samples taken 2½ years ago, in August, 1972. It is 2½ years out of date.

On Dec. 18, 1974, I asked the minister for a continuous programme of testing for asbestos in Thunder Bay with a view to establishing a filtration system. The minister gave no commitment.

On Feb. 3 I brought to his attention that research by scientists at Lakehead University indicated asbestos in the Port Arthur ward's drinking supply showed fibre counts of 10 to 100 times greater than figures released by the minister. The minister stonewalled again by saying: "May I tell the member that in dealing with testing in water one must be very careful."

Last week came the shocking news that research conducted by Lakehead University indicated that tap water in Port Arthur ward this past February had asbestos fibre counts

of 14 million to 15 million fibres per litre. These readings are two million fibres per litre greater than the levels obtained the same day from samples of tap water in Duluth, which admits that it faces a dangerous situation.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): In Duluth?

Mr. Bullbrook: Can't keep it up.

Mr. Foulds: The latest CBC independent tests indicated on one occasion readings of 60 million to 80 million fibres per litre; and a subsequent test showed much lower levels but still very high—higher than Sarnia—of five million to six million fibres per litre.

The ministry has had, since 1973, a clear indication from the NASA earth resources satellite photographs, ample evidence that effluent from the Reserve Mining Co. in Silver Bay, Minn., was finding its way into Thunder Bay. This alone should have been sufficient reason for an immediate programme of continuous monitoring of Port Arthur's tap water. Published research by R. D. Pontifract and H. M. Cunningham indicates that ingested asbestos fibres can cause malignant tumours in rats and baboons.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Then the member should be worried.

Mr. Henderson: The member is the baboon over there.

Mr. Foulds: If the minister has no sympathy with the rats, he should have some understanding of baboons.

As well, it is clear that inhalation of asbestos fibres is carcinogenic. There is widespread use of vapourizers, clothes dryers, humidifiers and steam baths in Thunder Bay. Any asbestos in tap water will, through these appliances, be put into the air and be inhaled daily by men, women and children in my riding.

This ministry must take two steps immediately. No matter what the cost, it must take daily samples of tap water in conjunction with Lakehead University. Health warnings should be issued and announced on this basis as they are necessary.

Second, the Ontario government should move to provide funds immediately for a filtration plant in Thunder Bay.

A potential health hazard exists. Why does this government continue to fool around with people's lives? I don't want to be responsible for government inaction if the life of one single human being can be saved.

Are we going to wait for 20 to 25 years to see if Port Arthur's residents start dying from intestinal and lung cancer at unduly high rates? A filtration system for Port Arthur's drinking water is an insurance policy. On those days when storms and turbulence cause outrageously high asbestos counts it could filter out 90 to 95 per cent of the fibres. It can also be a protective device against other accidental spills and pollutants. If the minister thought it important enough to proceed with a filtration plant in Sarnia, with counts one-quarter of those in Thunder Bay from one sampling taken in 1972, surely it makes sense to do so now for Port Arthur.

At the turn of the century, Mr. Speaker, the great Norwegian dramatist Henrik Ibsen wrote a play about a man, his conscience and an attempt by his community to cover up a pollution problem. He ironically entitled that play "An Enemy of the People." I say that this government is an enemy of the people by its continuous attempts to run away from this problem and its attempts to hide the problem from the people of Thunder Bay.

There is no panic in Port Arthur. There is anger and deep frustration. Anger and frustration because the ministry has not done continuous and comprehensive testing; anger and frustration because the ministry has not acted as it should act, as a tough and active protector of the people's health and safety. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister has five minutes.

Hon. W. Newman (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I am just somewhat disappointed that the member for Port Arthur would stand up here tonight and make a political speech; a man who—

Mr. Breithaupt: We can't have that in the Legislature, surely.

Hon. W. Newman: —doesn't even know what is going on in his own riding, who doesn't even understand what is being done.

Mr. Foulds: Okay. How many tests has the ministry done?

Hon. W. Newman: I listened to the member. He should sit down and listen to me for a minute; he might learn something. This government is covering up absolutely nothing in that area at all.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. W. Newman: Will the member be—no, I won't say it.

Mr. Speaker, I indicated that research on asbestos was started in the Province of Ontario in 1972. We published in *Water and Pollution Control* magazine, in September of 1973, readings of the 1972 sampling. This indicated in the Thunder Bay area, as the member said—he was a little bit out—approximately 30,000 fibres per litre. In November of 1974 the testing that was done indicated 87,000 fibres per litre; and in February of 1975 it indicated 40,000 fibres per litre.

We were advised by the Ministry of Health that available research indicates that the asbestos level in the drinking water of the cities we sampled does not constitute a human health hazard. While a vast majority of available research indicates there is no threat to human health, we are nevertheless continuing our research to develop methods of removing asbestos which can be applied to conventional water treatment plants and facilities.

I have figures in front of me here tonight which show the incidence of stomach cancer, which has been reported in the Province of Ontario from 1930 to 1972, has gone down among males—to give one example—from 27.30 deaths per 100,000 to 12.81 per 100,000. It has gone down in that period of time.

I would also like to point out to the member that we did testing in 1972 and November of 1974 and February of 1975.

Mr. Foulds: Three tests.

Hon. W. Newman: Something quite obviously the member doesn't even know is that today the Ontario Research Foundation—

Mr. Foulds: I know that.

Hon. W. Newman:—under a Dr. Pullman, director of applied physics for the Ontario Research Foundation, with our own lab experts and the dean of science at Lakehead University, were meeting and will continue to meet tonight to discuss this matter in the member's area.

Mr. Foulds: I know that.

Hon. W. Newman: Well then, why did the member talk the way he did?

An hon. member: Where's the filtration plant?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: He wants to scare everybody to death.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We think Port Arthur is a pretty good town in spite of its member.

Mr. J. A. Belanger (Prescott and Russell): That's typical

Hon. W. Newman: We have suggested that joint samples be taken. We discussed with Lakehead University as to how they should be taken and the methods of testing.

The Ontario Research Foundation is an independent organization which I think has done a very fine job in the province of Ontario. They have come up with different figures than Lakehead University; that's why they're meeting today, to discuss this particular matter.

The member has talked about Reserve Mining. I have copies of correspondence that I have had with Mme. Sauve of the federal Ministry of Environment outlining my concerns to her about the Reserve Mining Co. And I must say I received a letter from the member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Rhodes) long before the member for Port Arthur ever got into the act, asking me to look into it. So the member opposite shouldn't start making critical hay. The member for Sault Ste. Marie was on it long ago.

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): The member doesn't look after his people up there.

Hon. W. Newman: In case the member doesn't know, the city of Thunder Bay has hired consultants to look at treatment methods for the water in their area. They will be setting up a pilot project to look into the best means of treating their water supply in the Thunder Bay area.

I could go on and on. I have reports here in my hand which overwhelmingly show there is no major problem to health; they are verified by the Ministry of Health. But on top of that, this ministry is continuing to test. We have an experiment now going on in our labs under controlled conditions to find the best and most efficient way to remove asbestos from the drinking water supplies of this province.

The member can't stand over there and say we're not doing anything, we're not involved, we're not concerned about people, because we are. I make my reports public, I make the results public, and I say to the member if he really wants to represent his people properly, let him go up and find out what's going on in his own riding and not stand here and make political speeches.

Mr. Speaker: Just before I announce the adjournment of the House, the hon. House leader—

An hon. member: They know he's not representing them. They won't send him back.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Interjections by hon members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The debate is completed.

Just before I announce the adjournment of the House, I believe the hon. House leader wishes to make an announcement about the forthcoming programme.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I just want to confirm, Mr. Speaker, that we'll deal with items num-

ber 8, 9 and 13. Then possibly we will move onto items 14, 15 and 16. Failing those ministers being available to me, I would call the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Potter) for the balance of his estimates.

Mr. Foulds: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order; I deem the motion to adjourn to have been made.

The House adjourned at 10:35 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 22, 1975

Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Amendment Act, Mr. Meen, second reading	1129
Gasoline Tax Amendment Act, Mr. Meen, second reading	1133
Income Tax Amendment Act, Mr. Meen, second reading	1136
Third readings	1145
Debates re answers to oral questions, Mr. Roy, Mrs. Birch, Mr. Foulds, Mr. W. Newman	1146
Adjournment	1153



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, April 24, 1975

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 24, 1975

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, in the debate on Tuesday last, in the evening, the Minister of the Environment accused me of not knowing what was going on in my riding.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): Well it's true.

Mr. Foulds: He subsequently said, on page 79 of the *Instant Hansard*:

Dr. Pullan, a director of applied physics for the Ontario Research Foundation, our own lab experts and the dean of science of Lakehead University were meeting today and will continue to meet tonight to discuss the matter in your area.

I know the minister did not do this deliberately, but he inadvertently gave a wrong piece of information to the House, as the scientists from Lakehead University were not invited to the meeting on Tuesday evening, which took place publicly, between his ministry officials, the ORF officials and the city council, at which time the ORF scientists attempted to discredit the findings of Lakehead University. I would like to put that on the record.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to the House a number of students from Queensmount Public School in Kitchener, in my constituency, and I would ask the members to welcome them. They are, I think, the last of four or five groups which have now been able to visit the Legislature as part of their continuing interest in public affairs within the province. I'm sure the members will join with me in welcoming them to the House.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Fort William.

Mr. J. H. Jessiman (Fort William): On a more friendly note from Thunder Bay, Mr.

Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, sir, and to the House, 35 students from St. Peter's School in Thunder Bay south who are visiting us, in the west gallery, with their teacher, Mr. Cullen.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Humber.

Mr. N. G. Leluk (Humber): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the member for Ottawa East made certain allegations or inferences in an article which appeared in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* yesterday—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): There were no allegations.

Mr. Leluk: —that I was one of four members of this House who went to Taiwan in October, 1974, at the expense of the Ontario taxpayers and on government business.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): I never did say that.

Mr. Leluk: I just want to set the record straight that I was not there on government business and that it did not cost the taxpayers of this province one cent.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Wrong again.

Mr. Breithaupt: There are no allegations. We would just like to know.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I'm not sure that allegation was made, but the information is interesting.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, when a point of privilege is made like that, allegations are attributed to me that I did not make. I simply asked the question: Did these members go, who paid for the trip and what was the purpose of the trip?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The innuendo was there.

Mr. Speaker: I agree. The question was asked and there was no definite answer given. The record is now set straight, I would say.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Cheap politics.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Where has the Minister of Agriculture and Food been at the taxpayers' expense that gets him so worked up?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: Simple envy.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the member for Essex South (Mr. Paterson) I would like to introduce grade 7 students from Colchester North Central School—which happens to be the school that Kevin Webb, one of our pages here, attends—and I would like the members to make them welcome.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It must be an election year.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: An introduction? Yes.

Mr. J. R. Smith: Mr. Speaker, through you, I would like to extend a welcome to a group of 35 ladies from St. John's United Church on Mount Hamilton.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to the hon. members a group of students from the New Central School in the town of Oakville, who are in the west gallery this afternoon, accompanied by Mr. John Merrifield.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry. The Minister of Industry and Tourism.

ONTARIO TRAVEL ASSOCIATION PROGRAMME

Hon. C. Bennett (Minister of Industry and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce an expansion in our Ontario Travel Association Programme, in recognition of the accomplishments of the 12 travel associations which are partially funded by the province.

On April 1, 1974, the ministry introduced a revised programme to fund local tourism marketing, research and development activities. The 39 former tourist councils were consolidated into 12 travel areas. Each travel association established under the Ontario Travel Association Programme is eligible for an outright grant from the province of

\$30,000 toward the administration costs, and \$45,000 for cost-sharing moneys in their programme.

The cost sharing is determined on the basis of a 90 per cent contribution from the ministry for approved programmes in northern Ontario, a 75 per cent contribution in eastern Ontario and a 50 per cent contribution in the rest of our province. The administrative grant ensures the employment of full-time professional staff; the cost-sharing moneys ensure execution of sound marketing strategies and identification of development opportunities in their areas. This funding is, of course, only part of the assistance provided to these travel associations from our ministry.

We have been well satisfied with the associations' accomplishments in the past year and have concluded that increased funding will provide more marketing services for the travel areas. I welcome this opportunity to announce that my ministry will:

1. Increase the cost-sharing moneys available to each association by \$5,000, for a total of \$50,000 on the current matching formulae basis.

2. Increase the administrative grants to each association by \$5,000, for a total of \$35,000.

When we began our review of regional tourism programmes in 1973, my ministry had a total budget commitment to the travel councils of \$380,000, with actual expenditures amounting to only \$260,000.

In this past year, we estimate that the expenditures will exceed \$850,000—an increase of over three times the investment in local tourism. During the current fiscal year, our commitment is \$1.2 million. We have moved in this direction in recognition of the need to develop strong local promotion in all parts of the province, and to increase local funding in support of tourism.

In 1974, these were the results: An increase in tourism by Ontario residents within the province of \$175 million; an increase in travel from other Canadian provinces of an additional \$45 million; an increase in US visitor spending of \$117 million; an increase in overseas spending in Ontario of an additional \$25 million; for the first time ever, Ontario's tourist revenue broke through the \$2 billion level—an increase of 18.6 per cent over 1973.

My ministry has a commitment to improving the tourism plant in this province as well. Last year, through the development corporations in Ontario, the ministry gave direct financial assistance to 186 tourist

operators in the province to the tune of almost \$23 million. This compares with 57 loans granted in the seven years between 1966 and 1973 for something just over \$2 million. A better plant, coupled with more aggressive local promotion through the Ontario Travel Association Programme, will result in further tourism revenue increases in all parts of this province.

Through the youth secretariat's student summer employment programme, each association will hire six travel counsellors, one marketing assistant and one photographer. The salaries of these students are paid by the province, which, in effect, adds another \$14,000 to the funds available to each association.

The Ontario Travel Association Programme moneys will go directly into our provincial tourism economy to meet the difficult challenges ahead.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry. The Minister of Transportation and Communications.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: The member for Ottawa East wouldn't know much about it.

Mr. Roy: Tell me about it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister has the floor.

NORFOLK ROAD WORKERS' DISPUTE

Hon. J. R. Rhodes (Minister of Transportation and Communications): **Mr. Speaker,** on April 17, the hon. member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy), asked me a question concerning the situation involving the township of Norfolk and its employees. I will not repeat the question. It's in Hansard as of that date. At the time I did not feel in a position to answer the question adequately. I would like to give the answer at this time and rather than take up the time of the question period do it in the form of a statement.

Mr. Roy: That's a good idea.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: **Mr. Speaker,** I've reviewed the submission from the township of Norfolk to become urban for road purposes. The request simply means that instead of the ministry sharing in the original purchase cost of the road equipment and subsidizing the operating costs, the municipality, as an urban municipality, will buy and own its own equipment without subsidy and the ministry will subsidize the operating costs on a rental basis.

As a matter of general policy, my ministry favours and encourages municipalities to go to an urban status for road purposes, particularly those local municipalities which now fall within a regional municipality.

With respect to the specific situation at hand, it is my understanding that the municipality reviewed the alternative of contracting out work instead of its present method of performing the majority of the work with its own forces. The results indicated that the former would result in a substantial saving to the township.

I have been given by the member for Ottawa Centre a petition signed by over 1,000 ratepayers of the township of Norfolk indicating, "That they are in favour of the road employees of the township receiving the same collective agreement as the road employees of the Haldimand-Norfolk region, township of Delhi, town of Simcoe and city of Nanticoke."

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that a decision with regard to the township going urban for road purposes will affect the bargaining position of either the township or its employees. I view this decision to be quite unrelated to the labour question. Changing status has no bearing on whether it decides to contract out the work or own and operate its own equipment. It is the municipality's prerogative and it has this choice of whether the municipality is rural or urban for road purposes. The significant difference is that when a municipality goes urban for road purposes, we do not reclaim the ministry's share of the original purchase cost of equipment whether the municipality keeps it or sells it.

My position with this municipality is no different from that with any other under the same conditions. The decision to not approve urban status would financially penalize all of the people in the township of Norfolk. I have therefore instructed my staff to approve of the township's submission.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions. The Leader of the Opposition.

NORFOLK ROAD WORKERS' DISPUTE

Mr. R. F. Nixon: **Mr. Speaker,** I would like to ask the Minister of Transportation and Communications a question based on his statement just made.

Wouldn't he think the fact that the application for urban status from the township concerned, which was approved—perhaps not in a written way but it was affirmed by the department that approval would be forth-

coming three to four days later—was an indication that the township could go forward with its plans to do away with much of the employment it had habitually needed in the area and put its roadwork out to rental and tender rather than doing it itself? Wouldn't the minister be afraid that at least in the minds of those people on strike in that community his decision given verbally some days ago and now affirmed in the House would be seen to be interfering with a continuing and more and more acrimonious labour dispute in that rural community?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I did not give any verbal assurance that this sort of approval would be forthcoming. The verbal approval apparently came from the director of that particular branch of my ministry who was contacted. As I indicated in my remarks, the practice of allowing this change has become very simple, especially for a municipality within a region. It was not a strange decision on the part of the official to so advise the municipality that it would receive approval.

Following the question from the member for Ottawa Centre, I did look into it in more detail and found that really there is a labour dispute. It is being handled by the two parties in conjunction with the Minister of Labour (Mr. MacBeth) and it really didn't involve my ministry. We would have been, I think, taking a position that was really not warranted to become involved in that particular dispute.

VISIT TO INDIAN RESERVES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I'd like to ask a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. Has he been to Grassy Narrows yet or when does he intend to travel there?

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): No, Mr. Speaker, if the member will recall I said I was going this Saturday.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: This Saturday? I wonder if before he goes he could look into the reported research that's been carried out at the Hospital for Sick Children in this town by Dr. Sarkar and Dr. Cox, who apparently have developed a procedure whereby through medication, very simply and safely applied, the heavy metal mercury can be removed very readily from the blood streams of those people who have ingested food with a heavy mercury content? Is he aware of that research and would he undertake to find out about

it and report to the House since it would have such far-reaching ramifications for these Indian communities and others exposed to heavy metal pollution?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure my colleague the Minister of Health (Mr. Miller) is familiar with these matters to which the Leader of the Opposition referred. I'll certainly discuss that with him before I go. Quite frankly, I tell the member our first concern at this particular time is to attempt to find a solution to the problem of substitution because of deficiency in protein in the people in that area. However, we are not excluding any of these matters from the discussion we are going to have with people in that area.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: While we would agree with the priority put by the minister now that finally he as provincial secretary has been brought into the field—perhaps he can co-ordinate the inadequate efforts of his colleagues over the last four years—surely he would agree that if this medical breakthrough has been accomplished we ought to be able to make use of it without delay? Will he report to the House his findings in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, with the aid of my very adequate and very capable colleagues we'll do whatever we can in this regard.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: His very adequate and capable colleagues have made a mess of this for four years.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

ALLEGED COMPLAINTS ABOUT MINISTER'S TACTICS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I have a question of the Minister of Housing, if I can have his attention for a moment.

An hon. member: He needs all the public relations he can get.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask the minister if he can explain to the House why the mayor and the chief planner of the municipality of Mississauga have complained about intimidation tactics by the minister personally in support of his OHA programme? Why would they feel that his programme is a complete interference with the autonomy of that municipality in view of the

fact that they have awarded building permits amounting to 3,000 units in the community and it cannot be said they are standing in the way of all growth? Perhaps they are only unprepared to accept the blandishments, now becoming the threats, of the minister?

Hon. D. R. Irvine (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to answer the Leader of the Opposition because—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Good.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —it is a very misleading statement to make either in the press or in the House that I was—

Mr. Lewis: Right, he is stupid; he is wrong.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —intimidating the mayor or his chief planner.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is not capable of blandishment, I will tell him.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: What I did suggest to the mayor was that the municipality of Mississauga has been dealing with me for several months on a particular piece of property for development. I had been requested by certain people to refer the matter to the OMB; I had also been assured by the mayor that the council would deal with the item as quickly as possible and it would go through. He told me in January that everything was going along fine. In February it was the same story and I think we reached the end of the rope when he finally said there had to be another study which might take six to eight weeks to complete; a study which was known full well by the mayor and the municipality, whether they were elected or appointed officials, right from the beginning.

Therefore I suggested it was time we quit dragging our heels as I thought they were doing and we do something about trying to develop housing in Ontario, especially in this particular area. I asked the mayor, if he wasn't going to resolve the situation, to say yes or no, one or the other. That's all I wanted and then I was going to deal with the request before me to refer the matter to the OMB. It's as simple as that.

Mr. Roy: I wish the minister would give answers like that, just yes or no.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, a supplementary: How can he approach a municipality under those circumstances when they are unwilling to accept his particular programme and the municipality has 15,000 serviced lots there

now with building permits readily available? Sure they would want the province's money but wouldn't the minister agree that the problem in his approach in dealing with these municipalities, which he has criticized publicly and frequently in this House, is really a personal problem—that in fact he is not going to be able to get an agreement with these people if he is going to try to coerce them with the kind of power that he feels he has?

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe the Leader of the Opposition has all the facts, because the municipality has accepted our housing programme. It has accepted \$100,000 in a grant to assist it in preparing its official plans. It has said it would have housing in 1975 and not in 1985. Therefore, the municipality is in agreement with housing in 1975 and 1976. All I am asking is that it fulfil the agreement which it signed with us.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask the minister a further supplementary: Doesn't it concern him that perhaps his own personality is intruding into the kind of settlement that all of us would like to see forthcoming?

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No way, no way.

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): Get off it.

Mr. Lewis: That's true. It is his essential sweetness. It just got in the way.

Mr. G. Nixon: The leader of the NDP doesn't have any sweetness.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: What does the leader of the NDP know about sweetness?

Mr. Lewis: It's the minister's saccharine sweetness.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I am always concerned about what image I might have. I would suggest maybe the Leader of the Opposition should be just as concerned as he suggests I should be.

Mr. Roy: The minister needn't worry.

An hon. member: Another cheap answer.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

ARSENIC LEVELS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask the Minister of the Environment whether he can announce that our standards for arsenic levels in the work place are going to be reduced at least to the level that has been in effect under the jurisdiction of the United States Department of Labour since Jan. 1, because our levels are six times as high as theirs?

Hon. W. Newman (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I realize there has been research done at, I believe, Johns Hopkins University. In light of that, we discussed it with the Ministry of Health. No doubt there will be some changes in the standards.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Since there was a story, I believe, in the Globe this morning from officials of the ministry indicating a reduction was at least possible, what is the delay in simply assuming at least the levels that other jurisdictions have found necessary for the safety of their workmen?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I just said that in light of the recent studies that were done at Johns Hopkins University, we are having discussions with the Ministry of Health right now regarding reducing the emission standards of arsenic.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. Lewis: I have two quick supplementaries on this issue. Is the threshold limit value in Ontario for arsenic 25 micrograms or 25 milligrams per cubic metre?

Hon. W. Newman: Is the member talking about in the air or in the water?

Mr. Lewis: In the air it would be 75 of one or the other.

Hon. W. Newman: I believe the air is 75—I stand to be corrected on that—but I know the water is 0.05 milligrams per litre.

Mr. Lewis: Milligrams?

Hon. W. Newman: Yes, that is the criterion.

Mr. Lewis: The figures don't compare but we'll leave them for the moment.

Is the minister aware that in addition to the Johns Hopkins study, at the major environmental conference just finished in New York it emerged that as a result of the use of arsenic the incidence of cancer of bronchus and the lung in Butte and Anaconda, Mont., in the women in the community as well as the men who worked in the plant, was demonstrably higher than levels in the re-

lated population, leading to the sense that the changes in threshold limit must be instantaneously provided? Can the minister respond to that perhaps even more quickly than to the Johns Hopkins study?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that my staff are aware of it. We have the experts on it. As I just finished saying, we are looking at the criteria for both the air and the water levels at this point in time. We are discussing it with the Ministry of Health.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

FUNDS FROM OPEC COUNTRIES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Just before the Treasurer leaves, can he tell us if his officials are negotiating with any of the OPEC countries for Arab funding of that \$600 million that was left up in the air in his budget? He will recall that his predecessor travelled to some of those countries in the fall. Is the Treasurer or are any of the people in his ministry following that up? Are we actively pursuing that sort of borrowing in Ontario?

Mr. Roy: Lucky he did a report on it.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Yes, we are actively following it up, not on behalf of the province but on behalf of Ontario Hydro.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I wonder if the Treasurer could tell us what would the aim be for the first loan and when might we expect an announcement about it?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In the fullness of time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Can we expect that money will be available to us at as much as three-quarters of a per cent less than it would be on another market, or perhaps saving more than that? Can he assure us we won't face the same problem we faced after we borrowed the deutsche marks when revaluation did away with the substantial improvement of the interest rate?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, all those details will be known when anything is consummated, and nothing has been consummated at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? The member for Scarborough West.

POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF CIVIL SERVANTS

Mr. Lewis: I have a question first of the Chairman of the Management Board. What is he going to do about the case of Brian Charlton in Hamilton, who's position probably has been brought to the minister's attention—indeed, the CSAO has written a letter directly to the minister—in terms of the ultimatum he has received that either he stop his political activities, or he will be removed from employment; he will be fired tomorrow?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Yes, that is correct, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman referred to did receive such notice. I believe the letter to which the leader of the NDP refers was probably delivered to him before it was delivered to me. Immediately I got it, I discussed the matter with the Minister of Revenue. (Mr. Meen), in whose employ the gentleman is, and he has that matter currently under review.

Mr. Lewis: I would like to come back to the minister on it in this sense. I understand the Public Service Act, I understand how it reads, and I understand that this employee is, in fact, in a designated category. I understand and respect that. Can the minister then answer for me—maybe I have to put this to the Minister of Revenue. Mr. Speaker, maybe I should put it to the Minister of Revenue.

We are discussing the Brian Charlton case, the property assessor in Hamilton. Can I ask the minister why, when a letter was sent five years ago, at the end of 1970, raising the question of political activity, to which Mr. Charlton gave a response, and then nothing occurred, and in the intervening five-year period he has been involved in everything from seeking a provincial nomination, to taking leaves of absence for conventions, to participating in campaigns with leaves of absence, to participating on executives of riding associations publicly noted, and in all instances for five years noted by his superiors or known by his superiors, how is it that suddenly in April, 1975, he receives a letter which begins, "It has come to my attention that you hold office in a local political organization and you must quit or be fired in two weeks."

Hon. A. K. Meen (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to get to the root of this whole question at present. But my preliminary information is that none of us in the ministry, nor for that matter in the local

assessment office in which he was engaged, actually was formally aware of the degree of his activity. It really only came to light when there was an announcement in the local press of his election as the president of the NDP organization in Hamilton Mountain.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Does the minister apply the same standards to Tories and to Liberals?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Indeed, if I take that as a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, indeed the answer is yes, on a number of occasions.

Mr. Lewis: I am not questioning that at all.

Mr. Foulds: No, not a number of occasions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, yes.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Conservatives have been obliged either to resign from their posts and cease and desist from a breach of section 13 of the Public Service Act, or take the consequences of a dismissal from the civil service.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Only in the NDP provinces they don't have to resign.

Mr. Lewis: I have a supplementary. Doesn't it strike you as strange, Mr. Speaker, not to say beyond belief, that a man who contested a provincial nomination publicly in 1971, who is president of the riding association for the third year in a row, with press attention each time, who has requested leaves to participate in political activity in conventions and councils and campaigns, and has managed those campaigns and been publicly noted in Hamilton—is the minister trying to pretend for a second—

An hon. member: Who pays that much attention to each riding?

Mr. Lewis: Is the minister trying to pretend for a second—look, if the government wants to uphold the law, let it do it; let it not do it on the eve of an election.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Why does the minister think, after five years, they would suddenly move in on him?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, the point is that it is no use his suggesting that this has been going on for a number of years. I have told the hon. member that it only recently came to our attention on this point.

Mr. Lewis: I declare that false. That's impossible.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Meen: If the hon. member would care to tell me what correspondence he is talking about, going back to 1970, I would be pleased to see it because I have not seen any such correspondence. If the hon. member has it, I would like to see it.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Well, it is there.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of privilege then or a point of information, interestingly enough, the same man who issued the letter requesting Mr. Charlton's dismissal also wrote to him—let me find it so that I am accurate, Mr. Speaker—on Nov. 10, 1970: "Subject, The Public Service Act—Political Service of Activity," sending him the copies of the relative sections of the Act which he thought Mr. Charlton had transgressed at that time and asking for Mr. Charlton's comments. How can a man who did that in November, 1970 not be aware of the subsequent political activity of five years?

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. Lewis: May I come back and ask the Chairman of the Management Board, does he think it is fair raising the fundamental issue that a property assessor 3 or indeed so many of the designated categories should be excluded from any political involvement at all in the Province of Ontario? Isn't it appropriate with an election looming to amend the Public Service Act to give to the public servants of this province the same political rights as is accorded them in most other jurisdictions of the country, the federal government included?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I must say that I have had this schedule before me for a few days. I am reviewing it and I will be making a report to my colleagues on it.

However, I must say in conjunction with the questions that have been asked today that I knew nothing of the situation at all, despite what the leader of the NDP is saying here this afternoon. I knew nothing about it until that letter was delivered to my office yesterday afternoon. I want to say, if this man is looking for the NDP nomination in this particular instance, this is a poor way to get publicity.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Can I ask a supplementary on that?

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Does the minister recall answering a similar question at a public meeting attended by myself and a representative of the NDP—I am not sure whether it was the member for Scarborough West or the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald)—

Mr. Lewis: The member for York South.

Mr. R. F. Nixon:—in which he said quite clearly that the government was moving toward changing this particular provision in this particular law which would open it up to certain levels, if not all public employees, to participate in the democratic process at all levels?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I think I answered that question just a few moments ago and it is precisely what I am doing.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Scarborough West have further questions?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, a related question.

Mr. J. R. Smith: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: I have a supplementary on this. Mr. Charlton may or may not get a nomination; that's irrelevant. I am asking the minister, in light of the review—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis:—he wants to make, can he hold off on the exercise of the dismissal until he has reviewed the designated categories to find out whether or not the government intends to amend the legislation?

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): That's fair.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Inasmuch, Mr. Speaker, as I did receive notice, as I said, just yesterday, I have passed it to my colleague, the Minister of Revenue, for review. I am not going to stand here and say that I will withhold whatever action is legal in this particular instance.

An hon. member: It's the law.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: But I will certainly act on the advice of my colleague.

Mr. Speaker: A final supplementary by the member for Hamilton Mountain.

Mr. J. R. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Revenue if he could inform the House as to whether or not the regional assessment officer in the Hamilton-Wentworth area has advised other employees either verbally or by written statement in that office who support other political parties that they likewise must curtail or withdraw from political activities?

Mr. Deans: How would he know verbally?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, I know of no other incident of this nature and, therefore, I know of no other individual who might similarly have been advised of the conflict apparent under the Public Service Act. I have been advised by some of my colleagues that they are aware of similar incidences in their ministries in which they have had to take similar steps.

Might I just observe, though, in reply also to the member for Scarborough West, that I have been looking into this matter and I believe the letter from the regional director had indicated termination as of tomorrow, April. 25.

Mr. Lewis: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I have instructed that that date be postponed until I can have a further inquiry into it.

Mr. Lewis: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I was not aware of that letter of Nov. 10, 1970. That does pre-date by upwards of a year the categorization of the assessors in this area—

Mr. Lewis: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Meen: —and therefore may or may not have been appropriate to the circumstances as they subsequently developed. That's one of the things we are looking into.

Mr. Lewis: I am not sure it was either. It is the funny sequence that bothers me.

Hon. Mr. Meen: There's nothing sinister about the funny sequence, I can assure the member.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions by the member for Scarborough West?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member doesn't mind making it look sinister.

Mr. Lewis: Well, I wonder about it. I wonder about it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Could you place your other questions?

Mr. Lewis: I have a question of the Minister of Health. Now that the minister has been granted his liberty by the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development—he said, "You wanted the flak, you can take it"; he was very gracious to the minister—then what about the question of the—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: A point of order.

Mr. Lewis: I knew I shouldn't have done it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, the member shouldn't have. It's quite apparent the hon. member would do what he can to divide my colleagues from each other.

Mr. Lewis: They are so easily divisible.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The question was asked of me by a newspaperman. He said: "You know your colleague has complained of the flak he has to take without any authority." I said: "If he has to take the flak, he now has the authority," which is quite a different implication from what the hon. member is trying to put on it.

Mr. Speaker: I fail to understand it. The member for Scarborough West.

Interjections by hon. members.

USE OF HAZARDOUS CHEMICALS

Mr. Lewis: Is the Minister of Health feeling better, now that solidarity is reinstated? Good. Now, can I ask him, in terms of the statement that was made, what might he be able to do in the announced Petrosar development to protect in advance the workers from the use of benzene, the major chemical factor in the Petrosar development, when it has now been shown that 140 documented cases of benzene-induced leukaemia are scientifically noted, and indeed the government of Italy has banned benzene as a solvent in the process? Also, what will the minister do about the use of TDI—I cannot pronounce it; it's toluene diisocyanate—which is an effective inducement of asthma? Both of these dangerously harmful chemicals are major ingredients of the whole Petrosar development.

Hon. F. S. Miller (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the member started out by talking about the flak. I don't recall anybody giving me the alternative of not having the authority or the flak.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): That could be arranged.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We are working on that.

Hon. Mr. Miller: I now have them both. I might say I am pleased to have them both, because I hope and trust that this will result in the integration that we feel is essential in attacking problems like those the member has mentioned.

I think aromatic hydrocarbons of the type he has just discussed have been recognized in series to be carcinogens. I can only, at this point, take the standards that are recognized as being tolerable and see that they are going to be, in fact, maintainable within that factory as we come on stream and police it.

As I understand the authority, while the Ministry of Health will not be the inspecting agency, except where it suspects something wrong—in other words, we will be an over-seeing agency—we will have the authority to request shutdowns, changes or whatever may be required and I am quite prepared to do so.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, will the minister, as part of his mandate, be willing to examine and to test every single chemical substance that is planned for the Petrosar development prior to its actual use?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, if, in fact, the determination of dangerous chemicals was based on a simple study in a lab that could produce results in a short time frame, I wouldn't have the problems I have. When we bring out this paper on Elliot Lake in the near future, one of the comments we will make in it—I think I am revealing no breach—is that we won't know for X years whether certain measures have been effective. Sadly, that is the story of occupational health; it's a historical method rather than a predictive method.

There are groups of chemicals—and the hon. member named two, benzene and TDI, both of which are similar—and we know chemicals in that group traditionally have been carcinogens, so we have reason to suspect.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

The member for St. George.

RENT SUPPLEMENTS

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Mr. Speaker, my question is of the Minister of Housing. Would the minister explain to this House why Ontario is the only province in

Canada that has registered objection to full sharing with the federal government in the rent supplement programme?

Mr. Deans: They don't like renters.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, we have been endeavouring to get an agreement with the federal government for weeks and even months. Our proposal has been before the minister responsible, Mr. Danson, and I am waiting for his reply. It's not the province.

Mrs. Campbell: A supplementary: Is it not a fact that the only point between the two governments is that Ontario does not wish to share in the portion of the interest payments that needs to be subsidized? And isn't it a fact that those agreements are on the minister's desk or in his ministry now, and not at the federal level?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: No, it's not a fact as far as I'm concerned. It certainly isn't on my desk, and to my knowledge it isn't on my deputy's desk, unless it arrived today and I haven't seen it.

Mrs. Campbell: I see. Well, the minister had better check.

Mr. Speaker: A final supplementary. The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): A supplementary question of the Minister of Housing: Recognizing that the rent supplement is a three-level problem, what exactly is the state of the agreement between the Province of Ontario and the city of Toronto with respect to rent supplement programmes in the city itself?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, the same condition applies to the city of Toronto or any other municipality: we have to get an overall agreement worked out with the federal government. We made a proposal some while ago, as I said to the member for St. George, and I'm quite prepared to proceed forthwith with the city of Toronto as soon as I have an agreement to our proposal from the federal government. If they agree, I am prepared to sign today.

Mr. Renwick: By way of further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, does that mean there is no agreement with the city as yet and that the minister is waiting until the federal government and the provincial government reach agreement before he will negotiate with the city of Toronto on these matters?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I don't believe we have a problem as far as the city of Toronto or

any other municipality is concerned. Our problem in the past has been with the federal government. Once I have that agreement, we can proceed forthwith.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor West.

AMBULANCE SERVICES

Mr. Bounsall: A question of the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker: With regard to the impending amalgamation of all the ambulance services in Toronto to form the Metro Toronto department of ambulance services, can the minister ensure that the employees of the five private services affected and the ministry's own employees from the York-Toronto ambulance service—all of whom are to be added to the Metro Toronto department of emergency services ambulance group—without doubt will have transferred with them their seniority positions, their wage scales, their vacation entitlements and their pension and sick leave credits, and further that the transfer of all six employee groups will take place simultaneously so that a fair bargaining agent representation vote can be taken of the new combined group of employees?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I can't make those guarantees to the hon. member. These matters are being discussed. I received a letter from the CSAO on the subject within the last day or so. I'm sure that in the background work that's going on between my ministry and the Metropolitan Toronto corporation, the whole issue of these rights is being negotiated, and I trust it will be done fairly.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): I have a question in regard to the Wintario lottery. Everybody who has to do with it seems to have disappeared—

An hon. member: Including the Premier (Mr. Davis).

Mr. R. S. Smith: Perhaps I'll direct a question to the Minister of Transportation—no, here comes the Chairman of Management Board. Would he accept a question in regard to the Wintario lottery?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Certainly I will.

Interjections by hon. members.

ONTARIO LOTTERY

Mr. R. S. Smith: Is the minister aware of the problems of distribution of the tickets

across the province that is being created, particularly in northern Ontario where a Mr. J. P. LaBelle has been given the distribution rights and has been provided with 52,500 tickets? He has not followed the instructions of the Ontario Lottery Corp. in the distribution of those tickets, in that he stands to realize a profit of \$3,500 every two weeks, or about \$85,000 per year.

Will the minister inform me if this is going to continue, or if the man is going to be made to distribute the tickets properly, and will the minister look into the amounts of moneys that are being paid to these people in regard to this distribution?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That question interests me, Mr. Speaker, because I am having a dickens of a time getting a ticket myself. However, I wonder if the same gentleman had the distribution authority on the Olympic lottery.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All Liberals.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I have a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Drapeau's appointing him has got nothing to do with it. I would like to know if Mr. J. P. LaBelle is still going to be the Tory candidate in Nickel Belt riding.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I certainly wouldn't think so, but I must say that I will take the balance of the question as notice and give it to my colleague.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The feds make mistakes too, eh?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, will the minister take the first question as notice, because it is very important.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the minister will take all of it as notice.

Mr. Roy: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: On that particular question?

Mr. Roy: On that particular question, and the minister's reply about the agent having the agency for the Olympic lottery.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Win a few, lose a few. That's the way it is.

Mr. Roy: Would the minister look into the situation in Ottawa as well, where the

distributor in the Ottawa area apparently is not, first of all, an Ontario resident? Second, he is a distributor for Olympic lottery and he stands to make about \$100,000 a year over and above the Olympic lottery.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: It has already been looked after.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It is all looked after.

Mr. Roy: Is the minister not concerned that the real winners in this lottery are going to be the distributors and not the fellow whose ticket is drawn?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you who the real winners of this lottery will be—the people of Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

DIRECTOR OF COMMUNICATIONS FOR MINISTRY OF HOUSING

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Housing. What is it that the minister expects that this PR man that has hired is going to be able to do that isn't already being done by the PR people in the HOME programme or by the voluminous press statements coming out from his ministry that will be worth \$32,000 and will enable him to sell to the public his inadequate housing programmes?

Mr. Breithaupt: He won't sell it that cheap!

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I know that the press releases we have had in the past have been very good; they have been excellent.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: But the problem is this. We have had in the past someone responsible for communications for North Pickering and someone for communications for OHC, someone responsible for communications for the Ministry of Housing. We are reorganizing and co-ordinating all of the efforts in regard to communications and we want a director to handle this assignment.

I can't say to the hon. member that we will have fewer staff, but it is quite possible; we are looking in that direction. It may be that it will be much less costly than in the past. But certainly what I want is a qualified man, and if we have to pay \$32,000

to get the qualified man, I am quite prepared to do so.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary: Is the minister dissatisfied with the public's reaction to the press statements that flow out from all of these various parts of his ministry and from his own office—sufficiently dissatisfied to recognize that it is not press statements he needs but houses for people?

Mr. Lewis: How about a little affirmative action rather than a qualified man?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, as far as the Ministry of Housing is concerned we have had a lot of affirmative action in the past few months, and we are going to have a lot more in the next few months. I want to tell the member right now that we have had adequate press releases, but what I have found is that many municipalities are not fully aware of all our programmes. I want the people of the municipalities to take advantage of them. A case in point could be the Ontario Home Renewal Programme; I have gone around this province and found that many municipalities have not really known exactly what the programme was about. I think it's up to the municipalities to be involved in every programme the Ministry of Housing has.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): A supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: We are just about out of time and I think there are several people who wish to ask new questions. I think we should get to them first. If there is time left we will come back to that previous question.

The member for York-Forest Hill.

SPADINA ARTERIAL ROAD

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Now that he has so brilliantly solved the problem of the intermediate capacity transportation system for Ontario, when does he intend to respond to the application of Metropolitan Toronto which has been sitting on his desk now for many weeks with respect to the disposition of the Spadina ditch?

Mr. Jessiman: Why doesn't the member for York-Forest Hill drown in it?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for recog-

nizing the brilliance of the intermediate capacity solution.

Mr. Roy: Listen to the applause. The applause is indicative.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Secondly, the matter concerning the application from Metropolitan Toronto is being discussed with my colleagues and I will have an answer for Metro in the reasonably near future. I discussed the matter as well with the chairman of Metro not too long ago.

Mr. P. Taylor (Carleton East): In the election campaign.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Stormont.

PROPOSED OIL REFINERY IN EASTERN ONTARIO

Mr. G. Samis (Stormont): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism. Could he bring the House up to date as to the status of the proposed oil refinery at Morrisburg?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, very obviously the member for that area hasn't been listening to the remarks. I was asked casually by the mayor of Belleville whether there had been any inquiries by petroleum companies regarding refineries or establishments of that nature in that part of the province. I said we had very cautiously been discussing the subject with several people who had expressed some interest, related to the refinery process, in locating in the eastern part of the province.

I was very careful to indicate that in no way, shape or form was it a positive position. It was an inquiry to which our ministry was responding. They had asked where some of the locations might be in eastern Ontario and we had offered some suggestions and advice to them. At no time did I indicate positively that there would be a refinery in that part of our province.

Mr. Roy: Would the minister know?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I would know a lot more than the member for Ottawa East. I can assure him of that.

Mr. Samis: A supplementary.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): A supplementary.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview. A supplementary? Order, please. We will allow the member for Stormont one supplementary since he asked the original question.

Mr. Samis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since a public meeting was held at Morrisburg recently and the town solicitor as well as the reeve of Morrisburg said they had no way of finding out who was behind the proposed refinery, could the minister inform them, since the ministry officials said they couldn't find out who was behind it? Could he inform the House?

Mr. Roy: Careful now.

Mr. Lewis: It's not a lab assembly as the minister knows.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, our Ministry of Industry and Tourism deals with a great number of industries in the Province of Ontario, various parts of Canada and from many countries of the world, which would like to establish new operations in this province.

Mr. Roy: The minister has a big job.

Mr. Samis: Don't give us that.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: A great number of them come to us—if opposition members would listen for a moment rather than babble as they usually do when they go out on to the public platform—these people come to us to try to secure some information.

Mr. Roy: The minister has a big job, an important job.

Mr. Renwick: The minister is not speaking to the Rotary Club here.

Mr. Lewis: None of the members over there is very nice.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Generally, their inquiries are on a confidential basis and that is the way it is maintained by our ministry.

Mr. Renwick: The minister is not in Los Angeles. He is in that political forum now.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: If at any time we were to start disclosing who is discussing certain problems with us we would lose that credibility with the industrial operators in the province and those who wish to come to us.

Mr. Roy: The minister would be off his nut to do that.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: We do not disclose to municipalities or to others, with whom we are discussing the problems until they have

mide up their minds as to what position they wish to take or direction they wish to go.

Mr. Breithaupt: Not a word can be told.

Mr. Renwick: Until the minister and business have decided.

Mr. Lewis: Does he think the Legislature is one big Lion's Club?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I didn't speak to the Lion's Club. Will the member for Scarborough West get it straight?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

POLICE DRUG RAIDS

Mr. Singer: I have a question of the Attorney General if I can get him out from behind there. He was there a minute ago. Here he comes.

In view of yet another apparent abuse of civil rights by the RCMP—under the provisions of the Narcotic Control Act this time when they descended on a young lady who was getting ready to take a bath and broke down the door in the city of London—the same thing happened in St. Catharines in the Landmark incident, the criticisms by His Honour Judge Pringle in the Landmark report; the apparent comments and promises by the hon. Otto Lang, the federal Minister of Justice; can the Attorney General advise whether anything is being done to amend those terrible provisions in the Narcotic Control Act? What representations has the Attorney General made to try to get that Act cleaned up so that people's civil rights will be protected?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. J. T. Clement (Provincial Secretary for Justice): **Mr. Speaker,** I'm in shock to hear the member for Downsview referring to federal legislation in those kind of terms.

Mr. Singer: It is bad legislation.

Hon. Mr. Clement: My predecessor wrote to the hon. Otto Lang last May or June expressing his concern about the provisions of the Narcotic Control Act; and I think the Food and Drugs Act has similar legislation. I've read of the incident involving the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, over which I have no jurisdiction.

Mr. Singer: It took place in our province.

Hon. Mr. Clement: It apparently took place in our province. This is one of the anomalies we find with matters being prosecuted by

federal police relating to federal legislation. But now that we've got that all out of the way, I do have in my possession a letter from the hon. Minister of Justice telling me that he is introducing amendments to the two Acts this session that will impose the reasonable and probable clause provisions that so many members of the bar and the bench and public have expressed concern about. I did receive a communication from him, I believe a week or 10 days ago. It was also the subject of discussions at the Attorneys General conference in March, and I'm looking forward to those changes coming forth.

Mr. Singer: Will the minister make an urgent request that it be done as quickly as possible?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

EMPLOYMENT PROSPECTS OF HANDICAPPED PERSONS

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): A question of the Minister of Labour: What progress has the minister made towards improving the employment prospects of handicapped persons in this province?

Hon. J. P. MacBeth (Minister of Labour): **Mr. Speaker,** I'm afraid there is very little to report, as far as I can determine at this point. However, the ministry is investigating what we can do.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. There is too much conversation coming over that mike. Would the members please restrain themselves from talking so the hon. minister can be recorded?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: I know this is very dear to the member who has just asked the question, and I have given him my assurance that I will take some progressive action on it very shortly, sir.

Mr. B. Newman: Supplementary, **Mr. Speaker,** will the minister consider implementing Bill 19, that I introduced, and which would resolve the problem?

An hon. member: Of course, right away.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: **Mr. Speaker,** I'm not that familiar with Bill 19, as I perhaps should be. But I'll undertake to look at Bill 19 and see whether there is anything that we can incorporate into the government bill.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Transportation and Communications has the answer to a question asked previously.

QUINN ENTERPRISES

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On April 21, the hon. member for Downsview asked a question of my colleague, the Minister of Revenue. The question was as follows:

Since the minister is apparently not familiar with the various appearances of Quinn before the Ontario Highway Transport Board, could he undertake to inquire into those appearances, and discuss with his colleague, the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Rhodes) and perhaps with Mr. Shoniker, Quinn's various appearances there and determine whether or not it is reasonable that Quinn should have successfully opposed over a number of years applications of others for PCV licences, in order that he keep those others who were truck owners serving him, rather than being able to serve themselves?

Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Highway Transport Board has reviewed its files dated back to the beginning of 1972, and we find that Mr. Quinn opposed an application by Reliable Transport on March 5, 1973, for an extra-provincial operating authority to carry general commodities.

I understand that the application was granted by the Ontario Highway Transport Board upon hearing all the evidence. I'm advised there has been no other opposition filed by Mr. Quinn on any other application.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. McKeough presented the annual report of the Ontario Economic Council for the year 1974-1975.

Mr. Morrow from the standing procedural affairs committee presented the committee's interim report which was read as follows:

Your committee recommends:

1. That for the present session, substitution of members be allowed at all meetings of all standing committees, provided that all substitutions are communicated to the chairman in writing prior to the meeting and that each substitution be for that day only.

2. That the procedure in the House which allows the stacking of divisions be permitted

in any standing committee provided that such stacked divisions be voted upon prior to the adjournment of the committee on that day or the adjournment or completion of the bill or ministry estimates under consideration.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this report be adopted?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say one word about it. I realize that the committee has discussed it at length and this is their recommendation, but I still feel that the substitution changes are by no means fully adequate. The provision for substitution during the term of a meeting—that is, during the day—does not seem to be clear, other than for the day following. It would seem to me that we ought to accept the principle, on the basis of the distribution of members in the House, that we could have the votes distributed in the committee in such a way that we would have a much freer participation.

Regarding the second recommendation, allowing stacking, we have no particular objection as long as it simply doesn't leave the Tory members the right to be absent from the committee all day and come in at the end to carry the day with their votes. We hope this is not going to lead to any further lessening of the importance of the committee system, which in fact should be emphasized and not depreciated.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on the question of the stacking of votes in standing committees, the present practice in the Legislature is that a vote can be called by any party without stacking, and I wonder what the rule will be in the standing committee to ensure that all votes do not necessarily have to be stacked. I would hope the chairman would comment on that part of the stacking procedure in his reply.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to make a comment before the chairman replies?

Mr. Deans: Is the member for Ottawa West the chairman?

Mr. D. H. Morrow (Ottawa West): Yes.

Mr. Deans: I would like to comment on one other matter. I think it is absolutely imperative that there be a method found for recording the events—

Mr. Morrow: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, this particular part of the motion moved by the House leader hasn't been dealt with yet in the committee. We discussed it

for two days but we haven't dealt with the matter.

Mr. Deans: But they are going to?

Mr. Morrow: That's right.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments?

Mr. Morrow: While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Leader of the Opposition and to the hon. member for Riverdale, I would like to point out that all members of the committee unanimously approved of this particular report. There is really nothing in the substitution that prevents anyone from substituting on a given day, provided he gives the chairman notice in writing. There is nothing to hinder any member from speaking to any particular subject as long as he notifies the chairman. Each party will report to the chairman before the meeting starts, so there will be no confusion during that committee meeting for that day. Then we can start over again the next day if there are any substitutions.

In reply to the hon. member for Riverdale, I might say that our recommendation is simply intended to allow the same procedure that is allowed in the House to be used in the committees. If they want to clear off a vote, that's fine. If they want to stack them to the end of the day, that's fine. But on one point we do differ from the House procedure in that we want to clear off stacked votes each day and not hold them over until the next day.

Report agreed to.

Mr. Even from the standing private bills committee presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr11, An Act respecting the city of St. Catharines.

Bill Pr12, An Act respecting Sheridan Place.

Bill Pr13, An Act respecting the township of Goulbourn.

Bill Pr14, An Act respecting the city of Ottawa.

Bill Pr25, An Act respecting the township of Bruce.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

LIQUOR CONTROL AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Samis moves first reading of bill intitled, An Act to amend the Liquor Control Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Samis: The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to enable independent, owner-operated grocery stores to sell beer and apple cider.

An hon. member: That sounds reasonable.

Mr. Speaker: I recognize the member for Wellington South.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, before orders of the day, I would like to have the opportunity to welcome to the Legislature, and have the members also welcome, a group of ladies from the Beta Sigma Phi Guelph chapter who are here today to witness the operation of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

GIFT TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Meen moves second reading of Bill 32, An Act to amend the Gift Tax Act, 1972.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, my remarks at this stage of the bill will be quite brief. We are prepared to support the bill as, in our view, we are prepared to accept the continuation and development, particularly in these areas that are being benefited under this bill, of exemptions for gifts of farming assets where they are going to be used in farming. The other particular increases that have been developed to allow both the transfer of shares of small active business corporations, and also the increases in the annual exemption for gifts, are matters with which we concur. There may be some particular questions when the bill comes before us in committee, but those, I think, are sufficient remarks for the points I would make at this time.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, in the interest that I always have of expediting the business of the House and not being unduly long in my contribution, I want to make a few extended remarks on this bill, which will apply equally well to the other bill related to the taxation of wealth in the Province of Ontario, which I under-

stand will be called immediately following this bill, that is, Bill 31, the Act to amend the Succession Duty Act. Mr. Speaker, in speaking to Bill 32, an Act to amend the Gift Tax Act, which we passed in this assembly in 1972, I will also, because they are both bills relating to the taxation of wealth, deal with Bill 31, An Act to amend the Succession Duty Act.

It is our intention to oppose both of the bills. Although we will divide the House only on the Act to amend the Succession Duty Act, being Bill 32, our opposition to that bill should be comprehended to include opposition to this bill. As I stated, it is only in the interest of expediting the business of the House that I make that distinction.

I know that the bills will go into committee. I understand it is the intention to put these bills into committee of the whole House—I take it that the minister is about to nod his head in agreement—in which case the specifics of the particular clauses can be dealt with by us at that time.

Let me right at the outset make a caveat from the viewpoint of this party and of this caucus representing our party. Within the context of the two bills which are before us, but only within that limited context, we are in favour of the extension of the exemptions provided for the small active business and for the family farm. It should be very clear that we support those aspects of these bills within the existing context of the kind of taxation of wealth, if one can call it that, in the Province of Ontario at the present time. We supported it at the time they were originally introduced into the House with respect to the family farm. We support the extensions and we support the application of those provisions as they are reflected in these bills to what is to be defined as the small active business. But the principles of both bills, amending as they do and extending to a great extent the exemptions granted under the bills with respect to the taxation of wealth in the province, we oppose and we oppose continuously. We have opposed the amendments over the years and we continue to oppose them. I want, for a few minutes, to speak about that.

First of all, I think it is fair to say that any taxation of wealth in the country, in Canada, must be a federal matter. We have always felt it was unwise for the federal government to abdicate its responsibilities with respect to the taxation of wealth by withdrawing from the estate or inheritance tax field and by withdrawing from the gift tax field.

The result has been that we, as a party supporting as we do the federal system in its most positive aspects, object very strongly to the federal government's abdication, which has permitted an aspect of competition to exist between the various provinces so that some provinces have been trying to establish themselves as tax havens in the field of taxation of wealth at the expense of other provinces.

We think that in principle it is wrong. We do not think that each of the jurisdictions within Canada should be in competition with each other to determine whether or not they can attract wealth from one jurisdiction to another jurisdiction. That, in our view, is destructive.

Our first point, therefore, is that we deplore that abdication, as we have on other occasions, by the federal government.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Have they really abdicated? Isn't that more apparent than real?

Mr. Renwick: Well I don't for one moment believe that it is more apparent than real.

The result—and I say this to the member for York-Forest Hill—is that over the period of the last 10 years there has been a substantial erosion of the provisions of the taxing measures applicable in Ontario, be they federal or provincial, with respect to the taxation of wealth.

The net effect for practical purposes has been that in this day and age there is little, if any, taxation of wealth. There is little, if any, recognition that one aspect of taxation, the ability to pay in an equitable society, relates as well to capital assets as it does to income. I will perhaps deal further with that in a few minutes.

Mr. Givens: What about the capital gains tax?

Mr. Renwick: I say, again to my friend the member for York-Forest Hill, that a capital gains tax is not a tax on wealth. A capital gains tax, if one reads the Carter commission and the philosophy of taxation, is not a tax on wealth. Now I want that to be understood. That is why it is in the Income Tax Act of Canada. Under the Carter commission report, and under any philosophical understanding of a tax system, that is not the taxation of wealth.

It is interesting, and coincidental, because certainly it had nothing to do with this ministry introducing these bills at this particular time, that the federal government, apparently, has now recognized a degree of

concern with respect to the concentration of wealth and therefore of economic power in the business sector, by the appointment of the royal commission which has just been announced, undoubtedly directly flowing from the attempt by Power Corp. to take over Argus Corp.

That's one aspect of an overall problem that we have been concerned with in this party for many years. It is the question of the concentration of wealth. Where wealth is concentrated, there also is economic power concentrated; there also is social power concentrated.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): There also is political power.

Mr. Renwick. And there also, as a necessary consequence, is political power.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): And corruption.

Mr. Renwick: I will leave Hansard to record the remark of my colleague, the member for Sudbury.

It therefore seems to us that at this point in time, being faced again with another amendment to each of these two Acts, we must take a stand and say to the government where the New Democratic Party stands and what our position is with respect to the taxation of wealth. And I now want to try to say, in a few words, what our position is.

Our party is committed to use the taxation system to promote greater social and economic equality. This requires a redistribution of wealth as well as income.

The members who were here on Tuesday night will recall that I spoke at that time on the amendments to the Income Tax Act. At that time I drew the attention of the assembly to the statistical evidence supporting the proposition that, using the quintile system for slicing income distribution in Canada, regardless of the so-called social welfare provisions, regardless of the transfer payments which have been made, the relative positions of the five slices of the population with respect to the distribution of income has not changed over a 25-year period.

I was interested, indeed flattered, on that particular occasion when the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Meen) evinced a certain interest in the information which I tried to convey to the House. I intend to send him the background papers supporting the information which I laid on the table with respect to the distribution of income in Canada, in the hope that with the resources of the government we can get some factual information about the

distribution of income and the relative positions of the various quintiles of the population of the Province of Ontario taken from those figures. We do not have the resources to do it. At least that information is available. At least the information on which one can find out the conclusions or draw the conclusions is available.

We don't have any information in Canada, in the Province of Ontario, to identify privately-owned wealth. There is, to my knowledge, no way in which that information can be ascertained by Statistics Canada or by anyone else; and that poses an insuperable problem. I would surmise, although we do not know, that in the last 25 years there has been a substantial concentration in the distribution of privately-owned wealth in Canada and in the Province of Ontario.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we in this caucus are calling for a thoroughgoing reform of the taxation of wealth. The bill before us, the companion bill on the Succession Duty Act and the history of the piecemeal amendments to the Succession Duty Act in particular, and since it was introduced in 1972 the Gift Tax Act—constituting in all a frontal attack and a substantial destruction of our taxation of wealth—mirror the need for such a thoroughgoing reform of the taxation of wealth.

One of the main purposes of personal direct taxation, Mr. Speaker, is to share out the burden of taxation fairly in accordance with the principle of ability to pay. In this country we have come to think of income as the main yardstick of taxable capacity and have sought to promote a greater equality through a progressive income tax. However, income by itself is not an adequate measure of taxable capacity.

The ownership of wealth, whether it produces income or not, adds to the economic resources of a taxpayer so that the person who has wealth as well as income of a given size necessarily has a greater taxable capacity than one who has only income of that size. Our present tax system takes little account of this fact. Once the additional taxable capacity, represented by ownership of wealth, is adequately brought into charge, the inequalities in wealth will in time be eroded.

Let me say that when we call for a thoroughgoing reform of the taxation of wealth, we are speaking about a wide-ranging public discussion of such a reform. It appears to us that the day is long since past that tax reform, particularly in the field of taxation of wealth, is a matter to be left solely to

tax experts and to the bureaucracy of government to decide whether or when it should be introduced.

We, as a government, would commit ourselves—and we would call upon whichever party is the government of the province following the next election to commit itself in advance of that election—to the preparation of a green paper to provide a basis for the widespread discussion of this whole question of wealth taxation.

Let me illustrate some of the questions which came to my mind that must of necessity be discussed in this immensely difficult and complex field of taxation. What is the precise form that the tax should take? What is the extent of the coverage? What is the extent to which the net should be drawn for the taxation of wealth? What are the appropriate exemption limits? What are the rates at which the tax should be levied on successive slices of wealth? What is the interaction of the wealth tax with other taxes to ensure that the total tax liability of any individual is not unreasonable in all his circumstances?

There will be questions of the impact of such a tax on businessmen—to whom I referred at the outset of my remarks, the small active business corporations—and upon the family farmers. Those questions must be weighed with the greatest of care. In the end, we must be guided by what is fair and what is administratively possible.

The wider intention of our proposal is to make Ontario, indeed Canada, a fairer place to live in. To achieve this, a wealth tax must itself operate fairly.

After a suitable period of public discussion of a green paper, we would propose—and we would ask each party in this House to say—that after the next election a select committee would be set up to examine the whole matter. Finally, of course, this assembly would have to approve the precise form of the wealth tax.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, our caucus opposes this bill and the companion bill, which are before the assembly this afternoon. Not, I reiterate, because of the provisions related to the small active business corporation or to the family farm, but because this bill is the culmination of the destruction of the taxation of wealth in Ontario. If it is not the culmination, it's the penultimate step in the culmination of the destruction of the taxation of wealth in Ontario.

We in this party do not deny that even to measure the distribution of privately-owned wealth, let alone to tax it, involves difficult conceptual and statistical problems for which

adequate information is not available. That must not deter us. The social end commands us to proceed as I have tried to outline on behalf of this party.

The fundamental purpose of the wealth tax would be to make the distribution of the tax burden accord more closely with taxable capacities and thereby contribute to the creation of a more equitable society in which social divisions, characterized by differences of wealth, are reduced, and in which social and economic power—and if I may borrow the interjection a few minutes ago by my colleague the member for Lakeshore—and political power created by the possession of wealth is less concentrated than at present.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, we in this caucus, speaking on behalf of the New Democratic Party which we represent in this assembly, oppose this bill on second reading and will divide the House on the companion bill when it comes before the assembly.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. "We have not failed, but only because we have always gone on striving": A quotation from the "Four Quartets" of T. S. Eliot. That is the only vindication I know for our continued insistence, our continued malaise in rising year after year in this House with respect to this particular kind of measure, to oppose what this government does with respect to emasculating wealth taxation. There are many people with a great deal of wealth who pay very little income tax, we all know that and it's a scandal in the United States. If the facts were known in this country it would be equally a scandal, and perhaps more so.

At what stage and where do we finally move, in the name of the public and the public realm; those off whom they fed for their lifetime, those who have conferred the benefit? They live in the community and it is out of that community that they derive their money. Must they return nothing in terms of hard cash?

The irony of the thing, which would turn the mind of Montaigne, it's so radical an irony, Mr. Speaker, is that they won't even be able to curse you or forgive you, or do anything about you—you're dead.

This is the finest form of taxation—Lawlor had very much to do with it—it's a primary form of taxation, where you tax, with the least pain, those who are in the subsequent generations.

How the wealthy dote upon their children, apparently, so that they want to hand on the use of it. It's a way of self-perpetuation; I suppose it's a submitted form of egotism. This is the only way, through the medium of money, that their memory will be indelibly installed in the mind for all future generations, or something like that.

What fatuity, what a myth! If that's the bind they have with human relationships, then I am afraid it will disappear about three hours after they are dead, which is normally the case.

And so why not move in on this particular area? Those who are getting the benefits have done nothing to deserve it; an accident of birth. Those who have been able to acquire the wealth have obviously been able to find stratagems, loopholes and various methods of garnering and retaining it against the common weal and common purposes.

My friend has said the turnover in the income picture, with the trust that presently exists, does not allow this. Some day we may, with a royal commission and that green paper, get in on the basis of wealth taxation as a whole; with interrogation of the foundation concept in this province and how it operates. And it would be very much in order.

It's an aggressive field; it lies there fallow. No one ever mentions it. No one ever scapples it, interrogates it, sees how it is misused against the public as a pure device, as a conduit pipe, by which to escape. Every wealthy man in the United States, from Carnegie on, has set up his own personal foundation for perpetuation of his memory and for his personal self-aggrandizement; as I say, not knowing quite how he enjoys the vision in another life.

The remarks I am making at the moment are, perhaps, more pertinent to the succession duty bill. But, as the minister well knows, this bill is collateral to the other. We didn't have a gift tax in this province until Smith recommended it and the select committee of this House, in 1969, placed it forward as a positive proposal. A couple of years after that, the government finally brought in a Gift Tax Act, so that they wouldn't be able to give all their money away before they died and therefore escape taxation by that particular route. So the government felt it was necessary rather to close the gate there, and give coverage backing up to a period of five years prior to the death, which was felt to be an adequate time. I think the federal was three years.

Our recommendation, 360-355 was that Ontario introduce a gift tax applicable to

individuals and personal corporations at the same rate structure as recommended for succession duties. Then certain exemptions to charitable and other foundations are set out. Then we recommended that gifts made by an individual in a year to any one person, not exceeding \$1,000 in the aggregate, be exempt. What is it today—\$10,000 to any one individual? What is it in the aggregate to be? It's to go from \$10,000 to \$25,000 to all individuals.

That's quite a leap in a very short time. It's a cutting into and an erosion of the taxation base in this regard which can only benefit a very narrow number of people in this populace, the well-to-do. It's class legislation in a rank sense. We've said this before. It alleviates a tax burden duly earned, deservedly registered against a segment of society which is making in excess of \$100,000 or \$75,000 and up and who have accumulated capital assets in excess of \$150,000 or so. Those are the people who will be the beneficiaries of this legislation and no others.

It continues the division in the society, the deep acrimonious divisions which are, and will in the next few years come home to roost. The society is breaking down around us. These matters about taxation enjoy very little attention in the House, although from a New Democratic point they're absolutely crucial. The crunch, or one of the major crunches of the whole economy, is who taxes and who pays; what do you get and why do you get it in this particular area rather than another.

The Conservative Party has no quarrel with the federal government. My colleague laments the disappearance of the federal government from this field and its abdication and it is an abdication in this regard. This government thought at that particular time that it would make for increased revenues in the hands of the province. It was begging at that time for increased sources of taxation revenue and it thought succession duties and gift tax were just the bird of the right colour.

But what happened? Lougheed came into the world, a new-born babe glistening with oil, and he set up his little tax haven. We used to berate it. We'd stand here and point to the Bahamas, to E. P. Taylor's little demesne down there. He wants to take all his wealth now and extract it out of this country. I don't know what he intends to do with the poor Bahamians when he finally gets there.

Mr. Renwick: Or his predecessor, the chap that was murdered years ago.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Lougheed sets up his little empire, cuts out sales taxes and then moves in as soon as the federal government moves out to cancel all of succession duties. This government is placed in an invidious position because it feels that there might be individuals in this province, the wealthy who are always the most patriotic and the most loyal to that source from which they earn their revenues, who will depart the province, who will be off to the azure havens close to the mountains.

May the mountains fall on them. I think the government's fear is partially self-generated and therefore to that extent is fictitious.

After all, the sources of their wealth are in this province. They are in the manufacturing of this province. They're in acquired land holdings here. They can't move those things. If they want to go and live out there that's their business. But the fact of the matter is that if the government taxes at the situs of the property the benefits will stay with this province.

The government hasn't even the courage, in matters of taxation, when the members of the opposition stand up and rail against the damn thing, as I'm doing now, to answer us forthrightly and with any degree of frankness. It takes a lugubrious, long-faced stance; its lips are sealed; it won't mention the two reasons that motivate it behind all these things.

What is it all about and why does the government take these measures? The intention of the legislation is never even mooted. It's not in the Treasurer's (Mr. McKeough) statement on the budget. What is the *raison d'être* of the legislation? What is the government trying to do?

For five years I've listened to the various Treasurers of this province stand up here, place their hands over their breasts and say, "Oh no, we have no intention of moving out of the succession duty field; we'll retain it." But year after year at this time as a result of budget measures introduced in the spring, the further trespassing goes on, the erosion continues—Scarborough Bluffs is almost completely in the sea, so to speak, and we can see only a little hillock left here and there.

I dare say the minister will stand up again and say, platitudinously, "Oh no, we had no intention of wiping out succession duties." He knows what a stink it would raise in this House, as far as we are concerned in any event; I think the Liberals couldn't care less. But there the Tories find their identities; there they find themselves *ad idem* with the federal government. They moved out because they

didn't want anything to do with it; they washed their hands of it.

This government took it up and in the process is taking the skin off at the bone. What is left? In the field of wealth taxation, very little. That's why we are on our feet today.

I want something clearly understood too, as we apparently have to do ad nauseum in the House because of certain remarks that I hear over my shoulder from time to time. With respect to the retail sales tax, we voted against it and we gave our reasons for voting against it. We are voting against these two measures too. Not because—and let no blandishments be made—not because we would not alleviate the farmer in this way. If we can keep lands in agriculture, so be it. If this is an alleviation that will retain the agricultural life of the province into future generations, which is an absolutely crying need because the thing is being desolated at the present time, then so be it.

The small businessman has been given very little credence by this government, although of recent date they have begun to stir in their burrows a bit because there's an election coming and because we have raised the matter of the government's sense of assistance to small businessmen so many times that some of the smaller ones now benefit. The government must expand the development corporations sufficiently that the small businessman can get a little money in order to get their businesses going.

I've never been successful, no matter how many times I've approached them. Their terms of reference are constrictive, and the interest rates at which they lend are a malaise. The final bog everybody falls into is that the regulations and governing restrictions are so endemic that they are hanging and breathing over the shoulder of every small businessman in his daily, hour-to-hour operations, and he can't possibly conduct his business sensibly. That's the way the damned thing operates under this government, and it's an area where it can give some relief.

In section 1 we have these two principles, but in section 2 they come along with a third principle. Do they do it deliberately? Do they do it under a masquerade? Do they bring Trojan horses into the city? It's the third principle that we find so central and so unpalatable—although it doesn't obviate the other two; we would retain them—that we are forced to vote against the legislation. It eats into the public realm. It does a disaffection to the tax picture. It distorts it and is a basic

betrayal of the government's own announced position, year after year.

Who is going to defend an equitable tax structure? Lord, we haven't very many among the fellows in the provincial government—certainly not the Minister of Revenue because he wasn't in the rolls of the mighty in those times. He wasn't a dignitary; in those days he was just a fellow like the rest of us. But they were the ones who did more to scuttle the Carter commission when an intimation of possibility came down from above that we might get some kind of fair tax structure. It wasn't the Liberals in Ottawa, although Lord knows they did their share. Did you read the Senate report on the Carter commission, Mr. Speaker? It is one of the most devastating, most aristocratic, most patronage-ridden pieces of verbiage I have ever been exposed to—

Mr. Renwick: You'd think it would be purblind.

Mr. Lawlor: It was purblind, to sum it all up. I remember the statements emanating from here too, damning it under every head and bringing in every conceivable argument, however lucid or however valid, to undermine it, and they succeeded. They won the day. I don't pretend the Tories would dream of bringing in equitable and decent measures with respect to death taxation or wealth taxation generally. They are just against it; that's their position ideologically and ours is the other way. I think our position is eminently fairer.

Where does their weight fall? It falls on a whole echelon of people who have nothing or very little in this life except the income they make from month to month and week to week. The Tories court the wealthy.

It's like 10 years before the French Revolution. They all sat in their grandeur garnering up the goods but it was taken from them. If the Tories don't do it sagely and don't do it in the manner my colleague has suggested, by gradations and moving in that way instead of moving in the directly contrary direction, they are going to bring that upon their heads. I think it is in the works particularly with the increased unemployment we are suffering from. I look for great perils in this jurisdiction. Maybe it would be better if they weren't in office; at least, they wouldn't be taken down to the Don Jail.

All right. In the area of the tax there is another section having to do with recording facilities. It's a minor matter. It could be handled very well in committee. When we talk about committee on these things, we

mean the committee of the whole House for this one but I would like to forewarn or forearm the minister that when we get to the Corporations Tax Amendment Act we really mean it to be taken out of this House completely and to the committee downstairs where members of the public could make appearances.

I don't think it's necessary in this sort of legislation, at least not yet. If we could get the kind of hearing my colleague suggests it should be a matter taken to the public realm to receive some kind of enunciations from out there on present policies and to give us an opportunity to inform them out there precisely what is happening in the realm of wealth taxation in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to take part in the debate? The hon. minister.

Hon. A. K. Meen (Minister of Revenue): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to express my gratitude to the members of the official opposition at least who have indicated that they see the wisdom of this legislation and that they support it. I think it's got some excellent sections in it.

There are the increase in the amount of gifts which can be made, particularly the cumulative gifts which can be made of farming property or farm businesses; and the provision for exemption of contributions by a donor to a spouse's registered retirement savings plan which was previously not an exempt gift. In other words, it created some problems with these retirement savings plans. That was a section we had intended to bring in following the federal budget of 1974, and we had already announced that would be brought in.

I was interested to hear in that sense that even the NDP is prepared to support these provisions with respect to the farming community and small business. I suppose therefore it's apparent there is some measure of unanimity on wanting to keep farms in farming. We want to keep small businesses from having to be sold on the death of a principal shareholder. If they can be kept in the family for a short period of time now, as proposed, for a 10-year period, it's certainly to the good of the country. The reduction of that holding period from 25 years to 10 years is, I think, most significant.

I think it is fair to say that I, too, would favour a really good look at the succession duty provisions. Although we are talking about the gift tax sections they are, as indicated by the members opposite, a package, one might say, with the Succession Duty Act

amendment which will follow this one. We are going to be looking at these provisions over the next few months, not so much with respect to the question of taxation on wealth but rather with a view to simplification of the method of application of the tax on the estates that by the present exemptions now increase from \$150,000 to \$250,000 will have application to them. It's still a relatively complicated formula through which to work one's way when determining the method of tax collection.

The Gift Tax Act is, of course, here to protect the revenues of the Succession Duty Act. Without the Gift Tax Act we would, of course, be in deep trouble under the Succession Duty Act. I wonder if the member for Riverdale has ever taken the trouble to read appendix D of the report of the advisory committee on succession duties, dated Thursday, Feb. 23, 1973.

Appendix D, if I've got my papers right, is a paper, if memory serves—although it's not shown as such here—by Wolfe Goodman, QC, on the matter of the taxation of wealth. It's a very interesting article. In the long run, he weighs the two sides of the argument but comes down on the side of concluding that at this time in our history—and this is relatively current, 1973—this province and I suppose this country really isn't ready for a wealth tax in the direct sense put to us by the socialist member for Riverdale.

We are applying a tax here in a form of a wealth tax but it isn't altogether. We're taxing it at a particular time when a step is taken by a donor under this Act or under the Succession Duty Act on the death of the owner.

I think, Mr. Speaker, there is a fundamental difference of ideology here. We're not prepared to accept that at this time, so I would think that in the ongoing picture we won't be losing sight of the philosophies which Mr. Goodman has expressed and which others will express, I would suppose, in the months and years ahead.

The bill before us at the moment implements the budget proposals, and although I have a small amendment to this Act which I will propose when it goes into committee of the whole, I have no particular amendments for the Succession Duty Amendment Act. If the hon. members opposite want it to go into committee of the whole as well that will be perfectly satisfactory with me, but I want to make it abundantly clear that I was not necessarily suggesting that the Succession Duty Amendment Act go into committee. If the hon. members wish it to

go, then that will be fine and at the appropriate time we can discuss the clauses in it in greater detail at that time.

For the present time, inasmuch as we are dealing with the Gift Tax Amendment Act, Mr. Speaker, I think that would conclude my comments on this bill.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Hon. Mr. Meen: No, committee of the whole House.

Mr. Speaker: Committee of the whole House?

Agreed.

SUCCESSION DUTY AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Meen moves second reading of Bill 31, An Act to amend the Succession Duty Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: We have expressed ourselves fairly categorically at this stage but, it being a new bill, I think it should again be made amply clear that the section having to do with the alleviation of the tax vis-à-vis the farm community is perfectly justifiable and okay with us, and we wouldn't vote against it, and also as a stimulus to small business and the retention of small businesses in Canadian families and in their hands and keep them going in perpetuity.

Too often under the former succession duty regulations small businesses were, because of non-liquidity, forced to sell to strangers or wind up. We have had many studies over the years on this particular thing and to that extent giving an alleviation in this regard is fine. But when the minister lifts the basic exemption across the board to everybody under the sun from \$150,000 to \$250,000—a quarter of a million dollars—we think that's zeroing in on a very narrow number of the people of this province and is a give-away programme to the well-to-do.

We are under an obligation as representatives of the general public—nine-tenths of whom don't own shares in corporations and have small enough bank accounts, God knows, and I don't think it is our job nor the minister's to promote that particular kind of lacuna or loopholing of the whole succession duty operation. The amount of money left

coming in through succession duties constitutes a pittance in the treasury of the province. A disappearing pittance.

It is one of the oldest taxes touched upon in human history, if we look at Adam Smith, that benighted purblind old beggar, who supported and gave the Tories their foundations and roots and the way they think. Three hundred years ago there was Adam Smith.

I was looking at "The Wealth of Nations" the other day and it recommended succession duties as a form of taxation; he hated all other forms but this was the one form of taxation he found acceptable. It was the form that kings used in the widest sense against their subjects.

As I said previously, it has the sovereign merit of being the painless tax and on that count alone recommends itself heartily, I would think.

An hon. member: Is that a fact?

Mr. Lawlor: There wouldn't be any acrimony or backlash against the government in power for supporting, increasing, expanding and making the tax viable, making it a worthwhile tax.

I noticed Ricardo did a bit of it, too. I was doing a little research on succession duties to see how far they went back. John Stuart Mill in his representative government makes a strong case of it. Mill was the last—the beginning?—of the laissez-faire economists.

Of course, Mill was a man ahead of his time. As he got older he became a socialist and abandoned the whole thing. That was the beginning of enlightenment in Great Britain, prior to George Bernard Shaw and Harold Laski. They recommended the tax, too, let me assure members. The Tories are the only ones who derogate from it and watch the process of wiping out.

One can spend a long time on the history, giving the various rates in earlier times and watching its proportion of the tax revenue of the province. Once it represented a substantial tax; of the total revenues of the province it was a critical tax but in the past 10 years and more latterly in the last five, it has become a disappearing tax.

I suppose as the capital gains taxation came into being the wealthy ran for cover and are seeking a particular haven. They found the haven, as I said earlier, in Alberta and this jurisdiction is setting itself up as a similar haven not, I say, in my opinion, necessarily or even contingently against Alberta but because this is the predilection, the

Tories' own thinking. This is what, in their guts, they really want to do. It gives them this sense. Thank heavens for parliament—at least we get the opportunity to stand on our hind legs and tell them so, otherwise they might not know. Their degree of insouciance and unconsciousness of these regards quite passes belief if there weren't some of us sometimes to stand up and remind the government that this is what's happening, maybe there will be a stirring as a result of that. As I said, it is all we can hope for.

This guy Loughheed has more sins to repent than just his stand in oil revenues. At the initiation of the thing and before his wealth was so great, and before the world imbroglio which brought about his ascendancy, he moved in on this area of tax, and he has a great deal to be forgiven for so far as the rest of this country is concerned, and he has done more to breach Confederation, in terms of inamity and in terms of internal taxation and monetary policies, than anything that was ever done in Quebec. Duplessis was bad enough, but he didn't mulct the rest of the country, he mulcted his own people. But Loughheed plays a most vicious game and this is one of the portents of his viciousness.

I would like these words, if humanly possible, to be carried on to him, because some of us here feel that in this particular regard he undermines the whole country, upsets the tax structures, derogates from our possible growth and from the sources from which required necessary governmental schemes can be launched, simply because dog-in-the-manger-like he finds it possible to dispense with this form of taxation in an effort to lure the wealthy from Ontario into his own province. Some of them are going, I understand. There's a few. But as I say, the roots are here and they are pretty hard to break even if there is no sentiment about it left in us. In earlier times the fellow would have been taken to Canossa and maybe flagellated a little in the snow. It certainly would do him no harm.

I was bemused to read in the Financial Post of June 26, 1971:

It's Christmas on Jan. 1, 1972. Next New Year's Day should be far more lucrative than Christmas for children of wealthy Canadians. Finance Minister Benson's new tax package, which includes the abolition of the federal estate and gift taxes as of Dec. 31, 1971, appears to provide an ideal pipeline through which well-heeled fathers can unload much of their wealth almost tax free on their heirs. Instead of gift and estate tax, the proposed new system would

tax unrealized or paper capital gains. This tax break for the wealthy assumes the provinces don't move into the gift tax field.

No fear.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Which, of course, we did.

Mr. Lawlor: When they did, they don't.

Hon. Mr. Meen: We did.

Mr. Lawlor: They do the dance and the ostrich flounders. Come off it.

Here today the government is emasculating its own legislation. They brought it in at a high enough level. We objected to that. It wasn't even in line with the previous federal level. It was a much raised level, much more open, much more so-called generous. Generous to whom? Now, again, we are getting more of the same.

The thing becomes a charade. They may as well wipe it out. It has no validity. The whole field of taxation no longer has any weight in the province. It isn't a consequence. It isn't a real weight in the minds of those who have the wherewithal and are concerned or might be concerned about their tax. Their concern dissipates by the hour. Well, they simply advised them all to go and get some term insurance within the five-year period in which the thing exists. In 1972 they couldn't anticipate this day of April 24, 1975.

The bill does four things. It raises the exemption to \$250,000. It changes the way in which the tax is calculated, and this is the most interesting thing, so that the average rate of tax is reduced. In other words, previously if a person hit \$151,000, he then came in at the full rate.

Now the first \$250,000 doesn't even count; it's not in the picture. It's not as though it's incorporated into the new rate once one exceeds that horizon. They start their rates running in a different way which again, Mr. Speaker, is a second reduction of the tax within the same piece of legislation. It's a double move. Unless you read it carefully, I don't think you would see that particular point. Again, I feel it's a sort of masquerade, a dance that the minister plays hidden in the interstices of the legislation itself.

The minister takes the forgiveness period for succession duty on farms from 25 years to 10 years. I really don't know why he does that. We think, as I said, that the rate was fine. But why the time limitations? Does that not free farms in a shorter time to go out of the family business, to escape succession duty and to become the boon of developers to take away from farming? It strikes me that that

would do that. Then the bill does similar things—and this is a completely new measure—with respect to the small businessman. We have no great objection to that.

What happens after the double whammy of the devil-distilled, stem-winding hell of a move that the government is making in this particular thing? The present tax on a \$250,000 estate, would be \$12,500. Lord, that's little enough. Out of \$250,000, \$12,500 goes into the public purse as a result of the contributions that we made to that estate? How did the estate grow—in isolation? Did it live in some kind of abstract demesne, divorced from the labour, from the natural wealth, from everything that all of us participate in? Is that the way estates are? Anyway, the previous tax was \$12,500. Now it's nil.

On \$300,000, the tax used to be \$19,500. It's now \$5,500. At \$500,000, it was previously \$52,500 and now it's \$31,250. At \$800,000, it used to be \$117,000, and it's \$85,250. This is the way the world wags. Please stop, I want to get off.

How much further can the government go without eliminating the tax and making it a laughing stock? As far as I'm concerned, it's a laughing stock already. The sooner the government gets out of the field, as things stand, in the way of honesty, the better it will be for all of us.

There's a \$56-million loss computed this year. Succession duties could very easily fetch in the province, I suggest, \$100 million to \$150 million a year without driving anybody out, without anybody being mulcted, without any particular twist or turn of the screw and without doing any great harm to beneficiaries. They would still be the overwhelming beneficiaries of the largess. Why does the government do this? Aren't the benefits to the province sufficient?

The government is hard taxed for money; it's crying for it. It has to move in the next few years back into the area if it is going to find the requisite funds to carry out numerous projects. If it is going to do anything with child care projects, it's going to have to find extra money. The pressure on the budget is very hard. This is the simplest, most simple-minded, least onerous way of acquiring it. Let the government take good cognizance of that and alter its position.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to take part in the debate? The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite sure where the hon. member got his figures

from. They don't seem to check out with mine. Actually, the main thrust of increasing the exemption, apart from relieving the anguish of some of those whose estates might be looking as if they were pressing up toward the \$150,000 figure, is to get out of the taxation field quite a number of the estates that would otherwise be taxable. The figures, as my staff provide them to me, indicate there was actually a total of 43,700-odd processed last year. There were 2,675 that were taxable—2,675 out of 43,000. We will better than cut that in half by this modest increase in the exemptions. We estimate about 1,200 now will be subject to tax.

Mr. Lawlor: He says \$100,000 is modest. Well, the minister is a man of great modesty, indeed.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The member will have noted, if he looked at the budget papers, that they indicate an anticipated reduction in revenues from \$74 million in the last fiscal year to approximately \$67 million. So that's not a significant loss for a very significant reduction in the number of estates that would be taxable. We will still hit very heavily the sizable estates that will be coming in.

As I say, I don't know where he got his figures. In an estate size of, say, \$200,000, there was a tax before as the Act presently stands, but before amendment, in the preferred class of some \$24,000, in the collateral class of some \$25,000, and in the stranger class of some \$25,000. The notch provision would apply there to wipe out what would otherwise be an outrageous increase.

At the \$250,000 figure—which is, of course, still clear of any tax under these amendments—the preferred class would have paid \$31,250, the collateral some \$50,000, and, again, the stranger class some \$50,000.

But when you get up to the \$600,000 or \$800,000 class, Mr. Speaker, and I did not follow his figures at all when he got up there, my figures would show that in an estate of \$600,000 in the preferred category the tax would have been \$138,000. It's now reduced to \$123,000. The collateral would have been \$225,000, and that would be reduced to \$175,000. And in the \$800,000—I think he mentioned that one as well—the preferred category would have paid \$216,000, as opposed to \$196,000 under the new rates.

Mr. Lawlor: I am going to speak to my research department, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Meen: So you can see that the gap is narrowing there, Mr. Speaker, and in the higher category they are still paying a very substantial amount of tax. The figures he was quoting were quite different from that, and I was wondering where he got them from.

In any event, sir, this bill, in implementing the budget, does essentially increase the exemptions on the size of an estate that is taxable, and the size of any specific or general legacy that would attract any secondary tax to also \$250,000. I think, as I indicated at the beginning, it goes a long way toward easing the minds and the apprehension of those who think that their estates might be subject to some form of tax.

We're not about to try to confiscate the smaller estates of the people of this province. We still feel it's appropriate to apply a succession duty to the large estates. We do not think that, by taxing in this fashion, we will drive any significant number of people out of Ontario and into sister provinces, or into other jurisdictions, in which they might manage to escape some measure of tax.

Certainly, some people who are very wealthy have managed to do this, but I don't think this Act would have any effect one way or the other. You have to remember that the federal government, Mr. Speaker, with its capital gains legislation, capital gains tax on realty increases, capital gains tax on stocks, capital gains tax on any increase—except, of course, one's principal residence—takes a very substantial piece out of capital gains and wealth increases generally. We also have some pretty heavy income taxes, both federally and provincially.

Mr. Speaker, I know what the socialists would do, to put it very crassly—I really say this not altogether seriously—they'd confiscate everything.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Careful.

Mr. Lawlor: That kind of remark is beneath the minister.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Just go overboard.

Hon. Mr. Meen: They really wouldn't, I suppose, but they certainly would go a lot further toward the confiscation of wealth than this party is prepared to do.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister is not on the hustings now.

Hon. Mr. Meen: We feel people with wealth should bear their fair share and we believe this kind of legislation is doing just that.

Mr. Ferrier: We believe in socialism for the rich and free enterprise for the poor.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is for second reading of Bill 31.

The House divided on the motion for second reading of Bill 31, which was approved on the following vote:

AYES	NAYS
Auld	Bounsall
Bales	Burr
Beckett	Cassidy
Belanger	Davison
Braithwaite	Deans
Breithaupt	Ferrier
Brunelle	Foulds
Clement	Germa
Deacon	Laughren
Downer	Lawlor
Dymond	Lewis
Eaton	Samis—12.
Edighoffer	
Ewen	
Gaunt	
Gilbertson	
Givens	
Grossman	
Haggerty	
Handleman	
Henderson	
Hodgson	
(Victoria-Haliburton)	
Hodgson	
(York North)	
Irvine	
Jessiman	
Kennedy	
Kerr	
Leluk	
MacBeth	
Maeck	
McIlveen	
McKeough	
McNeil	
McNie	
Meen	
Morningstar	
Morrow	
Newman	
(Windsor-Walkerville)	
Nixon	
(Dovercourt)	
Nixon	
(Brant)	

AYES
 Nuttall
 Parrott
 Potter
 Riddell
 Rollins
 Root
 Roy
 Ruston
 Scrivener
 Singer
 Smith
 (Simcoe East)
 Smith
 (Hamilton Mountain)
 Smith
 (Nipissing)
 Snow
 Spence
 Taylor
 (Carleton East)
 Turner
 Villeneuve
 Wardle
 Welch
 White
 Winkler
 Wiseman
 Worton—64.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 64, the "nays" are 12.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Committee of the whole House.

Agreed.

ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. Speaker: I beg to inform the House that in the name of Her Majesty the Queen the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor has been pleased to assent to certain bills in her chambers.

The Clerk Assistant: The following are the titles of the bills to which Her Honour has assented:

Bill 30, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

Bill 33, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act.

Bill 34, An Act to amend the Gasoline Tax Act, 1973.

CORPORATIONS TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Meen moves second reading of Bill 36, An Act to amend the Corporations Tax Act, 1972.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, my remarks with respect to this bill will not be lengthy as I understand that, by agreement, the minister is going to send this bill to standing committee. There will be the opportunity, therefore, for members of the committee to deal more particularly with many of the points in this very lengthy and technical bill.

There are changes to start with, of course, with respect to certain definitions. We find words like "bank" and "do" being redefined in order to bring these terms and others into a parallel approach with respect to the federal definition.

Generally, throughout this statute, Mr. Speaker, there is an attempt to parallel various amendments and various changes to federal legislation so that we have a tax statute which is consonant with the federal approach to taxation. There are some things, of course, which perhaps should not be fully parallel and I have a couple of questions that the minister may at least consider when that time comes forward.

On the accrual basis that is dealt with in section 4, subsection 2, there is—as I understand it by definition—an attempt to change the timber resource matter. As I understand it, it is now going to be done on an accrual basis, rather than as the income has been received. This is paralleled with federal legislation.

I'm wondering why we are proceeding in this way, by tying in this kind of portion of the statute with the kinds of disallowances that have taken place on the levies for oil and for other gas and mineral resources. As a deduction, I understand, this is simply not allowed. One wonders why, instead of denying a deduction, the government doesn't change the situation so that this is not simply being brought back into income in this way, but rather that the deduction is not allowed in the first place.

There is a parallelism here with federal legislation. I understand, of course, that the federal disallowance is matched by an abatement of some 15 per cent, but the provincial disallowance is really not matched in that same way.

It would seem that if royalties are a rental, then presumably they should be an operating cost and, of course, are not allowed in this

circumstance as a deduction. The minister may have some further comments before the committee as this goes forward at that time, and perhaps he can explain to us at that point the approach which is being taken.

Again, in sections 4 and 5, there are parallelisms to the federal legislation dealing with accrual of interest and attempting to plug a loophole which was, of course, plugged in the federal budget in November. And also in section 5, dealing with the parallelism that made me sort of wonder; because it seemed to me, as I recalled the situation, that in section 5, Canada Savings Bonds could only be purchased by individuals.

As a result, I wondered why it was necessary to have presumably parallel legislation in our Corporations Act if, indeed, corporations could not buy Canada Savings Bonds in the first place.

Now, of course, for individuals the matter of interest would be beneficial, so that if interest received was more than \$1,000, then the additional amount could be taxed only at a 50 per cent rate.

However, I am wondering if really this section is not perhaps in the wrong Act. If we have a necessity to have this kind of situation with respect to an allowance under the Canada Savings Bond programme, then perhaps that should be in the Income Tax Act.

My question, of course, is: Why is it in the Corporations Tax Act, if I am correct—which, of course, I may not be—that Canada Savings Bonds can't be acquired by corporations in the first place?

There are various other housekeeping sections in the bill and these particularly start with section 6. There is greater certainty that it does apply in these various housekeeping sections. Again, we refer in section 7 to the matter of the royalties no longer being equivalent to operating expenses, so that this difference of 12 per cent will amount to an \$18 million amount more for the Province of Ontario this year.

There seems to be a lack of agreement between the federal and provincial authorities, since the mining tax is expected to bring in \$130 million this year, and this additional amount not being allowed as an expense would bring a concomitant 12 per cent benefit. Again, there is much more parallelism.

I would refer, even though it seems a minor point, to section 8, subsection 9, which appeared, at least in our review of it, to have an incorrect reference that I might just suggest to the minister at this point. In this case the bill reads, "... notwithstanding

section 22(1b) . . . " I suggest that perhaps should refer to clause a because, as I recall, clause b deals with a disallowance of capital outlays, whereas clause a is the one that I think reference might be intended. In this case I suppose the legislation becomes in effect no worse than the federal legislation and even though it may be a little difficult to interpret, perhaps we are resolving what is otherwise a problem.

It was suggested to me that the development of this particular clause came from the federal income tax interpretation bulletin No. 131 and that perhaps the clause unfortunately is based more on the comments within the bulletin than on the federal statute. As a result, this whole matter of convention expenses perhaps should be reviewed since the corporations do not deduct these expenses in the same manner that individuals do, and perhaps the kind of parallelism that the minister is seeking is not as clearly set out as he might wish.

I was interested in the point raised in section 12 with respect to the \$2-billion figure concerning the reduction of the investment reserve on outstanding loans. I was not aware that any company in Canada had achieved this particular level, and I hope it is not simply a sign of inflation that, as a result, we get the astounding figure that appears in this section. Perhaps the minister can advise us if there is any corporation operating within the province that in any way might come up to this particular point.

Certainly the matters dealt with in sections 13 and 14 are quite satisfactory. The whole approach of having a greater flexibility in the deduction of scientific costs parallels the federal legislation and is something we can certainly accept. Section 14, dealing with the timber resource property is only a matter of clarification, and since this is now treated as income there is really no particular problem.

The one area I would like to discuss briefly with the minister relates specifically to section 25. It is really very difficult to speak in any particular way on the principle of a bill like this because there are a great variety of items that no doubt we will go over more carefully in committee.

My understanding of section 25 was that the exploration deduction was of course entirely deductible but the development deduction was only a 30 per cent deductible area on a continuing declining balance. If on sale the proceeds are credited back, we are then in a different situation than we are in Ontario. If both the exploration and

the development deductions are entirely deductible, then those deductions in excess of what would be allowed under the federal scheme would come back into taxable income.

The matter of share for share exchange, which section 39 refers to, again parallels the federal legislation as we understand it. I suppose this kind of a section is much more important within our society now that we are having the Power and Argus Corp. projects going on, which I suppose have brought the kind of investigation of this entire involvement within Canadian society that the recent royal commission announced by the federal government is going to bring forward.

There is, of course, no gain to a shareholder when this kind of situation takes place until the final disposition of the shares. So this kind of a share-for-share exchange, we think, should not attract the probability of a tax situation until the share is obviously finally dealt with.

One point that I did want to raise in this section deals with the matter of the payment of sales tax. My understanding is that on these kinds of reorganization, where there are rollover provisions such as this, sales tax is payable. But the question arises, is there sales tax payable on this kind of winding up of a company when we have this exchange of share for share? There is no income tax payable, and one wonders why this kind of procedure should attract a sales tax involvement which may, in fact, be far more difficult to resolve and to work out than is worth it.

The matters of dividend stripping have been blocked of course in the next few sections of the bill, which is again similar to the federal legislation, as are those sections dealing with partnership.

I would like to refer particularly though to one matter and will pretty well complete my remarks at that point when we look at the matters raised in section 54. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, the standing committee now having its responsibility to deal with Bill 3 with respect to the Election Finances Reform Act is referring to some of the areas which this section will now amend. There is apparently a contrast that the government has decided to keep between the involvement with individuals and the involvement with companies. I would suggest that these things will be more particularly dealt with by the standing committee on justice because they will have just dealt with the Election Finances Reform Act at the same time.

But there are contracts, because the \$4,000 maximum payment here is likely to come off the payments of any company before the income tax base is set. So that \$4,000, as a result of the 12 per cent Ontario rate, yields \$480, but an individual giving some \$1,150 would get the \$500 tax credit. Really I suppose it's no better a tax rate for the individual than for the company. For a corporation to give that \$1,150, there would be a saving of some \$138 which, therefore, presumably allows a corporation to consider the making of this kind of a gift as something which should be encouraged.

I am sure that the committee will look into the kinds of problems that could arise where a bonus is given to a series of employees who, in turn, then use that money to make individual benefits, as a result, hopefully, giving the corporation a more beneficial position than would these donations made directly to political parties.

With a \$4,000 limit, presumably a gift of \$10,000 would mean that only \$4,000 would be allowable and, therefore, the corporations tax of the company would only be reduced by perhaps that \$480 figure. However, if \$10,000 was paid out in salary and wages, say, to five persons, then not only would the company benefit by having the full deduction of that payment as a business expense, but there would be really some federal tax relief also. The individuals who might be receiving benefits would allow themselves, obviously, the opportunity to pay a higher amount of income tax but the total benefits which individuals could then claim for will, as a result, be somewhat different from those which the company would allow.

I am sure this will be dealt with, particularly in committee, so that we are all dealing with these three areas of legislation, in the sections here, in the Income Tax Act and in the Election Finance Reform Act so that we have one consistent approach to the kinds of political contributions which the government—and indeed, we on this side of the House as well—believe should not only be encouraged but also should be made entirely and completely respectable.

I am rather interested in the points raised in section 64 which has a change in the payment times for instalments of tax payable. These sections, again, are somewhat parallel to the federal legislation and I presume they are a revenue raiser in that the deficit for the end of the year appears a little smaller if we get a bit of next year's money in this year.

Perhaps the minister, when we get to committee, could discuss with the standing com-

mittee the matter of the kinds of terms on which these final instalments should be paid. One would think, for example, that a small business corporation might be more easily able to get its books in order in two months and a larger corporation might require three, rather than the reverse which we have here. However, I suppose the amounts of money involved—

Hon. Mr. Meen: A larger corporation would probably have an internal auditor.

Mr. Breithaupt: This is a point, of course, and they also have a larger amount of money that the minister wants to get from them. I suppose that additional month is something they simply have to be prepared to cope with and to resolve their problems more quickly.

There are a few other points, Mr. Speaker, but only one I would like to refer to. That is a reference to the speech the Treasurer had made with particular concern on these points.

On page 8 of the bound copy of the budget speech, he sets out, comments with respect to tax simplification. The Treasurer has said the government is going to attempt to make certain streamlining procedures. The thing that interests me particularly in this area is the second line in that paragraph:

Our objectives will be to reduce the costs of compliance, to simplify forms and procedures to follow wherever possible the federal administration, and to speed up rulings and decisions.

This is an area of some particular interest because, as you know, Mr. Speaker, there is a rulings department in the federal Ministry of National Revenue which allows certain answers to be given and rulings made on points raised. From the comment at least in the speech one is able to presume that any ruling given by Ottawa on a particular technical matter is going to be followed without question by Ontario. I don't think the minister would want to give that presumption which might flow from this particular point in the Treasurer's budget speech.

If we are to have a rulings department of our own—which may, of course, be coming—we may not have things speeded up any more than they are now. If there is a difference in a ruling, we'll say, with respect to a corporate reorganization problem, there are going to have to be some mechanics set up in order to resolve these problems where the federal and provincial authorities may not see exactly eye to eye.

The statutes, of course, can be very close and indeed the amendments the minister is

making in this Act are parallel to the federal legislation in many ways. However, the ultimate rulings which may flow may not be the same and the minister may find himself in some difficulty unless, I think, he clarifies the commitment that he has to be master in his own house and not automatically follow federal rulings just because the rulings are made.

There are, of course, interpretation bulletins which the federal government publishes, as the minister is well aware, and if these are presumed to be paramount this should be clarified. I hardly think that would be the case because surely we will want to be in a position to have some balance in reviewing situations which may not be exactly the same as the federal administrators may see their Act in place.

I have no further comments generally with respect to the Act, Mr. Speaker. I think the minister in his reply may choose more particularly to reply as the various sections are dealt with. If he wishes to do that and raise certain comments when it goes to standing committee, certainly I would be pleased to have him deal with it in that manner. We will support the bill.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, once or twice in a session we get a particular, peculiar bridge of a bill. This is the prize cake for this particular time in our lives. We have indicated to the minister that since there are 67 sections in the legislation, and there are 103 different principles, it is better not to try and segment them out in second reading; second reading just doesn't seem to us the appropriate time. We have an understanding with the ministry, I take it, that the matter will be sent to the justice committee where representations from the public, and I trust from the legal profession and other sources may be received by the committee.

Quite frankly, in a spirit of humility, there are a good many sections in there I don't understand and on which I would be pleased to be clued in as to precisely what they do mean. We have been concerned about this.

The bill covers everything from wholly-owned subsidiaries and special ways of creating them, to patronage, dividends, co-ops, credit unions—the whole gambit and ambit of thorny special interest rates, touching parking lots. If you go on, Mr. Speaker, this is the soup-and-nuts bill, and as I say we welcome the co-operation of the minister in this particular regard. He is trying to parallel, to the greatest extent possible, federal legislation; but the federal legislation is itself in a

state of turbulence and change, and so to try and bring things into line is quite a problem under legislation of this kind.

I'll say this, I'll confess to it quite openly, I don't look forward to meeting the minister next week in committee on this. However, it is part of the job, I guess.

Mr. Speaker: Do any other hon. members wish to speak to this bill? The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, I'll undertake with the hon. member for Lakeshore that if he doesn't get pejorative when we get before the committee, I won't.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the member for Lakeshore never gets pejorative.

Hon. Mr. Meen: That's a matter of opinion, Mr. Speaker. In any event, I quite look forward to it even if he doesn't.

Both members who have spoken have indicated sentiments with which I find myself essentially in concurrence. The bill is immensely complicated. It has a host of principles. We are indeed attempting to parallel, wherever possible, the federal legislation, provided it coincides with our own thinking.

I might say that as to rulings from Ottawa and interpretations, I'd like to leave myself the latitude to determine whether, indeed, the interpretations placed on the sections of our Act are the same as those which, even if they are identical in nature in the federal legislation, are the same as the interpretations placed in Ottawa. But the intention, in paralleling the federal legislation, is in large measure to make it easier for the practitioners, for the people who have to guide industry in Ontario, to live within this extremely complicated, in fact, taxing legislation.

Yes, we touch on things like campaign contribution deductibility; and the hon. member for Kitchener is correct, as I assess it, in the amount that would be deductible from corporate tax. We will probably, in committee, get into discussions of the way in which this might be supervised so there can't be an abuse of these limitations; although it may well be that's more pertinent to the Election Finances Reform Act itself, I'm not quite sure.

In any event, I'll certainly welcome their views. And I actually would extend the invitation now—and will ask the staff to do so formally tomorrow—to have the representatives of the legal and accounting professions attend the committee. We will alert them to the fact that the bill is going to go to the standing committee on administration

of justice so they may be able to attend and offer us the benefit of their wisdom, experience and advice as we deal with the various sections clause by clause. I think, Mr. Speaker, there is only one point on which I would touch, and it was a technical one raised by the member for Kitchener; namely, would there be retail sales tax charged on rollover of shares? And as I understand it, of course, it's under another Act, the Retail Sales Tax Act, but in this kind of arrangement there would be no tax payable.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to do just as both hon. members have invited me to do; namely, reserve my comments on the principles of the bill as we get into the 67-odd sections of it when it's before the standing committee.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is for second reading of Bill 36. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: I understand this is to go to the standing committee on the administration of justice.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Clerk of the House: Order for committee of the Whole House.

GIFT TAX AMENDMENT ACT

House in committee on Bill 32, An Act to amend the Gift Tax Act, 1972.

On section 1:

Hon. A. K. Meen (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether you have a copy of it but I propose an amendment to section 1, subsection 1, so I suppose I might as well introduce it at this time. Yes, I see Mr. Chairman has a copy of the amendment and I have given copies to the members opposite.

Hon. Mr. Meen moves that clause (i) of the amendment to section 10 of the Act proposed by subsection 1 of section 1 of the bill be amended by inserting after "trust" in the third line of the said clause "of shares of a small active business corporation."

Mr. Chairman: Do any members have any comments on the amendment? Shall it carry?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I might explain, Mr. Chairman, that it corrects a typographical error in which those words were unintentionally left out when the bill was being printed. It's rather an important wording.

Mr. Chairman: Shall clause 1 carry as amended?

Section 1, as amended agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. Chairman: Clause 2.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, just a word on clause 2. I'm not going to move an amendment to delete the clause. I shall wait upon a similar clause in the next subsequent legislation to do so.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Excuse me, just for clarification, are we on section 2? The chairman referred to clause 2. Does he mean section 2?

Mr. Chairman: Section 2.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Thank you.

Mr. Lawlor: That is the section, yes; the section increasing the aggregate of all gifts to \$25,000. We have indicated our reasons for finding them unpalatable. We've sought to prevail upon the government to alter its position in this regard. We want to express our distaste for the section as it presently stands, but I have no intention of forcing it to a vote on this particular bill.

Mr. Chairman: Does section 2 carry?

Section 2 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Does section 3 carry? Does any member have any comments to make before section 8?

On section 3:

Mr. Lawlor: I have one question on 3.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Section 3?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes. You are requiring these returns for the first time. What is the reason for that? Won't it just make for a lot more paperwork—an unnecessary rigmarole?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I don't think so, Mr. Chairman. The point here is that if the returns are aggregating to a total of \$75,000, we want them as these gifts are made.

You see, this is the time where you may now make gifts aggregating up to a total of \$75,000. I think it's essential that we should have some mechanism so that as the gifts are made a copy of the declaration is filed and not 10 or 15 years later or whenever, when you have reached the total as presently contemplated in the Act.

Mr. Lawlor: Just a question: If they don't file then is there a period of disallowance?

Hon. Mr. Meen: My staff advises me there isn't. I'm wondering if there should be. We may have to take that under advisement.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, because if they sit on it then the very effect that your answer indicated to me you were trying to solve, could very easily occur. Somebody just comes up with a sheaf of papers many years after the event, post-dated or pre-dated or dated somehow. Yes, I think you better look at that, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Meen: It is an interesting point, Mr. Chairman. I don't think we should hold up the passage of the bill, but I certainly think we should take a good look at the enforcement section. There is a penalty, I'm advised, for failure to file, so that would be some kind of incentive.

Mr. Lawlor: But not within the limited time.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Right.

Bill 32, as amended, reported.

SUCCESSION DUTY AMENDMENT ACT

House in committee on Bill 31, An Act to amend the Succession Duty Act.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): May I call to your attention, with great regret, the lack of a quorum.

Mr. Chairman ordered that the bells be rung for four minutes.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, we now have a quorum.

On section 1:

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor moves that section 1 of Bill 31 be deleted, and the subsequent sections be renumbered accordingly.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, a few words. We've just debated the main principle of the bill. I took time out, in a hasty survey, to pick up what my files of the past few years contained in the way of government bills amending the Succession Duty Act—invariably, of course, reducing the amount of the tax, carving out all kinds of exemptions, altering the thing, withering it away, whittling its base, leaving nothing.

Also, I thought you might be interested in reading "Transfer Taxes—Their Effect on Productivity; Studies of the Royal Commission on Taxation." There is one that will touch the pulp of your heart. This doesn't do what you are doing. This is the recommendation, of course, of the Carter com-

mission with respect to the whole succession duty field.

There is any number of other documentations. We have been loaded in the past few years with reports, various summaries, royal commissions, volume after volume, and none of them—not even your own—recommends what you are doing here today. Ergo, section 1, out of your own lips, out of what you yourself have commissioned, becomes questionable and invalid. Just take it out and we'll go on from there, and leave the farmers and leave the others alone.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Chairman, obviously I have to oppose that. This is one of the fundamental principles in the bill, bringing into effect the proposals in the budget that we increase the exemptions to \$250,000. It's a complicated section. I'm sure the member understands it but he disagrees with us basically in principle. I guess that is where the Conservatives on the one hand and the socialists on the other have a parting of the ways.

Mr. Lawlor: You are perfectly right that we have a parting. That's where the Red Sea divides and we, the Israelis, go across; you, the Egyptians, drown.

Hon. Mr. Meen: We simply do feel that the area up to an estate of \$250,000 should be completely exempt from the attraction of any succession duty and that's the reason for section 1.

Mr. Lawlor: Do you like the biblical parable of mine? You, of course, will have manna.

The committee divided on Mr. Lawlor's amendment, which was negatived on the following vote:

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 11, the "nays" are 50.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Bill 31 reported.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee begs to report one bill with amendment and one bill without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 24, 1975

Ontario Travel Association programme, statement by Mr. Bennett	1158
Norfolk road workers' dispute, statement by Mr. Rhodes	1159
Norfolk road workers' dispute, question of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. R. F. Nixon	1159
Visit to Indian reserves, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. R. F. Nixon	1160
Alleged complaints about minister's tactics, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. R. F. Nixon	1160
Arsenic levels, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis	1162
Funds from OPEC countries, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. R. F. Nixon	1162
Political activity of civil servants, questions of Mr. Winkler and Mr. Meen: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Ferrier, Mr. J. R. Smith	1163
Use of hazardous chemicals, questions of Mr. Miller: Mr. Lewis	1165
Rent supplements, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mrs. Campbell, Mr. Renwick	1166
Ambulance services, question of Mr. Miller: Mr. Bounsall	1167
Ontario lottery, questions of Mr. Winkler: Mr. R. S. Smith, Mr. Roy	1167
Director of communications for Ministry of Housing, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Deans	1168
Spadina arterial road, question of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Givens	1168
Proposed oil refinery in eastern Ontario, questions of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Samis	1169
Police drug raids, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Singer	1170
Employment prospects of handicapped persons, questions of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Burr, Mr. B. Newman	1170
Quinn Enterprises, questions of Mr. Meen and Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Singer	1171
Report, Ontario Economic Council, Mr. McKeough	1171
Interim report, standing procedural affairs committee, Mr. Morrow	1171
Report, standing private bills committee, Mr. Ewen	1172
Liquor Control Amendment Act, Mr. Samis, first reading	1172
Gift Tax Amendment Act, Mr. Meen, second reading	1172
Succession Duty Amendment Act, Mr. Meen, second reading	1179
Royal assent to certain bills, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor	1183
Corporations Tax Amendment Act, Mr. Meen, second reading	1184
Gift Tax Amendment Act, reported	1188
Succession Duty Amendment Act, reported	1189
Recess, 6 o'clock	1189



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, April 24, 1975

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 24, 1975

The House resumed at 8:10 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

(concluded)

On vote 1403:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): I wonder if I could ask the minister, and I think it would follow what the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) was speaking about the last time we were in the estimates here with regard to the Oakville centre: I was wondering if the minister could give us a rundown on the assessment centre at Oakville and just how it is operating?

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Correctional Services): I think the hon. member probably knows that the purpose of the assessment centre at Oakville is, in the first place, to provide an in-depth study of the needs of each individual child who is sent there from southeastern Ontario. In other words, any child from southeastern Ontario who is sent to a training school, under section 8 or 9, goes to Oakville; and the purpose there is to do a proper study to determine what type of facility is best suited to that child.

Since we've had the centre in operation, for instance, we found that of roughly 800 who were sent there about 20 per cent of them were sent back to the community and the others were sent to either training schools or to one of the two DARE camps. Of those who went back to the community, 34 went to their own home, 48 of them went to foster homes and the others went to either treatment facilities or to ministry group homes, and as you are aware, we now have 39 group homes in the province.

When you consider the average per diem cost in an institution as compared to care in a group home or in a foster home, there is a considerable saving. On an average, it works out to \$45 a day in one of our training schools. In the group home it is any-

where from \$20 to \$30 a day. Of course, in the foster home it's much less—anywhere up to \$10 a day. So there is a considerable saving to the taxpayer from that standpoint, as well as performing a very useful service as far as the individual is concerned.

In addition, at Oakville we've had students participating in the programme there—social work students, recreation students, child welfare students—as well as ordinary academic teachers who have been working in the facility and helping make the programme a little more useful. But I think, all in all, it is doing what we hoped it would do. We hope it will continue to expand and we hope to continue to improve the qualifications of our staff and be much more useful in the future.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Chairman, has the minister the statistics or any rough count on how many of the people who were charged went into the training schools in the last year, compared to say five or 10 years ago? Have you any statistics on that, as to how that is working out now?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I have figures here from 1966 to 1975, that 10-year period. For the fiscal year of 1966-1967, we had 10,377 court appearances. Of those 1,091, almost 10 per cent, went to training schools for an average length of stay of 9.21 months. In 1973-1974, 10 years later, court appearances increased from 10,377 to 14,869. The number admitted to training school was some 40 fewer than in 1966; it dropped to 1,052 for an average length of stay of 6.79 months.

So you can see that the use of the group homes has been gradually increasing. Certainly, the number of new probation cases has been increasing and we have closed, in that length of time, both Glendale school and Elmcrest school.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): I have a question, Mr. Chairman, in regard to the Wendigo Lake facility. I presume it is now a training school. I've had some difficulty keeping up with just what kind of an institution that is. It started out to be administered under Burwash and there was some talk that it was going to be moved to the administration of the district jails in the area. At one point

one of the ministers indicated that to me. Is it now a training school?

Hon. Mr. Potter: It's a DARE camp. It is one of the camps we operate in conjunction with the training school.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Could you tell me the capital expenditure over the past year, and how much will be spent in this coming year; and what the per diem costs are there? And what they will be after you have spent all this money on them?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I haven't got it with me tonight, but I will get it for you. You want the cost of the camp, the average per diem cost of it?

Mr. R. S. Smith: How many people is it being built to house with the new changes that are being made there?

Hon. Mr. Potter: It's 36 to 60; minimum of 36 and maximum of 60.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I looked at this place some time ago, and then I went back and looked again. There seems to be quite a change. The further back in the bush you get, the more money is being spent. I really question whether this is really the direction your ministry is taking generally, or whether this is some type of a special case. I'm sure when you are finished with all the money you are spending there your per diem costs are going to be just so high it's going to be almost as high as some of our hospitals, \$80 or \$100 a day.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Of course the per diem costs will be brought down by the increase in numbers in the camp. But there is no question about it, the camp at Portage Lake and the camp at Wendigo are two different types of camps. The one at Portage Lake is a much rougher type of camp, a logging type of camp, than the one constructed at Wendigo Lake.

I am afraid I agree with you. I think the other type of camp is going to turn out to be much more suitable, but the two types of camps were constructed to determine which would be most suitable. It's almost completed. Hopefully this year it will be up to about 60 inmates, and then we will have a better idea on how much it is going to cost per day.

Mr. R. S. Smith: But you agree there is a lot of money being spent there for what the return may be insofar as treatment, if you can call it that, is being given under the programme.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well there is no question that as far as treatment under the programme is concerned it's a good programme. I've been out there myself both—

Mr. R. S. Smith: Oh I'm not questioning that at all, but the cost—

Hon. Mr. Potter: I'm not in a position to say whether it's too much at the present time, because I don't know how much it is; but I am going to get it for you.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): I would like to ask the minister if he recalls the incident I wrote him about having to do with inmates at the Portage Lake camp under your DARE project on the Lost Channel Lake road. You recall these kids had put a rope across the highway and it scared a lady and her family. They were coming out from their summer camp in the dead of night on a very lonesome road. This woman came across a group of people whom she did not recognize or identify in the dark and a cable or rope had been tied to a tree on one side of the road and was in the process of being tied to a tree on the other side, I believe.

It scared the wits out of this woman with her young kids; she gunned her car and broke through the rope, with this crowd of people around.

Now that must have been a very nerve-wracking experience for that young lady and her children to be confronted by a group of people in the middle of the night. I know the road intimately; it's a very lonesome bush road.

I did write to the minister and he did investigate. I'm satisfied with the way the minister responded to my complaint, or my drawing of that incident to his attention.

I just wondered who was delinquent—the security people at this institution, the correctional officers? What steps have been taken to preclude any such event—not necessarily a rope on the highway or on the roadway but any other event which might scare the wits out of the citizens in that particular district? Was anyone chastised or penalized? Were any penalties levied?

I understand to some degree what you are trying to do with the DARE project. It is to give these kids some initiative by putting them in the bush, sort of on an experimental project, to test their wits and their ability to survive at night. I know about your survival treks through the woods at night, and I recommend them. I think it might give these

kids from the city some idea of survival; and it's a challenge. But at the same time Mr. Minister, I think you have to—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): If they can survive in downtown Toronto they can survive anywhere.

Mr. Germa: I think this is precisely the kind of person we have. They have learned to live in their own environment, probably on the streets of Toronto. They have probably done that very well, and they would survive on the streets of Toronto. But, unfortunately, that does not make for a good citizen or the best citizen we are looking for.

A little challenge in the bush in northern Ontario does a lot for the soul. I think it cleanses the soul and toughens the muscle and gives you a little bit of fresh air as well.

The idea of the project is to get these kids from the pavement into the bush; show them how a frontiersman has to live, how he has to adapt, since the whole world is not centred around the pavement in Toronto and you've not really arrived when you have learned to live on the sidewalks of Toronto, there's more in the world than that; and that's what the project does.

Of course these kids are in a strange environment, there's no doubt about it, when they're up in the bush in northern Ontario.

I just wondered if the minister could respond and tell me what was the sequel to that complaint I raised with him. Is there any likelihood things are going to go haywire again as far as that Wendigo Lake camp is concerned. I think it's a good project. I'm not being critical or anything like that, except on that one incident that was brought to my attention.

How many kids do we put through that kind of a course in a year, and what is the effect? Do the kids, once they graduate from this course in the bush, show much improvement? Has their attitude toward society changed? Is it being effective and is the money we're spending at Portage Lake and on other frontier camps money well spent?

We have lots of open space up there and we have lots of bush. If this therapy, this survival in the woods in northern Ontario is a good thing, maybe we could expand on the project. I would like to see it expanded if, in fact, it is the kind of therapy which is going to correct the idiosyncrasies that some of these kids have.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, I will be quite honest with you. It was just damn poor judgement on the part of the supervisor on the occasion

that incident happened. He and another staff member were reprimanded at the time. I won't say that something like that won't happen again, because I am sure you are aware that in any type of programme such as this, occasionally something is bound to happen. The law of averages is such that you can't go on continually without something happening.

But we must be as careful as we can. It's the responsibility of those in charge to be as careful as they can to try to make sure that nothing does happen. I can't assure anybody that it won't. But I doubt very much that it will with the two individuals who were involved, given the publicity we got from it. I'm sure the others, too, are being just as careful with what they're doing.

We think the programmes are successful. As far as recidivism is concerned, it hasn't been cut down very much, but we're continually monitoring the programme. The results for first offenders is worthwhile, in our opinion. We, too, would like to see the programme improved upon; but you can get carried away and—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You have been.

Hon. Mr. Potter: How far are you going to go? The suggestion has been given to us that we should have some kind of a brigantine, or whatever you call it, and put on a six-month cruise in the summer.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They could take the minister down to the Caribbean.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, the next thing we know they will be wanting to have trips to Europe or someplace else. I think we have to be a little careful about some of these things. I think working in the bush and everything they do is good, but I think you can go too far in providing some of the amenities. I think the whole programme must be continually assessed from this standpoint. I would like to see it enlarged, but I would like to be sure we don't get carried away on it.

Mr. Chairman: The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. The minister's answer really leads into something that concerns me. It concerns me in more ways than one, because I don't want to be seriously critical of the fact that you are asking for another \$6 million, raising the service for juveniles to a total cost of \$31 million this year. Let me talk about the other side of the thing.

It must concern us that these people who are put into the care of the ministry by the courts are not put in permanent care in any way. In fact, you are trying to train them to go back into their own community, hopefully to their own homes. I am sure the minister is aware that many of these young people are going to return to homes which have a far lower standard of living than is provided by the taxpayers. We don't want to take them into care and somehow make them suffer so that they are going to be glad when they go back to their homes. I think perhaps White Oaks would be one of these. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Right.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: In the Sprucedale complex, I think with excellent foresight, the minister and his predecessor put them into homes in the area, oftentimes with staff complement almost one to one. I wouldn't say that if you had five or six kids in a home there would be five or six staff people there, but over a 24-hour period there would be. Part of the programme—I hate to criticize this—is that the kids are taken to town or taken to the show and given spending money.

I don't know what the answer is. I don't know whether you call it a term, because presumably there isn't a term, but when it is deemed they can return to their families or go back into the community, they are not going to be pleased at all. Most of them, if they have any judgement at all, are going to think: "My goodness, these group homes and other facilities are far better than anything our family has ever been able to provide for us."

I have heard of this DARE camp. I am quite sure the young people from any family would be delighted to have access to those facilities. It is difficult to put this, because the last thing we should be doing is giving them inadequate facilities. Yet the basis of training these young people so they are going to be able to move forward in the education system and stake out a place for themselves must be a problem for the minister and those people who advise him.

We are moving this forward another \$6 million. I don't want to sound red-necked or parsimonious, but what about this problem? What are we going to do for these young people to really assist them to adapt to the community as it is, and not to the kind of community that can be provided by the taxpayers, unless we are adapting them to go back into the community with the expectation the taxpayers will look after them for all time?

The second point is, in a facility similar to White Oaks, are the staff paid on an hourly basis? I have been told they are. It seems to me we should be prepared to pay an adequate salary to those people properly trained to care for the young people who come under the jurisdiction of this ministry. But if we have led them to expect that their responsibilities are on an hourly basis, then somehow we have fallen short of the mark. I don't think we can have people accepting this kind of responsibility if, in fact, it is eight hours on duty and they survive through the eight hours, keep the kids calmed down, and then away they go. There has to be a commitment to the welfare of these young people and a certain sensitivity that very few people would, I think, be capable of providing. I wanted to raise that point.

The last point is, do we have group homes that are completely independent of institutional supervision; that is are there, through the countryside, simply properties that have been purchased by the ministry, or perhaps by individuals or certain independent groups of people who, with the assistance of the ministry, are providing for young people put in their care?

I had the occasion to visit a home described to me as a group home under the Ministry of Correctional Services, which is in the Plandford area of the county of Oxford, where there were about 10 fine young men, no doubt, who seemed to be under the supervision of only one person, who was hard pressed to see that there were enough hot dogs to feed these kids at 6 o'clock at night. I had the impression that these young people were in care on the basis of court orders. I wanted to inquire—perhaps I could have done so privately, but since the minister is available with his experts I thought this might be an appropriate time to ask—if there are group homes under the Correctional Services ministry operating independently of the institutions that are presently established?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Regarding the costs of the group homes that the hon. leader was talking about in the first place and the types of accommodation being provided, as he says, you are sort of between the devil and the sea. One minute you are criticized because you are not providing adequate facilities or because something is going wrong, and the next minute you are criticized because you are doing a little bit too much. It is a very difficult thing to do. We are trying to make it as much of a home-like environment as possible, but again, what is a home-like environment to one child

might be like living in a castle to another child.

Recently I was at the Cecil Facer facility in Sudbury; we had lunch with the children and after lunch I was talking to the superintendent. I asked him why some of these children were still there, and he was pointing them out to me; those who had been returned home and who had asked to come back; or those who were ready to go but there was no place to put them, their home conditions are such that it just isn't fair to the child to put him back in that environment.

As a matter of fact we have some funds, limited as they are this year, with which we are hopeful that in a couple of areas we are going to be doing a little experimenting. We feel that in too many cases the child really is suffering because of something for which he isn't responsible, that it is the parents or the family that is involved, and we want to get the social worker or family counsellor involved to try and work in the home with the child and arrange for his placement there.

What we do in some of our facilities now is, we arrange for one of our social workers to go home with the child on weekends, for instance, and try to work with the family and try to see how it would work out. But it is a very difficult thing to do and we are working at it all the time.

The hon. leader spoke about the group homes: All of our group homes are separate from the ministry. We don't have any group homes connected with any of our institutions. They are all privately operated homes.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How many have you got?

Hon. Mr. Potter: We have 37 now and there will be another eight this year. They are all contracted on an individual basis.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, perhaps the minister has gone over this previously.

Hon. Mr. Potter: On the salaries, believe me, they have just got a 30 per cent raise.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I am not talking about that; is it by the hour?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, it is not by the hour. They are paid on an hourly basis, but they don't work just by the hour.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh boy, I wonder; I wonder if they don't work by the hour.

Hon. Mr. Potter: The salaries at the present time range from \$10,500 to \$12,500, which, as I say, is up considerably from what it was, but as far as I am concerned

it is not high enough, compared to what labour is getting today. These people are dedicated people; they are putting in long hours and I think they are doing a hell of a fine job. I think we have a responsibility, and certainly I am fighting for it all the time, but we still have to do something for an improvement in their salaries.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I want to ask further about those group homes. Since I presume, for example, at White Oaks, those individual units—I would call them group homes; they must have another name, you know, but they are individual cottages or homes with a number on them—

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, those are ours.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But the minister said all his group homes were independent, so I wanted to ask about those independent ones. They are established on the basis of a contract, so somebody could come to the ministry and say: "Look, I'm going to buy this farm and this house and I have these facilities." Do you have a standard contract? What is the level of inspection?

The one I visited—and believe me, I don't want to be directly critical because I admire those people who take on that responsibility—but here was an instance where there was a group of what I surmise to be eight or 10 boys in their very early teens, if that old. As far as I could see they were being supervised by only one young man, admirable although he may be, who was thoroughly involved in cooking supper. Half the kids were out doing the things that I suppose kids will do, which certainly in my view would have been something that would have required some parental supervision in a normal circumstance.

What is the financial arrangement, what is the basis of inspection, and are you satisfied the kids are getting the proper care?

Hon. Mr. Potter: When we come to set up a group home, certainly we make inquiries in an area to see if there happens to be a group or an association or a society or a group of individuals who are particularly interested. Then we are prepared to sit down and talk with them to see who they are, what they are, what kind of qualifications they have. One of the probation and aftercare officers in the area acts as a liaison with the group home and with the ministry in operating it.

We just don't let anybody come along and say: "I have a house that will take eight kids. I want you to pay me \$15 a day

and I am in business and things are pretty good." It isn't quite that simple. We must satisfy ourselves that the individuals who are running that home are capable of running the home.

In fact, we have one case, for instance, in Moonbeam of a woman and her daughter. The facility she is running for the Indians in that particular part of the province is best suited for the people in the country and she is doing a terrific job. My deputy says she is a psychiatric nurse.

In two or three locations we have them operated by a chain, Viking Homes, which operates four or five for us. Then we have other locations where we might have a man and his wife and, of course, they have available to them psychologists and social workers as they are needed.

But it is not just a case of somebody deciding this is an easy way to make a buck.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh, I wouldn't say it is easy.

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, it's a difficult thing and we must make sure that they are properly supervised. I think it has been working out very well in most areas of the province and that's why we are prepared to recommend that we open another six or eight this year.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I don't want to prolong this, but just one last mention. Is it the minister's intention to phase out the facilities such as White Oaks and Sprucedale in favour of the group-home concept, since it actually contracts out the care and responsibility under supervision?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, but through you, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is probably aware that I intimated I would be bringing in legislation very shortly to remove section 8 from the Act. Section 8, which has been so controversial, is the one where a child can be committed to a training school now without ever having committed a crime. Section 8 will be removed.

Most of the children we have at White Oaks now are these section 8 children who have been getting into difficulties. They are problem children, so to speak, without ever having committed a crime and they require a great deal of supervision.

We have been working with Community and Social Services and the social policy field on this matter, because if we remove

section 8 we must be sure there is some other way these children are going to be looked after besides the justice policy field.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Does that leave it with the Children's Aid Society?

Hon. Mr. Potter: What we are suggesting is that this is a facility we would probably turn over to Community and Social Services for their use, to look after those children who don't fall within the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Correctional Services.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I have a question on these two points he has just brought up.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): I have one right on the last vote.

Mr. Chairman: All right.

Mr. Bounsall: It follows fairly logically so we won't get off the topic.

I am glad to hear that in this area you're working in co-operation with Community and Social Services so that children with this obvious need but who have not committed a crime are still going to continue to receive some attention in our society. The minister may not know, because he's turning the problem over, how these children are going to get there. Would it be through referral by the Children's Aid Society of those who come to their attention through that route? Or could a private person who has a problem child come to the ministry or some ministry and ensure that the child gets placed in a treatment centre of this sort? How is that going to be accomplished as you see it?

Hon. Mr. Potter: This can be done through the present child welfare legislation. We want to be sure the proper system is set up before we proclaim the removal of section 8 of the Act so that there's not going to be a lag during which the children can't be looked after. There is an interministerial committee now working out the details on this so we'll have the answer.

Mr. Bounsall: We can be assured there will be no vacuum in this area while this change-over is occurring? It won't come out of your Act until they're ready to go in the other area? I'll be interested in hearing the announcement of how it's going to work in the other area.

This leads me to a point which is very closely related. I suspect the minister hasn't got an answer but if he has some thoughts

in the area I would very much like to hear about them. What prospects can you hold out to the parents of children as they reach the age of majority? That is, children who have been in and out of the juvenile centres within your ministry and who continue to show the problems which got them there in the first place? Perhaps there were violent tendencies or unmistakable signs of mental and emotional disturbances on which you can put a name. They have been in and out for the last few years and now, as they reach age 18, are perhaps out of the institution for a while, yet their parents can see they have not completely benefited from the help which they should receive in order to straighten them up. They can look ahead a couple of months and see they're about to become 18, adults in their own right, when they alone would have the say about where they go to get treatment. Yet they know it's only a matter of time until they commit a violent act, perhaps, and end up in the adult criminal system. Or they may continue their particular sexual aberration which up to this point has not led them into serious trouble but is known to exist and could very easily be serious in the future.

Are there any prospects at all that you can hold out to parents of children about to become adults, who've been in and out of your institutions and, as they approach age 18, happen to be outside?

I have a case in Windsor and the family is very much in this situation. The child has just turned 18 and they would like to receive further help for him. They know it's only a matter of time until this young man does commit a crime for which he needs to be sent away. There seems to be nothing they can do, immediately prior to his reaching age 18, so that he could get help. Does the minister have an answer to this area?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, I wish I did. I have a very close friend who has had exactly the same experience. There just doesn't seem to be any answer. At the present time the federal government has the young offenders Act in draft form. Hopefully, that will help in cases like this. It is proposing they would have continued care until they're 21 which would give them three more years during which something might be done to assist them.

We have heard a lot about the type of home these children come from. That isn't always necessarily pertinent to the case and I think you can probably bear that out. It doesn't matter what kind of home they came from.

In this case I am talking about, the child couldn't have had more. He had a damned good family life; he had very doting parents who did everything they could for him without spoiling him. But it just didn't seem to matter a damn what anybody thought; he was going to do it his way and that was it. He has been in our institutions and he is now in a federal institution. It breaks your heart when you see these cases but, believe me, it's very difficult.

I had an occasion to talk to one of the senior psychiatrists in the federal system about this just two or three weeks ago. His only reply is: "You know and I know there is something the matter with him, but what it is and what we do about it is a different proposition."

I'm hoping that, working with the feds on this, if this new Act comes in we will be able to at least find some way of getting treatment to them.

Mr. Bounsall: Do you know the details of the new Act at all? What I am concerned with is how can the person just prior to age 18 or maybe just after it—under this Act, how does he get into this, to where he is looked after or some treatment given to him up to age 21?

Hon. Mr. Potter: The only word I have from them is that they were contemplating putting this in the Act and that they would be sending us a draft to look over. We have a meeting on this at the end of May in Vancouver and I expect we will have it before then so that we will have an opportunity to study it. I haven't seen it yet.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have some similar questions, but I would like to get back to section 8 and those children who are now being held—and that is really what they are, they are being held under that section.

There is a real concern in the social services community that when this section 8 is removed these children will go out into the community and there won't be the services available to them. The minister says he is working this out with the Community and Social Services so that they will be able to take over. I would like to know just what he means by that.

Are we going to have more group homes established that are privately operated and come under the aegis, in some way, of Community and Social Services? Or are these

young people going to be moved to the Children's Aid Societies and then placed by those societies in maybe a variety of types of settings, including perhaps the Brown camps or some of the other institutions that may deal with what may be their specific needs? I would like to express to him that there is a real worry in the social community insofar as this is concerned.

There is another thing I would like to ask. Obviously, then, you are going to be moving out of the type of group home that your own ministry is operating, and the group homes are going to be privately operated mainly, and you have a per diem set-up for those privately-operated group homes. Can you tell me if each group home per diem is established separately or do you have a per diem and that's it, right across the province?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, the per diem is established separately, mostly because the homes differ, just like nursing homes. There is the standard of care that is required because of the children who are being placed there—they require more supervision, they require greater care, and you are going to have to pay more to get that.

At the present time we have three rates—\$21, \$24, and \$30 a day—that we pay to the various homes.

We are not trying to just slough off this group of children and say, "Let somebody else look after them." We appreciate that these children do have to be looked after and they do have to have facilities such as White Oaks; or some of them do have to have group homes and some of them can be cared for in private homes. But we are doing that now in this ministry. Our concern is that they are committed by a judge to a correctional institution or correctional service without ever having committed a crime and yet they are treated in the same way. Sometimes some of them are in the same institutions as children who have committed crimes and we don't think that's right. A lot of people don't think that is right.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): This latter-day awakening is not typical. You sound outraged. You have lived with it for an awfully long time.

Hon. Mr. Potter: What we're saying is that section 8 should be removed. They shouldn't be committed like this. We're not saying that nobody will look after them; I said that earlier. We think that should fall within the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Community and Social Services.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The federal government can pay half. Is that right? It would pay half?

Hon. Mr. Potter: As a matter of fact, as of today it is. The federal government of Canada has signed an agreement with us today whereby it is paying \$30 million this year toward our correctional services for children.

Mr. R. S. Smith: That's under the Canada Assistance Plan. It's been there for years.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Pardon?

Mr. R. S. Smith: It is under the Canada Assistance Plan.

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, under the Canada Assistance Plan that was excepted. Like the usual dealings we had with Ottawa they cut us off. For seven years we didn't have it but this year they're giving it to us.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is it under correctional services you're getting this money?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Good for them. That's very liberal.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Good for us.

Mr. Lawlor: I am amazed you got it. You are the only Tory minister who gets along with Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Don't kid yourself. This is the result of the last three ministers working like hell to get it out of them. I'm just cashing in on it.

Mr. Lawlor: Oh, is it? This is a unique ministry, I can tell you that. Talk to the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough).

Hon. Mr. Potter: This is a unique ministry.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Maybe they should have made you move it out of there before they gave it to you because that's why you couldn't get it before.

Hon. Mr. Potter: It's going out of here. What I'm saying is that this shouldn't change one iota. The children are going to be looked after. They're going to be looked after in the same way but they're going to be looked after by the Ministry of Community and Social Services rather than Correctional Services.

The funds allotted to us for that will be transferred to that ministry so it won't cost any more money. It will use the same type

of facilities and the same kind of programmes unless they can improve upon them.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Okay, fine. The other question I have is you talk about a per diem rate of between \$21 and \$30. Obviously, these young people are not in the same category of physical or mental need as those people who are sent to many other institutions such as the Browndale camps where the per diem rate is \$59.40.

I think there is a discrepancy here because I believe there are many children held under section 8 who need a very similar type of treatment and adjustment to be available to them because they are emotionally disturbed. How do you put these two together? Supposedly in the next little while under one ministry you're going to have this wide plethora of different types of treatment for these people. You're moving a number of people from under the direction of your ministry to the other ministry and perhaps to an altogether different kind of treatment. Obviously the cost of treatment is very different between that which is being provided by Community and Social Services and your ministry—Health for that matter. It's very difficult to see what the differentiation is, particularly when some of these young people require the same type of treatment.

Hon. Mr. Potter: There's no question the rates are different and I think if you would check them through you'd find our rates are probably lower than any of them. At the present time, once again, there is an inter-ministerial committee looking into the whole question of group homes—the need for group homes throughout government, not in just this ministry or in Health or Community and Social Services—comparing the types of services provided and what the costs are. I'm trying to get a handle on that now.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I'd like to make the point that as far as our party is concerned we're glad to see these people under section 8 moved out of your ministry. They should have been moved out of your ministry years ago and you would have got the 50-cent dollar from Ottawa. That's why you didn't get it. I'd like to make that point quite clear.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Chairman, I was glad to hear the minister say a little while ago he had been up to the Cecil Facer School recently. I didn't know you had been and you sure go in and out of town pretty quietly. Usually your colleagues come in with trumpets blaring and flags waving. I'm glad to

see you are in there to do your job, rather than do a little bit of politicking.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Don't give him any ideas now.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I was in North Bay too, but I heard he was there.

Mr. Germa: I wanted to ask a couple of questions about Cecil Facer, which started out as a boys' school and the ministry has seen fit to turn into a co-educational institution. I just wonder what jerked this minister into the 20th century all of a sudden to recognize that there are two sexes in this world, that eventually they have to live together and maybe they should live together there. I just wonder what sort of facilities and what kind of arrangements there are within the institution to accommodate them?

I'd also like to touch on a matter that was raised by the member for Brant, the salary scale. I presume he didn't raise it just by pulling things out of the air; he must have had some complaints. Certainly I have had some complaints about the salary scale for teachers at Cecil Facer School in Sudbury. The minister told me the scale runs between \$10,500 and \$12,500; I presume the same scale must apply right across the province for those people in the teaching profession.

I would point out to the minister that the scale paid now at Cecil Facer probably is running \$1,000 a year behind what a primary schoolteacher is now making in the city of Sudbury. This was brought to my attention not more than one week ago when I was sitting with a person who complained that when Cecil Facer first started, the wage scale was ahead of the rate in the city of Sudbury, but since that time—and Cecil Facer has not been there that long—your wage structure has deteriorated to the point where it is now running second to the wage scale in the elementary school system in the city.

I would also like to know how many inmates we have at Cecil Facer, and how many staff we have there in the different categories. I'd also like to know the global budget of the Cecil Facer School for the past year. What are the past figures you have?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, that's the first time I'd heard that there was any teacher at Cecil Fraser who was dissatisfied. I hadn't had any complaint, contrary to what you might think. When I was out there I met with a great many of them, and nobody had any complaints. Actually, I was under the impression that our teachers were quite competitive as far as their salaries were con-

cerned, but I will certainly look into this and find out if that's the situation. I hadn't had any complaints about it.

I was referring particularly to the correctional staff, who spend so much more time in some cases than the teachers themselves do in these areas. But I made the statement not because I had had complaints but because I have felt for a long time that we have a responsibility, if we expect to upgrade the status of our correctional officers; if we demand more of them and expect them to be counsellors, advisers, listeners, psychologists, social workers, you name it, teachers and all, then we must be prepared for it.

We are very fortunate in the calibre of the people we are getting today. Many of them are MAs in correctional work. Very seldom do I find any clock-watchers, people who are anxious to get out. I've been visiting all over the north and most of the southern part of the province; it doesn't seem to matter what time of the day or evening I go, I can find correctional officers there working with the residents. That's why I'm so anxious to see that they get a fair shake.

Cecil Facer School has 80 boys and 40 girls, and they have cottage-type accommodation. The annual budget is almost \$2 million and the school has a complement of 101 staff.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask of the minister what involvement is there with his ministry and Twin Valley School in Thamesville, near Rodney?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I don't know. Twin Valley School is new to me. That doesn't mean anything to me.

Mr. B. Newman: Are you sure there is no involvement at all and that there is no financial assistance? Twin Valley School is operated by St. Clair College in Thamesville near Rodney.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): In Elgin county.

Mr. B. Newman: In Elgin county, my colleague says. None whatsoever?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No.

Mr. B. Newman: I noticed in public accounts of a previous year that there was a total of some \$15,630 spent by your ministry for that institution. I am assuming then that this is an ongoing programme that you are subsidizing at Twin Valley School.

Hon. Mr. Potter: There is a special rate treatment home where we send children. At Thamesville, did you say?

Mr. B. Newman: At Rodney

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, we do send children who require special care there on occasion at special rates.

Mr. B. Newman: So there is an involvement?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, it's not one of our schools but we do send children there.

Mr. B. Newman: I didn't say it was one of your schools. I simply wanted to know what connection or involvement there is between your ministry and the school. Is there continuing involvement with that school? Do you have plans for using the facilities there or sending juveniles for some type of treatment to Twin Valley School?

Hon. Mr. Potter: On occasion. It depends on the needs of the child that we have. If we feel he can be best cared for in that institution, then we would ask it to take him.

Mr. B. Newman: Has your ministry checked out the school? Are you satisfied with the operation of that school?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, we are, as far as I can see.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a few things about training schools I want to peruse with the minister. I think it's fair to say that training schools haven't been given the attention in past estimates. We've dealt with reformatories and adult institutions largely and sometimes at very great length and in detail. Yours being the first set of estimates this year, you are not being subjected to the same sort of résumé. You may thank your lucky stars. As a matter of fact, I suspect, should you be the minister in some forthcoming session, you might even bring yourself on at the beginning.

In any event, I think we may have been remiss in our dealings with training schools as a whole and should give them more attention. There has been a great deal said in the past few months about these schools. It's hard to fault you on it because you are moving. The central notion is to empty those schools and to go off into the group home where a very much closer relationship, a

more direct and personal relationship between older people and the young and the young working within their peer groups takes place. It's the visitations and the effects of therapy and the recognition that if people can express themselves and can feel confident and trusting in that process, which they can do in a localized setting, then the possibilities of some remote form of rehabilitation obtains.

The record of the schools up until fairly recently has been appalling. Your own figures of fairly recent date show 34 to 48 per cent recidivist rates, with 48 per cent of them ending up in other institutions. In other words, they are schools from which they graduate to the penitentiary so that the echelons of the mass education system obtain within the element of delinquency as in other places. It is a breeding place of delinquency as is pointed out.

One of the things I want to discuss with you, since you yourselves say you don't see the elimination of these training schools but their substantial reformation and an alteration and change, is the internal system of enforcements that are used. It was mentioned the other day and it has something to do with a thing called the Skinner blocks. Our old friend B. F. Skinner always talks about freedom and places everybody under penalty—the conditioned reflex boy with his salivating dogs, which he applies to children. You are a peculiarly good minister to talk about this sort of thing. To the extent that it exists, eliminate it, get rid of it. I say you are a particularly good minister because you have had, as Minister of Health, an intimate acquaintance with this sort of thing, with this punishment and reward syndrome, this taking of little things away and giving over here, this point system for human deportment.

If I remember correctly, about three years ago, in this House or outside, you and I had quite a discussion about the way in which the elderly demented patients at the Brockville Psychiatric Hospital were treated. There was a special wing set up in that hospital where all these people were taken from under the regular routine of the hospital and placed over here in a kind of experimental laboratory unit. If they wet the bed, they lost three points. If they got up on the right side of the bed, they might gain back two again.

I think you eliminated it, finally, under pressure; with goodwill too. I think you saw into the meaning of it and how deleterious to human conduct and what an inhuman

robot-like way of treating human beings it was.

It nevertheless subsists in your training schools.

If it is wrong for older people, there is no reason in the world in my opinion why it shouldn't be equally wrong here. It's wrong in principle. Human beings are not to be reduced to conditioned reflexes. That type of psychology is for Neanderthals. I know it exists and it is tried throughout the system. So give some thought to it and do try to eliminate it. It's endemic of negative responses all the way through. It's a form of condition, a response mechanism that will not bring you a lower recidivism rate.

On the contrary, as the hero in "Brave New World" reacted and the fellow in Orwell, you get back at the system.

"They don't condition me. They don't put the screws of the electro-encephalogram on my brain and try to bring about a certain effect. I'll fall from the window and fool them and, on my second return, they'll know what it is all about."

I'm thinking of "Clockwork Orange" at the moment, if the minister hasn't seen it. It's a negative enforcement thing depicted in the movies and probably one of the most obscene movies I've ever seen. There's no obscenity in the strict sense in it as far as that goes, but it has it in the way in which it treats people and its attitude towards human beings.

The problem is that they have no time of their own. They have no privacy. They wear a kind of uniform. There are no doors in the cans in some of the places. Sometimes the sentencing is indeterminate. I am told that if you permitted some of the young people to smoke—much as you may dislike that as a doctor—that you would remove a good many of the problems internal to the institution. If they're going to smoke, they're going to smoke, despite you. It's like what the schools have to contend with.

I wouldn't encourage it. On the other hand, you can't use mandatory measures because there is a secret trafficking in the prison. The hierarchies are arranged. The boys in the know, the ones who run the show, are the ones who control the cigarettes. That is very often true, as you well know, in the reformatories too. That's where the power comes from. That's their currency and trade. Whereas you guys trade in filthy lucre, they trade in cigarettes. It's the same kind of thing.

Let me range a little bit on this thing. The

Premier of this province (Mr. Davis), in his present campaign, in a piece of white knight-ery against all forms of human immorality, is using this as kind of an election base to appeal to all the red-necks and the know-nothings out there in this particular regard.

You produced the society—we all did—which is a deeply atavistic one where every man's hand is raised against every man. The palms, all the premiums, go to the greatest aggressors, to the ones who can forge ahead and step over the bones of everybody else. They are the ones who are the masters of industry. They are the ones who are looked up to.

Then you come along and say violence is rife in this society. Of course it is rife. The society has bred it. It is supposed to be a mark of virility or something. You can't suddenly switch in the dead of the night and say, "Oh, we find this lamentable, having gained our station by those very methods and our whole attitude having been formed around this particular premise."

Hobbes rules the modern world. That's why I am a socialist—because I don't like it. But how you who are Tories, and supported and bred it and affirmed it and gave palms and accolades for it, can then, out of the other side of your mouths, say something quite different in the throes of an election campaign without any gestures toward the modification of the society, without giving any of the enfranchised gains, seems to me a piece of blatant hypocrisy running contrary to your whole grain.

That's all I want to say about that at the moment but I will come back to that.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Well said, too.

Mr. Lawlor: A number of people of recent date have been pilloried, jettisoned, thrown out of their jobs by your ministry or the environs thereof. There is a man by the name of Jerry O'Sullivan. I would like to know a little bit more about Jerry O'Sullivan and about individuals who speak out against a ministry or a minister—people who work inside that ministry for long periods of time, learning the innards of the beast, knowing how it operates, finding it inhuman, and who then speak out in public and are sanctioned immediately because of that. Don't you think that is rather narrow-minded and purblind? Your invoking of the Official Secrets Act in this context is absurd.

There are grounds, as the Globe and Mail has pointed out, for people in the Treasury to be held in the strictest secrecy with respect

to monetary matters, fiscal matters. But in matters affecting the whole public, in matters of humane treatment, in matters of social import—in that range—surely you should free the people in your ministry. They approach you and are silenced, or you are inattentive that day, or this is a field that doesn't interest you particularly. Why ought they not come out and speak, and why should you bring a bludgeon to bear upon their heads?

William Brewer was called before a secret ministerial hearing to answer the charges against him. He himself called witnesses—juveniles who had been in training schools—to back up his statements. His terminology was, "They are places of brutal sadistic goings-on."

I know that is unpalatable to you, and I know it would offend you as the minister; but to the extent that these statements can be proved, made evidential, given validity in public, they ought to be so given. Why should you hold your secret hearing and put the clamps on? Would it be an airing of some dirty linen on your part if you had a more open spirit and permitted this to be? Then the rectifications would automatically take place.

Most of these schools are run by private institutions. I think on the whole they run them well over the life of the thing. But your degree of supervision and the fact that they are within the private realm does permit a certain area of self-determination that falls outside your ken. You only move in on cases of overt behaviour.

The routinized cruel course of the daily proceedings in these places are not your immediate concern. When a child lacerates himself in the process, then you have an immediate interest. Or if there are complaints emanating from sources like over here, then you are aroused. How can you help but be when it comes from one of your own people, who knows the internal workings there? I hardly think it's fair. Donald Sinclair, when he was deputy minister for Correctional Services, was not fired for telling the press there were a million things wrong with the way the ministry handles juveniles, but William Brewer was fired.

Sometimes I think it's far better to hold these estimates downstairs, where the deputy minister is a free man to speak, where people like Donald Sinclair can be called in and interrogated and trade notes. We can then come to grips with the problems of the ministry through those who really know them from the inside.

I think it would be highly beneficial to you, yourself, in the process, to have this done. I would hope that if we ever happen to be in a position to appoint the minister, the men over here would be prepared to have these open hearings. I think there's no validity in them becoming officers of the government as cabinet ministers if they are not. They should stay out in that case and let you fellows run the show in caves, in secrecy and within the walls.

I don't know what happened to Brewer and his appeal. Perhaps you can tell me. I am most interested to learn the ultimate results there.

Now we have a number of questions I would like to ask the minister. The first has to do with sections 8 and 9. I don't think we will dwell on it long tonight, because you will be introducing legislation shortly and we can give it a fairly thorough going over at that time.

The question my colleague, the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) was most interested in was the extent that you anticipated section 9 would be used in lieu of section 8, having eliminated 8. Section 9 is, after all, still there. I know that it says that if a child has contravened any statute in force in Ontario, such contravention would be punishable by imprisonment if committed by an adult.

That is a severe restriction, Mr. Minister, but it is not all that difficult you know to find grounds for laying charges which would have the impact these particular charges indicate.

Over against a disgruntled or unmanageable child, or parents who are unhappy, it's always assault of one kind or another. There is also damage to property. There are also malicious intents of various kind. All of these are operative in any one of these situations.

I would like you to address us just shortly on how you see the changes within section 8 as affecting section 9, if it will at all; or whether you would trust that section 9 would not supervene and become effectively what section 8 already is; which is what we are trying to get rid of.

I understand you are going through a series of regionalizations to create eight regions in the province. Does that mean there will be eight training schools set up in the province? Perhaps you could give us some idea of what they might be.

How will this decentralization you are attempting affect the Oakville assessment

centre? Will it change in any way, or is it just a conduit pipe, an assessment area, from which people will be sent out to the various areas?

I understand from the notes that I have been given here there's a third set of questions. If adult courts judge the gravity of a breach of probation before the prisoner is sent back to jail, why can a training school superintendent return a kid to the training school with no family court hearing?

I haven't checked the law in the matter. I assume that this question is veridical, is a true question, and that the superintendent apparently has this kind of power. If he has, do you intend to change the system?

I have a number of other questions, but I think we don't want to place the load too heavy on any particular occasion, so I will abide with some of the answers from the minister.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, I'm surprised at the hon. member referring tonight to the conditions in some of our institutions; he was referring to a 1972 report on conditions in 1966 and 1967, which was long before we had started our group homes and long before we had many changes in our institutions. I am only sorry that he hasn't taken the opportunity to let me take him to some of our homes to see for himself what the situation is.

Mr. Lawlor: I take umbrage with that. You know as well as I do.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. Order.

Mr. Lawlor: I wasn't in to see you for nothing either.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. Potter: He would have seen for himself, rather than just reading the comments of other people who were determined that they were going to close our training schools, which doesn't necessarily give him the true picture.

For instance, I have here a copy of a letter sent to the editor of the Ottawa Journal regarding the training school controversy. This individual, who is a social worker, wrote:

It's just simply not true that training schools are all black and that they are disabling rather than enabling to their wards—

Mr. Lawlor: Nothing in this life is all black.

Hon. Mr. Potter: This person went on:

From my experience in child welfare, the following formulation of the use and abuse of training schools would seem more accurate: Because children develop in a wide variety of ways, their needs vary widely too.

Mr. Lawlor: We are just concerned about your shades of grey, doctor.

Hon. Mr. Potter: The letter continued:

The typical child is able to operate with increasing freedom in the community, as he or she grows older, because he learns how to live without being destructive to himself and others.

And the writer goes on to say why training schools are an essential part of the programme and should never be abolished. So for every person who writes to say we've got to close them out, there's somebody else who will write to say there's every reason why we shouldn't.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, I think it should be gradually eliminated.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I've also sat here and listened to the complaints of one of our employees who resigned and then took it upon himself to divulge information to the press; in fact, the member from Ottawa himself made reference to it here.

You know, we destroy a child's records in Correctional Services when he becomes 18 so they will no longer follow him around. But apparently there are those who believe it's quite all right to make reference to these same children in the Legislature here and to have their names recorded in Hansard, where they will stay indefinitely and never be destroyed.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Fortunately, nobody reads Hansard.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister is the only person who reads Hansard.

Hon. Mr. Potter: In this particular case, I do want to point out that an impartial investigator of good standing has been appointed to look into the substance of this former employee's complaints.

There was also a reference to a Mr. Brewer; and, as the hon. member is probably aware, Mr. Brewer was released for a wide variety of reasons. I would like to discuss them, but I daren't at the present time because he still has the opportunity to appeal before the Public Service Grievances Board.

If Mr. Brewer himself wants to speak up, he can; and when this is finished I would be delighted to tell the whole story. Believe me, maybe you'll then have changed your opinions.

Mr. Lawlor: Maybe, maybe not. But the principle stands.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Regarding section 8, Mr. Chairman, at the present time about 30 per cent of the children who come to us are sent under section 8. As far as we can check it out, probably about 30 per cent of that 30 per cent could be committed under section 9 by a judge if he so wishes, but he has sent them in under section 8. Probably he thought it would accomplish the same thing; and rather than put it on record that they had been convicted of a crime, he sent them for care under section 8. As a matter of fact, at the present time we're finding that they're beginning to use it less and less all the time.

Regarding the eight catchment areas, we won't be opening any new training schools, I hope, unless something drastic happens. If the feds increase the age from 16 to 18 and if the need arises that we must have more facilities for them, of course we may have to do so. But it is my hope that since we started the programme of closing out our training schools gradually we will be able to continue this programme and make much greater use of the community facilities.

Mr. Lawlor: Are these schools closed because of section 8 going out?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Pardon?

Mr. Lawlor: Are these schools closed?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, no. Does that cover what? Oh, you were asking about the superintendent being able to send the child back to training school. That is the law and I'm afraid I can't do much about that.

Mr. Lawlor: You mean under the federal statute?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes.

Mr. Lawlor: Two more things. I did ask about the Oakville situation vis-à-vis the decentralization, but you have given one of the other members some assessment of the Oakville situation and I think I may leave it alone for the time. What is the cost of the supervision of kids with their families? I may say juveniles; this word "kids" is getting me down. It was costing \$45 a day for the training schools, and \$20 to \$30 a day for

the group homes. What about the supervision of children in their own families?

Hon. Mr. Potter: It's \$7 a day in foster homes.

Mr. Lawlor: Seven dollars. That is paid by your ministry and not by social services?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes.

Mr. Lawlor: The other day—and you may not have had an opportunity yet—you were going to get me some information on what I call "solitary confinement" within the schools; as to what extent that is carried out.

In addition to that, I am a little concerned about this self-mutilation bit, as to what the incidence of that is in Ontario training schools. I quote from the Lambert and Birkenmayer 1972 report—these are Americans, I think—that self-mutilation is carried out by 10 per cent of training school inmates. They say there are many cases of self-mutilation that are not reported to the medical staff and most likely are not recorded. It takes the form of anything from minor tattooing to friction burns, to fairly serious gouging of arms, legs and genitals with broken glass, razor blades and this sort of thing.

Obviously, this is a masochistic exercise where, through sheer anger and frustration, the human being, on being unable to do anything with respect to system—in other words being unable to sock the guard—socks himself. He is the only available object to carry out his rage against and to punish. So I am not surprised.

The reason I ask about it is it gives a good indication of the quality of the school and the quality of the relationships there. If there is a fairly high rate of self-mutilation, obviously the coercive, downing effect of the institutions runs in a way that can only breed further criminality. If they are going to take it out on themselves today, they are going to be taking it out on you tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Potter: On the matter of what you call "solitary," what we call "quiet rooms" approach, I mentioned this the other day. We have—

Mr. Lawlor: You call it the quiet room. That's what the Inquisition called the rack room.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, no, it's a little different with us. I mentioned the other day that in a 12-month period we had 12 children who were in there for more than 48 hours.

In each case, of course, there had to be a report submitted by the superintendent advising us of the reasons and everything else. At the same time, there were over 1,500 who had spent anywhere from five minutes to 48 hours for various reasons. Many of these children were there because they asked if they could be left alone for a while, for a period of time, and of course some of these were the same children who had repeated on several occasions.

Self-mutilation is another matter. We've checked this out and we've done a spot check on several of our schools. For instance, at Cecil Facer School there were three boys out of 88 and five girls out of 25 who had scratched themselves, or cut themselves, or injured themselves in one way or another.

The girls and women seem to go for this more than the men do and usually it is in the way of tattooing. It has been suggested that most of this is done in the institutions, but we've found, for instance, in one group of 63 girls who were admitted, 10 of them had been tattooed when they came in.

Mr. Lawlor: How many were tattooed when they went out?

Hon. Mr. Potter: It's one of these things that you have to be on the watch for all the time. Believe me, they can always find some way of getting a pin or needle or something and start sticking dye in underneath their skin.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, but you don't slough it off like that. Come on!

Hon. Mr. Potter: It's not a question of sloughing off. It's a question of saying that no matter how careful you are, unless you're going to have somebody supervise every inmate on a continual basis this is going to happen.

Mr. Lawlor: I don't agree with you, doctor.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Maybe you don't, but I've been in many institutions in this country and in other countries and it's the same the world over. Believe me, it happens and I defy anybody to stop it.

Mr. Lawlor: When did you tattoo yourself for the last time? Members of this Legislature can bring a sufficient amount of pressure upon you and a sufficient amount of frustration, I trust, that might drive you to it, but you have never done so. These young people do. There's something damned strange about it.

You may think that this is a tribal custom, some form of ritual that is peculiar among the young. I just say that people don't mutilate their bodies unless they find the conditions very condign, very destructive indeed. It's a way of taking it out on themselves against the society and it is the group around them that has imposed these conditions that have driven them to it.

You seem to think that they do it as some kind of elixir, some kind of joy, that it's a way of expressing themselves. I would look at that very carefully if I were you.

You've given me the figures for one school, Cecil Facer School. What's the incidence of that throughout the province? Is it fairly widespread?

Hon. Mr. Potter: At Brookside, among 58 boys there were no such instances, but there were three girls out of 23. So there were three out of 81 at Brookside and there were eight out of 113 at Cecil Facer. There were 19 girls out of 83 at Grandview.

Mr. Lawlor: Out of 83?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes.

Mr. Lawlor: That's practically an epidemic.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Eight of these were tattooing.

Mr. Lawlor: Eight of them were tattoos?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes.

Mr. Lawlor: What were the rest of them, slashing of the arteries? I mean that speaks volumes. You go take a look at that joint, really. Somebody had better go and take a look at it.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Oh, we've had a look at it, don't worry.

Mr. Lawlor: Nineteen out of 83.

Hon. Mr. Potter: The psychiatrist reported at this time it was a wave that was started by one girl scratching her boyfriend's initials on her arms or hands and then, of course, when the other girls saw this they wanted to follow suit and started a fad. This does happen, believe me.

Mr. Lawlor: It sure does happen, that's right. It's like the symptoms of a disease, isn't it? When you begin to break out in places you begin to detect that maybe there is something very wrong in the anatomy or even the physiology. There is something

very wrong there and we'll have to watch the incidence of that particular thing.

I suppose we could go seriatim, one by one, through all the various 36 training schools of the province and test this. I think we know enough to say, standing here right at the moment, that it's not an unknown phenomenon—as a matter of fact it's fairly deep-seated—and what was said in that report of Lambert and Birkenmayer is reflected in our own jurisdiction. There's nothing strange. But they found it, as I do, indicative of a diseased condition or something that must be closely scrutinized.

The atmosphere, the surroundings, the pressures that are operative in places that cause that particular type of response must be scrutinized, and it is your sovereign responsibility to see to that. It would be interesting to follow those statistics from year to year in this particular regard and see what happens with these schools.

Just before I sit down, I would like to mention a subject about which a great deal has been said over the years. I have in front of me the Harvard Educational Review special edition containing an article about the rights of children, which I trust the minister has seen, and particularly his staff, so they may inform him of the highlights and be thoroughly clued in on this subject.

I would also mention a matter which I know the minister is cognizant of—and I'm not going to beat the beast, I'm not going to flagellate the hounds tonight: the stuff was brought to my attention, and probably to the attention of the minister. It concerns a particular approach to the whole matter, arising out of the University of Chicago and Harvard with respect to a concept of a moral development approach, based I suppose to some degree on Piaget, the famous French child psychologist.

When you talk about moral development, you become moralistic, and I'd rather avoid that. All they say is that there are stages in life's way up to 11, from 11 to about 14 or 16 and so on, and different attitudes form themselves. I think we all know this with our own children, that around 14 or 15 they really turn off, because they are growing, they are setting up their distance from father and mother and becoming their own person, asserting a kind of independence.

The training school concept is so rigorous, so aligned and so institutionalized that the resistances they come up against are unyielding and tend towards a uniformity and military-like regimen. That kills the

human spirit, because with our children we are pliable, we back up and move forward and we understand. We seek to give a certain play so that the growth may occur and be encouraged and all that sort of thing. That's just the difference between the two types of institution.

What they come to here is really worth looking at in terms of internal discussions, in terms of participation, in terms of feeling their own personal worth in being listened to and in taking responsible decisions with their peers and running the institution up to point. These various things are well known to you. But I wish to bring to your attention the full impact, the spectrum in this particular area and I would hope that you are thoroughly aware of it.

The manual that I've got in my hand is a manual of Lawrence Kohlberg, Kelsey Koffman, Peter Scharfe and Joseph Hickey. It is quite a thick volume, going into the discipline boards, the various ways of sharing, the collective responsibility concept, particularly the beneficial effect upon girl or women prisoners. They seem to emerge from that particular milieu and the rate of recidivism is statistically proven to fall substantially if this particular approach is taken to the problem.

The earliest stage of moral development, curiously enough, is more closely allied, phylogenetically speaking, to the earliest times of the human race. In other words, the savage starts, the savage is egotistical, the savage is the egotist; the second level is the level of division, etc., when the authoritarian aspect comes into play. Then there is the area of the third stage and each of these stages have two stages but the third stage is a sense of the world, a wide sense of others and not just others in a confined environment but others everywhere, that we are all in the boat together. This widening sense establishes an identity with the human race so they are not enemies of the people; they are not enemies of everybody. They start off as enemies of everybody but the gradual widening of the consciousness, the types of conflicts that occur and the fact of resolving them in discussion helps at least. Talk isn't going to save the world but it helps up to a point otherwise parliaments wouldn't exist.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Chairman, I am surprised. The member mentioned last week about how helpful our newsletters were to him and I'm beginning to wonder whether he really reads them. In one of our newsletters last June and another one in Decem-

ber, we described our programme in moral development, one at Thunder Bay and one at St. John. Mr. Hickey is helping out with the one at St. John. I'll send these over to him and he can see for himself.

Mr. Lawlor: Don't bother about that—I have got the damned things. This whole report on St. John.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Kent.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the minister in regard to students taking social services courses at Humber College. During their studies they go to your institutions and carry out work on a part-time and unpaid basis. I had one young student in my office yesterday who said he was told by one of your officials in one of your institutions that when he completed his studies and got a diploma he would not qualify for a permanent position in those institutions, which was a great disappointment to him.

I often wonder, Mr. Minister, if you are familiar with these courses. I would say the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. Auld) should upgrade these courses if the students can't qualify for a permanent position in institutions which come under your portfolio. They should certainly be familiarized or informed before they ever start these courses on what they can qualify to do after they have graduated or got their diploma. Is the minister familiar with these students who carry out part of their studies in the institutions and who can't qualify for a permanent position after they receive a diploma?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, he can qualify for a permanent position with the ministry but it's probably a different position he was asking about. If he wants to work as a social service worker with the ministry, he must get either a BSc, BSW or an MSW. The social service course at a community college isn't a degree course and doesn't qualify him as a social worker. It would qualify him to apply as a correctional officer and he would be eligible for that position.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to return to the Twin Valley School in Rodney. We discussed this earlier. Would you tell me of the association between your ministry and the institution? What type of services does that institution provide to the people you send there? What is the age

level of the people you send there and what are the general qualifications of the people who run the school to provide the type of services you require of the institution?

Hon. Mr. Potter: We purchase service from the institution and we send children who require special care.

Mr. B. Newman: Such as?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Such as very badly disturbed children. I can't tell you the qualifications of the individuals on the staff but my staff have been satisfied that they do have the necessary qualifications to give the type of care which is recommended for those children who are sent there.

Mr. B. Newman: In any other institution, would the individual giving treatment to the youngster be required to have certain types of qualifications before he would be allowed to provide this type of guidance and counselling?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Certainly we would expect them to be psychologists and social workers, depending on the individual.

Mr. B. Newman: Then are the minister's officials satisfied that those responsible for providing the services and the guidance and the counselling at Twin Valley have that special degree so that the individuals who are sent there by the ministry are receiving proper attention?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, we have been satisfied. If you have information you think we should have, I would be delighted if you would let me have it.

Mr. B. Newman: I don't have any information but I just want to know, Mr. Minister, because I understand that that is an adjunct of St. Clair College.

Hon. Mr. Potter: We have been satisfied, yes.

Mr. B. Newman: I am trying to find out the association between St. Clair College, this, and now your ministry.

Now, is the institution paid on a per diem basis?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I would expect so. That is the usual procedure.

Mr. B. Newman: Do these funds go to St. Clair College, or do those funds now go to Twin Valley?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Twin Valley School.

Mr. B. Newman: Twin Valley School.

Mr. L. Maeck (Parry Sound): Back on that again?

Mr. B. Newman: And what is the per diem rate, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I cannot give you that.

Mr. B. Newman: Well, your officials probably can. They come under some category of institution.

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, I cannot give it to you now for the Twin Valley School, but I will see that you get it.

Mr. B. Newman: Would you likewise send to me any assessment that you have made of the Twin Valley School, and why you selected it, and the general picture of the whole thing so that I could know the association between it and St. Clair College?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Wellington South.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, the minister replied to the member for Kent in regard to qualification of graduates of the community college. What are the requirements for a correctional officer; and what are the educational standards?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Grade 12.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 1403 carry? The hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Chairman, I raised earlier the question about the teachers' wages in the Cecil Facer School. The minister responded that he was surprised that I had raised it, and that the member for Brant had raised it, and that all that he had seen was peace and harmony in his institutions.

I'm surprised that he hasn't read the newspapers during the past four to six months. I have here the Globe and Mail of Nov. 8, 1974, and I'm quoting now from the article:

Leaders of about 500 special teachers in 18 provincial schools for the retarded, disturbed, deaf and blind, are making plans to protest against the government's year-old refusal to bargain with them over salaries and fringe benefits.

Now that was just in November of last year. That's not too far back, Mr. Minister.

I should point out that at that time all that was left in the bargaining unit were the people from the schools for the retarded, disturbed, deaf and blind. The people from your

institutions who had been in that group from the beginning of bargaining had by that time already settled. I understand they had settled in September.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, but they renegotiated with us.

Mr. Germa: That is what I am coming to. I understand that the final settlement didn't come until Dec. 5 when the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) announced in the House that this group had settled. But it indicates to me, Mr. Minister, that you had lack of harmony in September, for one reason or another.

Now I don't know how you split one group from the teachers in the deaf and the retarded schools. I don't know how you split off the teachers in the correctional institutions. But anyway you did, and they settled for a lower contract than what these other people finally arrived at. Now, I think the minister intimates that he had gone back and had brought their level up. Can you tell me the details of that particular situation?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes. Each has its own association. In our particular ministry they were indeed quite satisfied. We signed an agreement with them in September; the other groups didn't. When the government started negotiating with the other group, we went back and suggested that we should renegotiate ours too and negotiate as a whole bunch, because we didn't see any reason why they shouldn't have the advantage of the increase in pay if the others were getting it. But to start with they were quite happy.

Mr. Germa: They had started out as an original group with the other two groups concerned.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Each had its own association.

Mr. Germa: Had they not been negotiating collectively with the government on behalf of all the groups?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, they hadn't.

Mr. Germa: That's not the way I read it. I understand that there had been a joint committee bargaining with the government, and I know the old gimmick in bargaining.

Hon. Mr. Potter: They had never bargained before with the government.

Mr. Germa: I recognize that. This was their first time at it. I recognize the old trick

of divide and conquer. I have been caught in this trap before as a worker in the Province of Ontario.

In one way or another you divided that group off. You peeled them off. I am glad to see you did go back. When I look at the wage scale, the beginning rate right now is \$6,300 a year. That's really not too fat a salary for a school teacher as far as I understand it.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 1403 carry?

Vote 1403 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of the Ministry of Correctional Services.

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Mr. Chairman, the House leader has advised me that probably it would be just as well if we adjourn the House at this stage.

Mr. Lawlor: Did he ever have an easy time this year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He did a good job. That's why.

Mr. Lawlor: Pure Vaseline jelly.

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 31, An Act to amend the Succession Duty Act.

Bill 32, An Act to amend the Gift Tax Act.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I was somewhat surprised that the situation developed and we are finished with the minister's estimates, I would like to say that I will move the adjournment of the House. Tomorrow we will deal with the sixth item on the order paper.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, since that may take only five or 10 minutes, what would follow?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am rather inclined to believe that that won't happen, but should it happen I will call the 15th order.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, if I might comment, the minister responsible (Mr. Welch) has two other bills available on the order paper, which perhaps could be dealt with too, if he is of a mind so to do. It might be convenient.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Certainly, I don't want the people across the floor to think that I am not co-operative.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is not curtailing debate. We just want to clear the deck for him.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Certainly, I would call those orders as well, if time permitted. I have a feeling, if I understand this House—

Mr. Lewis: We want to leave June open to the government.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —that it just won't be that way.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 9:55 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 24, 1975

Estimates, Ministry of Correctional Services, Mr. Potter, concluded	1193
Third readings	1211
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	1212



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Friday, April 25, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, APRIL 25, 1975

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a point of privilege? It is small but I wish to have it on the record. It relates to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman), so perhaps I can say it.

On the 6 p.m. broadcast of Wednesday, April 23, the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations was interviewed on CKEY about the report of the study on sex and violence which had been a subject to some controversy. He began the interview by saying—and I quote from the tape: "This idea of Mr. Lewis receiving stolen goods and making it public . . ."

Mr. Speaker, apart from the unpleasantness of that kind of thing coming from the minister, I just want to say very simply, as I think he knows, that the woman who wrote the report, the researcher, phoned me during the day and offered me the document. I said, "Why not?" and accepted it. I wouldn't have thought that could be classified as stolen goods. I would think a minister of the Crown should exercise a little more caution about what he says on such circumstances.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Or have the Attorney General (Mr. Clement) charge the member.

Hon. S. B. Handleman (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the statement by the hon. member, I would just like to comment on the point of privilege which he has raised. Whether or not this document was the property of the government and was taken by someone else I think is a question of fact, not a question of privilege.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): There is no question of comment on this at all. It requires an apology.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: What does the minister mean by "it is a question of fact"? Is he going to charge me under the Criminal Code? What does he spout such nonsense on the air for?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: This minister and the member for St. David (Mrs. Scrivener) and the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. White) and his racism—

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, I may have a little bit of privilege here too. It seems to me that the member for Scarborough West said he hoped I was titillated by reading it when I got it in 1971.

Mr. Lewis: I didn't say I hoped he was.

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): That was slanderous.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think he had subsequently found that I did not receive it. Mr. Guindon, I believe, was the Minister of Tourism and Information at that time.

Mr. Lewis: In fact, I said that Mr. Guindon received it.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I didn't receive it but since the member for Scarborough West received it, I wonder if he found it titillating?

Mr. Lewis: No.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Mr. Renwick: One thing the Speaker doesn't know how to do is to deal with questions of privilege.

Mr. Lewis: If someone else in this Legislature accused a cabinet minister of a criminal offence, he would intervene.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have no jurisdiction over what has been said outside the Legislature. I think the hon. member realizes that. I let him make his explanation and that was it.

Mr. Lewis: All right, but that is not the way to deal with it.

Mr. Renwick: The Speaker knows what a question of privilege is and he should deal with it properly.

Mr. Speaker: There is nothing for me to deal with when it is said outside the Legislature. The hon. minister.

COMMODITY FUTURES

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I would like to place before the Legislature today, the report of the interministerial committee on commodity futures trading.

This study was proposed by my predecessor (Mr. Clement) acting upon the recommendations of the Ontario Securities Commission. The purpose of the study was to examine the commodity futures market with a view to:

1. Establishing the appropriate regulatory mechanisms to control and regulate trading in commodity futures in the Province of Ontario in order to protect the customers of commodity futures brokers, and

2. To determine the desirability of encouraging the establishment of an exchange for the trading in commodity futures contracts in Ontario.

With the increasing interest among investors in trading in commodity futures contracts, my ministry was aware of the lack of regulations in Ontario and of the frauds which had been perpetrated in the United States, particularly in California, through commodity option trading.

Because of the implications of the trading and its potential effect on the price of commodities in the agricultural, mineral and forest product fields, economic planning, the application of criminal law, as well as investor protection, representatives were nominated from five Ontario government ministries. These were the ministries of: Attorney General, Agriculture and Food, Treasury and Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, Natural Resources, and Consumer and Commercial Relations.

The committee, which represented a range of disciplines, was chaired by Harry S. Bray, QC, vice-chairman of the Ontario Securities Commission, and included:

Dr. Thomas P. Mohide, director of the mineral resources branch and former president of the Winnipeg Commodity Exchange;

Martin J. Jaeger, senior economist with the Ministry of Agriculture and Food;

David E. Redgrave, executive director of the office of economic policy, TEIGA;

Edward F. Then, counsel from the criminal appeals and special prosecutions branch of the Attorney General; and

Mrs. Dagmar A. Staff, senior economist, and Barry Tocher, senior programme analyst, from my ministry.

The committee, assisted by Keith E. Boast, as study director, and Robert M. Rickover,

an economist with TEIGA, examined the problems flowing from commodity trading and the regulatory solutions devised in Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom and elsewhere.

It examined the kinds of commodity contracts offered for sale in Ontario, the qualifications of the persons at present trading as brokers and as advisers, and have recommended legislation directed to a registration system concerned not only with the honesty, reputation and competence of the persons who would be permitted to act as commodity futures brokers but also the kinds of contracts which would be permitted to be traded in Ontario under the proposed Act.

The report does not find a present need for a commodity futures exchange in Ontario. However, it recommends that the proposed legislation include the regulatory framework within which such an exchange could be established.

Mr. Speaker, the report will be placed before the justice policy field committee for consideration. Copies have been furnished to all members of this House. Those who presented briefs to the committee and other interested parties will be supplied with copies. To assist in reviewing the report and its recommendations, submissions will be welcome.

While the report is not a textbook on commodity futures trading, I believe it provides a helpful review of the subject from a regulatory point of view.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

REPORT ON PORNOGRAPHY

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I'm today filing with the Clerk a copy of a report submitted to the government in 1971 entitled, "Perspectives on Pornography." This report, which has been variously described—

Mr. Singer: Has the minister got that stolen document?

Mr. Lewis: The minister is too much.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: —as hidden, secret and even titillating, is simply a report commissioned by the then Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld) for the purpose of obtaining reliable information on which to base certain policy decisions by the Ontario Censor Board.

It has been alleged that the report makes unnecessary the royal commission on violence in the media announced by the Premier (Mr. Davis) a short time ago. I would like to

advise the House that the purpose of the inquiry, although related, was certainly not the same as that of the royal commission. In a memorandum to the minister in 1970, the consulting firm engaged to conduct the inquiry and prepare the report stated:

The goals of this inquiry are two-fold. Namely, to formulate and execute a research design disclosing,

1. The empirically informed contentions of professions, i.e., objective criteria, and

2. The existential content of community standards with reference to obscenity, particularly filmic obscenity, i.e., subjective criteria.

Mr. Lewis: The existential standards. The minister is impossible.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: They are not my words; I end the quote.

The consultants conducted no original research.

Mr. Lewis: Nonsense! They did a complete original questionnaire.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Their primary goal was to compile and evaluate critically the information which was available at that time, that is, in 1970 and 1971, and to report to the minister without recommendations, but to formulate certain conclusions based on the research which had been done by others.

Having read the report and having witnessed some of the violence which has been produced by film makers both in North America and abroad, I am more than ever convinced that the royal commission on violence in the media is not only justified but is urgently required.

The report which I am filing today is a scholarly treatise, valuable but out of date—

Mr. J. R. Breihaupt (Kitchener): It is like this government.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Five years late.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: —and devoid of the kind of original research required to deal with this most serious societal problem.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: Why did the government suppress it for five years? I give up on existentialism after 12 years around this place.

Mr. Speaker: Just before the question period I recognize the hon. member for Peel South.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce in the east and west galleries students from Glen Forest Secondary School with their teachers, Mrs. Stroud, Mrs. LaRoche, Mr. Stroud and Mrs. Smith. Would the members join me in welcoming this group?

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

The member for Kitchener.

ONTARIO LOTTERY

Mr. Breihaupt: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development with respect to Wintario lottery: In the absence of the Minister of Culture and Recreation (Mr. Welch)—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): He is absent every day.

Mrs. Campbell: It's a continuing absence.

Mr. Breihaupt: —if the ticket sales are as successful as we have been informed they are, can the minister advise what reason there is for the continuing advertising campaign? And will that commitment for advertising costs of some \$1.5 million be able to be cut back, with some savings, if in fact the programme is otherwise so successful?

Hon. M. Birch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that everyone is aware of the success of the lottery. In my own community it is impossible and has been impossible even to buy a ticket. But the lottery is under the control of the lottery board and those are internal decisions. However, I will pass along that information to the minister responsible.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Supplementary: Would the policy secretary indicate that in those cases where distributors of lottery tickets are making excessive profits because they have not followed the instructions of the lottery board to distribute the tickets properly, an investigation will be made and those people will be removed from those jobs?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the distributors are the same ones who have been responsible for the Olympic lottery. They were all appointed by the federal government. The arrangement, because it was most important to get this under way, was that we would use the same distributors. But there will be some changes made, I would anticipate.

Mr. Singer: They weren't appointed by the federal government at all.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I would just like to make a point that they weren't appointed by the federal government, they were appointed by the Quebec Lotteries Commission—

Mr. Singer: That's the same thing.

An hon. member: That's the federal government?

Mr. R. S. Smith: —under Mr. Drapeau, who is perhaps a closer friend of the minister's party.

An hon. member: Mr. Drapeau is a leader of the Tory party in Montreal.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mais oui. The member is informed.

Mr. Singer: A Frenchman is a Frenchman, eh?

Mr. Speaker: Are there further questions?

The member for Kitchener.

HYDRO RATES

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Natural Resources—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Resources Development.

Mr. Breithaupt: Resources Development, yes—with respect to the announcement now concerning the increased cost structure which Ontario Hydro is seeking. Since the last increase was effective on Jan. 1, 1975, and there has been no increase in the cost of oil since that date, can the minister advise us if this increased cost requirement is going to destroy the third consideration of the Ontario budget with respect to the assumption of stable energy prices during 1975, or if this kind of an increase is presumed to be acceptable to the government?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the government is, of course, doing everything to avoid an increase in the cost of everything—

Mrs. Campbell: Including energy?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member will appreciate that this is not 100 per cent possible in view of increases all the way down the line. However, with regard to the specific question, my colleague the Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell) will be here on Mon-

day and he has already announced publicly that he will have a statement in respect of this matter.

Mr. Lewis: Somebody should be here today to answer that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Answer what?

Mr. Lewis: We'll ask the questions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It's going before the ministry—

Mr. Lewis: That's no answer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It's going before the Energy Board. They will have to justify—

Mr. Lewis: That was an answer once. No more is that an answer.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): It looks as if the Premier took one stand in Ottawa and a different one here.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There's no question either.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Was the member for Scarborough West calm on Fraser Kelly's programme?

Mr. Lewis: Was I calm on Fraser Kelly's programme? Wonderfully: I was in my own home.

May I ask the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development how much of the intended increase of 30 per cent is intended for the capital requirements of Hydro and how much is a simple additional rate increase?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, that, of course, would be part of the evidence presented at the hearings of the Energy Board, and to pre-empt the Energy Board in terms of the basis on which it will make its decision would be presumptuous of anyone at this stage.

Mr. Lewis: Well, I can follow it up by way of a new question.

Mr. Breithaupt: A supplementary: With respect to the other comment alleged to have been made by the chairman, does the minister have any comment with respect to the views set out by Mr. Taylor, who was quoted as saying natural gas prices have already doubled and probably will double again by next year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The only comment I would make on that, Mr. Speaker, is that I would hope that Mr. Taylor's comments and his prophecies are not correct.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

POLICING COSTS IN WEST LINCOLN

Mr. Breithaupt: I have a question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the policing costs in the township of West Lincoln. Can the minister advise the House about the situation whereby the Ontario Provincial Police apparently are policing that portion of Niagara region when in effect about \$225,000 is being paid by the township officials to the regional government for police services which the township officials apparently are not prepared to accept, thereby of course resulting in a greater cost and perhaps using the resources of the Ontario Provincial Police unnecessarily?

Hon. J. T. Clement (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Mr. Speaker, this matter has been touched on in the past. I think I can explain the rationale this way: In the development of the regional police force about four years ago now, I suppose, the Ontario Provincial Police at that time had jurisdiction over certain of the King's highways, and it is my understanding that jurisdiction is being phased out—not in one fell swoop, but gradually. Since we have a detachment at Niagara Falls, I have some connection with the situation. My understanding is that the jurisdiction will be phased out over a period of time, and the resources of the Ontario Provincial Police or a substantial portion of them will be diverted into other areas of the province that need policing. But rather than do it all at once, with the new regional police taking over and in view of the difficulties of phasing in a new large force, the OPP remained there and has retained jurisdiction over certain regionalization, which I believe occurred on Jan. 1, 1970.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland South.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, is the minister indicating that the OPP force in the village of Crystal Beach, now in the town of Fort Erie, will be also removed? Is he aware that there are about 20 officers who cover one

hundred square miles and that such a move would add an additional burden to the regional police force?

Hon. Mr. Clement: I am aware that for a number of years the Ontario Provincial Police had contractually provided police services to that particular part of the Niagara area. But eventually, I am certain, that will be phased out and the regional police will assume jurisdiction over the entire region. There is little point in having a regional police force if within that region you have pockets, being communities, hamlets or villages, where policing is being maintained by the OPP or a small force. It just cannot continue that way forever.

Mr. Breithaupt: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Attorney General for his comments on the opinions as reported from Mr. Hodgkins, the mayor of the township, to the effect: "The way things are working out now, we just don't want the regional force. We will pay without argument our share to keep them out." Does the minister not think this kind of an approach is going to require some missionary work by himself as a member in that area or, indeed, as Attorney General, so that the timetable that is expected by the government is clear and so that these matters are presumably resolved in the best interests of the taxpayers of the area?

Hon. Mr. Clement: I am sorry, I didn't catch the name or the position of the person he quoted.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mayor Hodgkins, of the township of West Lincoln.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Oh, West Lincoln. I should advise the members of the House that this matter was discussed, as a matter of fact, as recently as yesterday, not as it pertains to Niagara but as it pertains to the entire province, particularly in areas where there have been regional governments established. As members know, there is a regional government in the Ottawa-Carleton area but there is not a regionalization of the police forces in that particular area. I think there are four forces within the regional Ottawa-Carleton area maintaining police supervision at the present time.

I would also add that we would not move, or recommend a move, quickly in any particular area without sufficient lead time to those communities affected, but I can see little purpose in having a portion of an area such as Crystal Beach, which was touched on by

the member for Welland South, being covered by the Ontario Provincial Police and the rest of the area by the regional police. But as I pointed out, the OPP are in other parts of the region of Niagara too, and perform a very worthwhile function there at the present time.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? The member for Scarborough West.

GOVERNMENT POLICY ON ONTARIO HYDRO

Mr. Lewis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development: Is the cabinet considering a fundamental policy decision on Hydro's insatiable rate of growth and constant rate increases, rather than always submitting them to the Ontario Energy Board, whose directives it largely discards and ignores anyway? Doesn't the minister think it is time for a major policy decision on the part of the government about the way in which Hydro is to be controlled?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, except for the term "insatiable," because if we are considering this we have to try to consider it on the basis of something a little more than making a decision in advance, I would tell the hon. member that the government is very much concerned about it, very much concerned about it. As a government we are not quite satisfied that that rate of growth is necessary and we are concerned.

One of the reasons for the appointment of the Porter commission was so that the public would have this debate out in the open and we would have all the facts placed before us, not just the legislators but the people in the streets, so that they will know precisely what the cost of growth is, whether they want that growth and all the factors that go into that.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: Since, in the last hearing to the Ontario Energy Board, the board's request that the reserve requirement be dropped by five points—from I guess about 28 per cent to 23 per cent—was ignored by Hydro, the board's request that the nuclear programme be slowed down was ignored by Hydro, the board's request that the fourth heavy water power plant at Bruce be delayed for an independent inquiry was turned down by Hydro, does the minister not think the government has to set a policy to limit Hydro's public demands before it even gets to the Ontario Energy Board, because Hydro is out of control?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, some of the matters which the hon. member has raised

do concern the government, but if he would expect a government with any sense of responsibility merely to make a decision that quickly on a matter of such extreme importance, well, we just can't stop everything. We appreciate the problems inherent in rapid growth in the energy requirements of Hydro. We appreciate the problems but we can't stop it as of yesterday.

What we are attempting to do is have a proper appraisal made as to the terms under which Hydro decides the kind of growth it feels is necessary, and the kinds of terms which are acceptable to the people of this province and therefore the government and therefore this Legislature. All of this, as I said previously to the member, Mr. Speaker, will be subject to a good healthy airing when the board of commission begins its hearings.

Mr. Lewis: One last supplementary: The minister will agree that the Porter commission, if I recall, is examining the requirements from 1982 on; by 1982 Hydro may have bankrupted Ontario. Does the minister recognize that if the rate of growth is slowed from seven per cent as demanded by Hydro to four per cent as most reasonable energy people would agree is legitimate, it would save—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Who is "most people"?

Mr. Lewis: Most of the Pollution Probe people and, I presume, Macaulay when he came before the Energy Board to defend the public interest. Let me put it another way; since we will lose \$1 billion a year in interest payments alone by 1982 in terms of how Hydro is developing—I am sorry. If we reduced it from seven to four per cent we would save \$1 billion a year by 1982 on Hydro's cost. How can the minister forever raise qualms about what it is doing without ever moving in and taking it under control? Doesn't he realize he has unleashed Hydro and it is beyond him now?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to be dishonest about this answer because I never have been with the members in this House. Of course, the member has raised the dilemma of governments all over the world in this respect. Of course, there will be a certain amount of development which has already begun.

For example, one of the power stations will be finished within the reasonable future and if we don't have something on stream that power station will sit there and it will cost the people of this province millions of dollars without getting any value for it at

all. Of course, there is a dilemma. In one respect a commission hearing has been called on the long-range plans; on the other hand, certain programmes are being permitted to proceed.

Mr. Lewis: Twenty-three billion dollars by 1982? It is out of control.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I wouldn't say it is out of control; we are going to find that out. I doubt whether we'd find it is out of control.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It may possibly be that there is a great difference of opinion; there is, as a matter of fact. We will find out just where the line should be drawn.

There is no doubt when the commission hearings get under way, even though they are dealing with the future, they will have some impact at least on a portion of the programme proceeding at the present time.

We would need a Solomon to be able to resolve that problem and to decide shall we turn it off completely.

Mr. Lewis: No, we need a government policy, not a Solomon.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Surely the member isn't saying to the people of this province, without having really gone fully into all of this, that we should stop the production of any further hydro energy?

Mr. Lewis: No, we should slow the rate of growth by government policy.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think the rate of growth has already been slowed by the very fact—

Mr. Lewis: No, it has not.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): The government is abdicating its responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the member will give me a chance, it has already been slowed by the fact we are having public hearings on all these things.

Mr. Lewis: No, that hasn't touched it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And by the fact we have set up a royal commission on the future plans of Hydro.

Mr. Lewis: Hydro laughs at the government.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think we have been in the forefront on this on this continent.

Mr. Speaker: Any new questions? The member for Scarborough West.

STATUS OF PHYSICALLY DISABLED PERSONS

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development if I may: What has happened to her review of people who are considered permanently unemployable rather than chronically or physically disabled, given the commitment back in June, 1974, by the minister that a scrupulous assessment of each of the 6,000 to 10,000 Ontarians who fell between or into these categories would be made?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, that was under consideration and review for some period of time. It is my understanding that many people in that particular category have been put into the permanently unemployable category.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister mean the disabled category?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: I think she means they have gone into the disabled category so they receive more.

Is the minister still confident in her own mind that the distinction between permanently unemployable and physically disabled is a legitimate distinction? Has it ever been given definition?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, not to my knowledge it hasn't.

COMMODITY FUTURES

Mr. Lewis: I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations: I was just glancing through the little study that he tabled this morning. Is he going to pay some kind of tribute to the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) as the only individual consulted? I look on page 22 and I never thought I would be saying this, but what does the minister think of these words:

The majority of experts declare that the speculator is necessary for the continuity and liquidity of the future market. It is the speculator who absorbs the hedgers' orders with a minimum of price disruption. The speculator is said to assist in minimizing price fluctuations rather than exaggerating them.

Could that possibly be true?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the member agree with that?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, first of all, yes, I think the committee was very wise in consulting with the member for High Park. The words that the hon. member just spoke I am sure were contained somewhere in the discussions held between the committee and the member for High Park.

Mr. Ruston: New NDP policy.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: They are exactly his views.

MINISTER'S JOKES

Mr. Lewis: I have one last question, if I may, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Industry and Tourism. Who writes his jokes in international Women's Year?

Hon. C. Bennett (Minister of Industry and Tourism): Not the member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister? He would do better if he entrusted it to me.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister recall his speech to the Welland Chamber of Commerce on March 5, 1975, in which he began, and I quote exactly: "Another definition of the optimist I like, and this is apropos of absolutely nothing—"

Hon. W. Newman (Minister of the Environment): Is that a matter of urgent public importance?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, it is, as a matter of fact. The minister is right, it is. It goes like this: "A pessimist is a man who thinks all women are bad. An optimist is one who hopes they are."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister make these kinds of speeches around the province generally? Is he some kind of —

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I hope the member will find it useful.

Mr. Speaker: The member for St. George.

Mr. Lewis: It is unbelievable.

Mr. Cassidy: If he were only a token male chauvinist it wouldn't be so bad, but they are all like that.

HANDICAPPED PERSONS IN LICENSED PREMISES

Mrs. Campbell: I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations: Is the minister familiar with the publication called "The Third Eye," published by BOOST, blind organization of Ontario with Self-Help Tactics, in which they relate their difficulties in being served in licensed establishments? They say this:

We contacted the board chairman [that is, the chairman of the Liquor Licence Board] when a member of his department told us that handicapped people were impaired already and that common sense should tell us that they shouldn't be served as this would increase their impairment.

If the minister is not aware of this situation, would he look into it?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to reply to the hon. member by saying, no, I was not aware of the publication or the allegation which has been made and, if it is accurate, I would deplore it right here. I will be looking into it and obtain further detail.

Mr. Lewis: Try looking at the intellectual impairment of the chairman, as a matter of fact.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

ASBESTOS STUDIES

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Health. Can the minister confirm a statement attributed to Dr. J. Pimenta of the Ministry of the Environment that said:

No medical studies are being undertaken by the Ontario government with respect to the effect of ingested asbestos.

I believe that statement was made Tuesday evening in Thunder Bay to the city council. How does that square with the statement by the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development on Monday in this House when he said:

The government is moving more aggressively to strengthen its own activities in occupational environmental health. Greater emphasis will be placed on the prevention of known health hazards through the setting of guidelines in the search for unknown health hazards in industrial processes.

Will the minister have examined and pursued the published research of R. D. Pontefract and H. M. Cunningham with respect

to the penetration of asbestos throughout digestive tracts?

Hon. F. S. Miller (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, in all honesty the two statements are not necessarily mutually exclusive. It is quite possible that we are not carrying out studies but we are observing studies being carried out.

Mr. Lewis: "In all honesty, not necessarily" is an interesting proviso.

Hon. Mr. Miller: The English of an engineer is often convoluted.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): How about a paint salesman?

Hon. Mr. Miller: A paint salesman? Never, never.

An hon. member: Very colourful.

Hon. Mr. Miller: Very colourful, yes. In any case, I will be glad to check, first of all, the statements attributed to the doctors. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, we have been watching, with great interest, studies done in the fields of the ingestion of water-borne asbestos.

Mr. Foulds: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: But would the minister not think, in view of the Resources Development secretary's statement on Monday, that simply observing present research is not aggressively making a search for unknown health hazards?

Hon. Mr. Miller: No, I don't agree with that, Mr. Speaker. That goes on the assumption that all research will be undertaken by our ministry in all fields. That is absolutely impossible in today's very complicated world. But we are recognized as having probably one of the best libraries and monitoring systems of any government in North America for these problems. Certainly, when we see the need to carry out specific studies we will carry them out, or endorse and back the research to do so, depending upon the need.

Mr. Foulds: A final supplementary, if I may just quickly, Mr. Speaker, because this is important to me and to my constituents. Does the minister see at the present time a need for research into this problem? Or is he satisfied enough is being carried out already independently?

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, whenever technical experts disagree—and this is one of those areas where they do—I think the rest of us should be wary enough to keep our eyes and ears open. To jump to conclusions

when there is professional disagreement is to invite disaster. Therefore, with this disagreement, I am not going to suggest that we accept any position as valid while the studies go on.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Etobicoke.

CERTIFICATION OF TRADESMEN

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): I have a question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Colleges and Universities. It's a rather lengthy question. Is the minister aware that recently eight bricklayers employed with the North York Board of Education have been asked to take written tests to obtain certificates of qualification from the minister's manpower training branch? Is the minister aware that these men have all worked as bricklayers for over 15 years, some for as many as 30 years? However, the four who have already taken the test all failed very badly.

Is the minister aware that the test is bilingual—that is, French and English—although most of the men in question are Italian-Canadians? While they are instructed to take an interpreter with them, the interpreter must not be a tradesman. Does the minister think it is fair that this certificate is required for employment with the North York Board of Education, even though carpenters, plasterers and other tradesmen who worked along with these bricklayers in the past, were given certificates of their trade, without tests, upon the payment of \$10?

Will the minister seriously consider the use of the grandfather clause, exempting experienced bricklayers and other tradesmen from taking the test? And will the minister look into having the tests changed so that it is more practical and fair to tradesmen?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am aware of the various things that the hon. member just mentioned, because I had his letter about it; I think it was on Monday or Tuesday. I have instituted inquiries to find out all the background and all the detail. When I do that I'll be able to give a reply to the hon. member.

But I would mention one thing. Perhaps I just inferred it from the hon. member's question a moment ago, but it is pretty obvious to me that an interpreter of a tradesman's choice should not be a tradesman of that trade for pretty obvious reasons.

Mr. Braithwaite: A supplementary: In reply to the minister, is the minister aware or is it not possible that the test could be in English and Italian? The other question is, as far as the test is concerned, does the minister not know that these people are working people, and although they are excellent tradesmen they know nothing about—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. These are all statements in the form of a question.

Mr. Braithwaite: I'm just finishing—they know nothing about the architectural terms that are used in the trade?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Without getting into a debate or the details of the requirements for certification in a trade—and I'm not a competent bricklayer, so I don't know whether one needs to be able to read drawings or not—I would think that that might be a requirement.

Mr. Braithwaite: After 30 years of making a living at it a person should be able to be certified.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A final supplementary from the member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, may I ask of the minister: Rather than the use of interpreters, why wouldn't the minister consider setting the exams in various languages so that the individual trying could try it in Italian or try it in Portuguese, and likewise have personnel who could mark that exam?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is being debated now. Is there any further answer?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I think at one time the ministry, in those days I guess it was the Ministry of Labour, attempted to do this, but the problem was one of supply and demand as I understand it. The system that has now been worked out means we are not required to have on staff, available at every testing place, somebody who is fluent or a number of people who are fluent in quite a number of languages.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa Centre.

AWARDS FOR ADVERTISING WORK

Mr. Cassidy: A question of the Chairman of the Management Board or the Ministry of Industry and Tourism which is responsible

for the government's agency of record; I am not sure which minister should take this, Mr. Speaker.

Can either minister explain the enormous springtime proliferation of media advertising for various government programmes such as Wintario, the consumer protection service, Ontario tax credits, summer job programmes, the WCB; and God knows what else? Can they give to the House some indication of the increase in spending on media advertising by the government this spring as opposed to last year when no election was in prospect?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, it is my responsibility to establish and approve budgets; but if there are specific questions they should be directed to specific ministries.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, could the minister then perhaps, if he is going to consider these various figures, compare the 1975 spending with the 1971 spending to get perhaps a better balance than last year's spending?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the members of the opposition will do that when the estimates are being heard.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa Centre with his supplementary.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister knows perfectly well that it is impossible to ask every minister and get a picture from them. Which minister in the government has an overall look at the spending by government departments on advertising? Who runs the plan and co-ordinates it with the political plans of the government for this year's election?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, in this regard, again I can simply say to the member that these programmes are designed by the ministries and included in their estimates. We screen them when they are before us. Again I say if there is a specific area which the member is inquiring about, he should inquire from that minister.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

AUTO INSURANCE RATE JUSTIFICATION

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Is he aware of the new plan initiated in the Province of New Brunswick to force the appearance of the automobile insurance companies before a public body when

they want to increase their rates and to justify their application for increase before such a public body? If he is aware of that, when does he intend to allow that kind of system to be introduced into the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, that particular plan was announced in the Speech from the Throne in New Brunswick, and I have asked my staff to obtain details. I understand the bill was introduced in their Legislature just yesterday. I am trying to obtain copies of that for use in guiding us toward our future policies in insurance development.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Always followers, never leaders.

Mr. Singer: When are we going to see the bill?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury.

ARSENIC LEVELS

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of the Environment relative to arsenic emissions in smelters in northern Ontario: Is it correct that officers of his ministry are dealing quietly and secretly with various smelters in northern Ontario? If this is true, does the minister not think it is incumbent upon him to alert the residents as to the location of these smelters so that they would be aware of the hazards to which they are being subjected at present?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, we don't go around secretly working with any company. I want to make that very clear.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister does it openly, is that right?

Hon. W. Newman: In an answer to a question in the House yesterday I said we were working with the Ministry of Health to bring in tougher emission standards on arsenic. As members know, we have had co-operation from the companies. On abatement equipment we have been telling the companies recently that we anticipate we are going to tighten up and we have been talking to the companies about what sort of abatement equipment could be put on to lower the levels.

Mr. Germa: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the minister then say that a statement by Louis Shenfeld, the Environment Ministry's chief of air quality, is incorrect when he said yesterday in the Globe and Mail: "We've already quietly told a few what is in

the wind." He was referring to various smelters. Is that correct or not?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It's not very secret, is it?

Hon. W. Newman: I don't know how many we have talked to, but all have been notified that we are going to be bringing in tighter standards, as we do on any other emissions from time to time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is the way to keep it secret; tell it to the press.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Welland South.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON BUILDING INDUSTRY

Mr. Haggerty: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour relating to the report of the royal commission on certain sectors of the building industry. In its summary, there are 17 recommendations dealing specifically with labour-management relations. When can we expect legislation dealing with this particular report?

Hon. J. P. MacBeth (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I can't give the House a definite time. It is being considered under the legislation that we have under review. I can't give a definite time.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park.

LIMOUSINE FOR LCBO CHAIRMAN

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, Mr. Speaker. In view of the difficult financial situation in which our province finds itself at the present time, does the minister think it is necessary to maintain a chauffeured limousine for the head of his liquor division?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, the question that was asked of me previously was whether or not it was worthwhile, and it was regarding the securities commission. I wasn't aware of the fact. I knew there was a limousine with a driver for the chairman of the Liquor Control Board. I wasn't aware of the fact that there was a uniform involved, but I'll look into that.

Mr. Breithaupt: The minister has got so many of them that he has lost count.

Mr. Lewis: The chairman is handicapped.

Mr. Speaker: The member for St. George.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

ONTARIO BULLETIN CONTENTS

Mrs. Campbell: I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism. I would ask if he is familiar with the "Ontario Bulletin," which is put out by Mr. Cornell, as I understand it. Is he also familiar with the demonstration which was shown in Britain recently? Does he really think he needs to continue this sexist kind of advertising with women in bikinis selling vacuum cleaners, as it appears here?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Shame.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to—

Mr. Lewis: It is typical of his ministry all right. Why doesn't he tell us about the female race?

Mr. Cassidy: Are they good or bad?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: May I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that regarding the article or the publication referred to, I shall look at it. I'm not sure of the ad, but I would be more than likely correct in saying that it's a private firm that has been on one of the trade missions, or BOM missions with our government in England. I'm prepared to look at it.

Mrs. Campbell: Is it under the minister's aegis?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Let me add to the leader of the NDP that the Ministry of Industry and Tourism has taken the lead in bringing forward programmes—

Mr. Lewis: That's what the minister deals in. He is a sexist.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: That's the member's opinion. The ministry is led by a bachelor.

Mr. Lewis: He is an impossible fellow.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I can tell him that as a bachelor I have taken more direct action in regard to International Women's Year than his party will ever take in its lifetime. The member should read the whole thing, not just what satisfies him.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Next time we'll show men in bikinis.

Mr. Foulds: Who read "Alice in Wonderland" to the minister?

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. Deans: I have a question of the Minister without Portfolio in charge of manpower.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The minister of person power.

Mr. Deans: Given that further layoffs are starting today at John Inglis at Stoney Creek; given that there have been a number of plants in the Hamilton area, in fact, right across the province which have been laying off on a fairly regular basis; could the minister give us an outline of the programmes he has in place with regard to retraining and also the finding of suitable job opportunities for people in the province?

Hon. J. McNie (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, the whole subject of unemployment is one that has been pre-occupying our government for the last two or three months.

Mr. Laughren: It is beyond the minister.

Hon. Mr. McNie: We're working with the federal people. We met Wednesday this week in Hamilton, where we spent all day discussing with industry and with the union people and with training people, ways in which we could meet the needs, not only for unskilled workers who are unemployed, but also the need for upgrading these people so they could fill the jobs which are at present going begging. The budget was designed, as the member knows, to try to stimulate manufacturing in some key industries which have been involved.

We have a paper before cabinet on the whole subject of unemployment describing ways in which together with the federal government we can mitigate some of the problems. We are particularly concerned with what would happen in the event the present economic decline is sustained and unemployment insurance benefits and SUB benefits run out.

I think the answer to the member is that we are very concerned with it and we are looking for ways in which we can creatively provide alternatives for these people who have been laid off. As he knows, many of those laid off are enjoying SUB benefits and unemployment insurance benefits, but this doesn't take the place of employment. We would like to provide alternatives if we can

and this isn't easy. I can assure him that it has a very high priority with our government and with the federal government.

Mr. Deans: One supplementary question: Would the minister agree that the provision of 62,500 jobs would be of interest to him? If that could be accomplished by the expenditure of the \$400 million not to be collected by the seven per cent tax on machinery and the provision of 20,000 houses might he be interested in such a programme and might he initiate it in the cabinet?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Essex-Kent.

MUNICIPAL REBATES

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Is the minister aware of a consulting firm which has been sending letters out to all municipalities suggesting it will check the records of the municipalities for the last 15 years to see if the province has short-changed them on any of their rebates and so forth and offering to do it on a 50-50 basis? Has he heard of this firm?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

GAS COMPANY RENTAL CHARGES

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. It is an energy question dealing not in billions of dollars but in \$5 or \$10 amounts.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's the sort of thing I can understand.

Mr. Burr: Yes, we hope.

Mr. Breithaupt: The only problem is there will be two million questions on one subject.

Mr. Burr: Is the minister giving consideration to an amendment to the Energy Board Act that would give the board authority to fix or control rates for equipment rented by the gas companies to consumers of natural gas?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I am going to have to advise the member that in my view that's a question properly directed to my colleague the Minister of Energy.

Mr. Burr: He is not here.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think that question can wait until Monday.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

WINDSOR HOSPITAL FACILITIES

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health. Will the minister assure the citizens of my community as well as the professional and other personnel of the various hospitals that before any changes are made in the delivery system in the community both the employees and the public will have an opportunity for input? The employees are quite concerned that their jobs may be in jeopardy as a result of changes contemplated by the ministry.

Hon. Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, first, I can assure the member there will be an opportunity for input. In fact, there has been an opportunity for input—sometimes this is not visible to the community as a whole—because we've been carrying on discussions with the individual hospitals and the hospital planning council in Windsor.

We were trying to sort out the surpluses and the deficits in the needs of the city. We were not entirely successful in gaining the support or the agreement of the local organizations. Therefore our ministry, as the member knows, two or three weeks ago issued a letter to them stating the way we would like to see it; not the way it was going to be, but the way we would like to see it. There is no question this has stimulated much more reaction than all the previous discussions we had privately with groups. That, by itself, was a good thing.

I can certainly assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we will be protecting people's jobs insofar as it's possible. I really don't believe a single person will involuntarily lose the opportunity to work in the hospitals in Windsor as a result of the changes we are going to be making, for several reasons. First, they deserve an opportunity to change if their particular facility or service is being altered or phased out. Secondly, the attrition rate in that particular industry is high and I'm sure we can work out an arrangement with the hospitals and the other agencies in Windsor to give this guarantee to the employees, because in my opinion they deserve it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Stormont.

LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Mr. G. Samis (Stormont): A question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations: In view of some of his comments this week regarding alcohol and other problems connected with it, can he tell us if he has any intention of introducing new guidelines or regulations regarding the advertising of beer and spirits in this province?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, we have distributed to all members a full and very detailed suggested code of procedure, and we have asked for comment. I don't intend to introduce anything until all the comments have been received and the ideas digested and analysed. Then we will, of course, be bringing out regulations. At the present time, there is an advertising code which is the most restrictive in Canada, and if there are suggestions from the public or hon. members to make it more restrictive, I'd be certainly glad to take them under advisement.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Welch presented the annual report of the Royal Ontario Museum for the period July 1, 1973, to June 30, 1974.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

CITY OF ST. CATHARINES ACT

Hon. Mr. Winkler, on behalf of Mr. Johnston moves second reading of Bill Pr11, An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill Pr11, An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines.

SHERIDAN PLACE ACT

Hon. Mr. Winkler, on behalf of Mr. Beckett, moves second reading of Bill Pr11, An Act respecting Sheridan Place.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill Pr12, An Act respecting Sheridan Place.

TOWNSHIP OF GOULBORN ACT

Hon. Mr. Winkler, on behalf of Mr. Morrow, moves second reading of Bill Pr14, An Act respecting the Township of Goulbourn.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill Pr13, An Act respecting the Township of Goulbourn.

CITY OF OTTAWA ACT

Hon. Mr. Winkler, on behalf of Mr. Morrow, moves second reading of Bill Pr14, An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill Pr14, An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

TOWNSHIP OF BRUCE ACT

Mr. Breithaupt, on behalf of Mr. Gaunt, moves second reading of Bill Pr25, An Act respecting the Township of Bruce.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill Pr25, An Act respecting the Township of Bruce.

REPRESENTATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Welch moves second reading of Bill 22, the Representation Act, 1975.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kitchener.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, since this is a bill that is somewhat different than many that are brought before us, I wonder whether the minister could advise us if he is proposing amendments that would require the bill to go into committee or just what procedure we will follow with

respect to any changes that might be contemplated by the ministry.

Hon. R. Welch (Minister of Culture and Recreation): Mr. Speaker, it was my hope that we would proceed with second reading today. I would like then to suggest that it go to committee of the whole House. There are one or two boundary descriptions we want to be satisfied with respect to, and then we would proceed to finish it up during the first part of next week.

Mr. Breithaupt: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, again because this is a somewhat different item than is usually before us, if the minister will be able to provide us with copies of those changes. Are they technical in description or are they substantive? I am sure the members would be quite interested.

Hon. Mr. Welch: At this stage, I'm only talking about satisfying ourselves with respect to one or two technical matters, and if in fact there are any changes—and I'm not suggesting there are any at all—certainly they would be provided to the hon. members ahead of time.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the second reading of this bill, I understand that it has been traditionally attended to over the years in such matters that debate, if it occurred at all, would be of course quite brief.

We have now gone through half a dozen steps as we approach the redistribution of constituencies within the Province of Ontario. After the first report was received from the commission, there were of course a number of comments made by members on various sides of the House. We were then favoured with a second report and a number of substantial changes in the second map which was prepared.

We had the opportunity, in actually debating the report of the commission during the last several days in January of this year, to have the results of that debate returned to the commission in case there would be any final changes that the commission would accept. As I recall, Mr. Speaker, 47 or 48 members involved themselves in that particular debate, and the results in the final report, which of course was in the form of a bill, Bill 22, represented many changes that members had suggested.

In one way, I suppose, it's rather difficult for a member to suggest particular changes because perhaps each one of us has a certain self-seeking motive as to how things might be changed. In that light, of course, we talk

about our own constituencies as though they were particular preserves. But I really feel that in the debate which took place in the House on this report, members did not look particularly at their own benefit but rather at the benefit of community interest in terms of the changes, because as representatives they are perhaps somewhat more aware of their impact than members of the commission. As a result, we have a balancing between the commission and the work it did, and the input of individual members.

I suppose there is really no requirement to return to the lengthy debate which we had when the report was referred to in those last days of January, 1975. I would suggest, though, Mr. Speaker, that the three particular points referred to in that debate perhaps could be mentioned again.

First of all, the commission in another time perhaps could be much benefited in its work if there were public hearings that were to take place. The commission, of course, has available to it a large number of sources of information. However, I think that another time the instructions that go to the commission should consider, and indeed should require, that there be some obvious source of public input. It is no longer sufficient to simply ask for submissions. We must, of course, as a result see that there is the opportunity in various centres across the province for the average citizen, for various groups, for municipalities and whatever to come face to face with the commissioners.

Another thing, I think the commission should be larger next time. We should attempt to have a somewhat broader group—perhaps seven or nine persons—involving various facets of the community, representing northern Ontario or eastern Ontario, bringing together certain of their own particular points of view, whether they have been serving as politicians at one time or another or whether they are active in their communities and therefore able to bring, hopefully, an unbiased view to doing the best kind of job as quickly as possible.

So the matter of public hearings and the size of the commission is one thing I think we should consider another time.

The second thing, which is even more important, is the allowable differential in population. In this instance we have seen that the approach taken, based on the instructions given by the commission, has attempted to live within the 25 per cent rule which was set, when one looks at the various kinds of ridings. In my remarks on

Jan. 27 I referred to the number of ridings that were involved and their differentials with respect to the Metropolitan Toronto area, with respect to northern Ontario and with respect to the other ridings that were outside of those two particular areas.

It is certainly not necessary to go over the details of those various figures, other than to suggest that a differential of perhaps 15 per cent would be the kind of goal which we think should be given to the commission as it attempts to do its work another time.

There was, of course, the other matter of the situation of boundaries within the city of Toronto. There has been much comment made on the requirements by the Ontario Municipal Board to structure the boundaries within the city of Toronto for a ward system to avoid the old kind of strip system that has historically been the case. This, we believe, should have been the case as well in the new boundaries which are set under this bill. However, the older boundaries have been accepted and this matter, while it is regrettable, is a decision which has now been accepted by the ministry.

So those are the three areas we think are ones which a commission should be involved in another time. We, of course, are very pleased that this bill has now come before us. The Premier (Mr. Davis) had, on a number of occasions, given his assurance that we would, in fact, be in a redistributed situation before the next provincial general election and, of course, this brings us one step closer to honouring that commitment. There will be eight new members who will join those of us who are successful in an election, whenever it may be called, and they of course are going to be representing various of the more quickly growing areas of the province.

The debate to which I had referred has been looked upon by the members of the commission in their final report with, I think, a great deal of favour. I believe all of the members who have joined in that debate should be pleased with the results that have generally attempted to resolve particular local issues. I am certain that none of us would be able to divide this province into 125 pieces and satisfy every member, or every proposed candidate or political party. However, I think the commission has done a good job within the terms of its recommendation. It has brought in a report which is now before us in the form of this bill and, other than the comments that I have made as to how the instructions might be improved another time, I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this debate today and the put-

ting into place of redistribution is certainly a milestone in the development of the province.

The chamber is getting a little crowded I am sure; you, sir, have to decide how to fit in eight more desks. However, I think the persons who will be responsible for that particular duty will be able to do so without too much difficulty.

We are pleased the bill has come forward for second reading and we look forward to its speedy passage.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Thank you. It is impossible, I suppose, to satisfy everyone, particularly when one is talking about the make-up of constituencies. I don't imagine this bill satisfies everyone any more than any other redistribution bill has done in the past.

I think part of the reason probably centres on the terms of reference. On looking back on the terms of reference we approved, we obviously didn't give sufficient consideration to what those terms of reference ought to contain. I think in the future, if we are going to have a further redistribution, as we no doubt will, we are going to have to set up a procedure whereby there will be an adequate opportunity for discussion about the terms of reference prior to their being passed by the House. I think that perhaps one of the standing committees should be charged with the responsibility of reviewing the debate that took place on this particular bill and on the recommendations of the commission. They should, to the best of their ability, come up with a set of criteria that could be used, rather broadly perhaps, as guidance for any future terms of reference.

At the time that we dealt with the government motion, I think that we probably didn't really understand the make-up of the various ridings in the province and the problems that might develop as a result of setting out the terms as we did. The major problem I see is that of using the census of 1971. I think we obviously can't, in a growing community, use a census that is already four years out of date to establish something which is hopefully going to last for 10 years into the future. To begin with, I think we should make it clear that we would use the most recent statistics that are available with regard to population. If they are any more than 12 months out of date, we would engage in establishing the newest statistics for the purposes of making up a redistribution bill.

The second thing is that I think we probably erred in saying what size the House must be. We tied the hands of the commission unnecessarily. The commission should be given the opportunity to come up with a recommendation in keeping with the criteria we establish. The size of the House will then naturally flow from that criteria. Rather than saying it cannot exceed a certain number and cannot be fewer than another number, we should leave that to the discretion of the commission after they have seen what the population figures and distribution of population figures show.

It is important that we have public hearings. I think we all agree on that now. It's a cumbersome process. It tends to be time-consuming but it also is a little more democratic. There are people outside of this legislative chamber who have an interest in the boundaries of the various constituencies. It would make a lot of good sense if the opportunity was given to municipalities and to other interested groups to appear before the commission and to make formal representation with regard to changes which they see as being necessary or desirable.

I think also that the working papers of the commission should be available. It was a point that we raised during the deliberations. It probably makes sense that the commission should be in a position of justifying its decisions in the event the decisions are questioned. It makes for a very much better sense of fair play in the community at large if, when a decision of the commission is questioned or a recommendation of the commission is questioned, they be in the position to provide the background and the reasoning to the decision to place a boundary in a particular place or to move it, for whatever reason.

The whole matter of redistribution is not going to be resolved to everyone's satisfaction but I think what we have to do is to make it as non-political as possible. We have to do everything in our power to make it as non-partisan as it can be. I think that's probably accomplished if it's known fairly clearly from year to year the basis for the deliberations of a commission and the way in which they're going to reach their decisions.

I think every one of us in the Legislature probably has a very strong attachment to the constituency they represent, and can think of all kinds of good reasons why certain pieces ought not to be taken out or why it ought not to be changed so drastically. But those are emotional things, in most instances, rather than logical reasoning. For most of us

it's simply a matter of finding it a little uncomfortable to deal with something we hadn't previously had to deal with.

I think that on balance the commission's task can be made more difficult if we cloak the deliberations they have in secrecy. I strongly urge that there be an openness about the commission's deliberations that will make it clear to everyone who might question how they arrive at the decisions they reach.

I think perhaps you'll hear from a number of members about their particular concerns. They're not satisfied about the size of the ridings, in many instances. We feel the distribution on the basis of representation by population is not yet fair, and that there is still an imbalance across the province that might be able to be corrected. It seems to me, as I look at the Province of Ontario, that it's extremely difficult to make an argument in some parts of southern rural Ontario that the constituency, were it to embrace representation by population, would be much too large; while at the same time suggesting that the constituency of my colleague the member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes) is just the right size. There's some inconsistency in that, given that he represents a constituency probably almost as big as southern Ontario itself.

If representation by population is something we believe in as a principle, then I think we have to strive very hard to accomplish it. A voter in the rural community should have only the same degree of influence on the legislative process as a voter in the urban community.

The interest in politics of a voter in the rural community is no greater, on average, than the interest in politics of the average urban voter. It takes, in many instances, two or three urban voters to make one rural voter when it comes to going to the polls. I think there's an imbalance there that we have to seek ways of correcting. I'm not exactly clear what that are, but that's the reason I suggest that the standing committee be charged with this responsibility when there is no pressure, when there is no public scrutiny, and when they can have the opportunity to sit together over a period of time and review all of the procedures that have been used, the procedures that are currently used in other jurisdictions, and come up with something that will be set out as a reasonable guideline for any future redistribution.

We, of course, are not intending to oppose the bill. I think the minister understands that. I am a little worried though, about his remarks to the House leader of the Liberal Party in regard to proposed amendments that

may or may not be coming forward. I would have thought, given the length of time this bill has sat on the order paper, that it would now be very clear whether these boundary definitions as set out are consistent with the recommendations of the commission and consistent with the views of the House. If there are to be any changes, then I would have thought those changes would have been well researched and it would then have been possible to tell us there are some minor things to be done in order to bring them into line with facts relating to municipal boundaries or the like.

I'd like to hear the minister tell us if he has something in mind. If it turns out not to be so, then of course nothing is lost; but if he has nothing in mind then I would wonder why we're going into committee, as I understand we are.

The bill no doubt will be debated by other people. But with those comments, I'd like to say finally that I think in some areas the commission probably misjudged the population growth. I think in some areas the commission has set up a situation that will be difficult to manage next year, as it was two years ago, and many of the constituencies are going to be far too large.

I think my colleague the member for Wentworth North (Mr. Ewen) would agree with me that another definition of bounds within that area would have made some sense. I have spoken with him privately, in a personal sense. I would have been happy to have found some reasonable way to renegotiate those boundaries, recognizing of course that not all of what's in one riding could necessarily be in another. But that doesn't seem to be possible.

On balance, though, we could do a better job if we better understood what the terms were to be and how the redistribution was to be conducted well in advance of any future redistribution.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin.

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the commission for the effort they have made to meet the requirements set out in the terms of reference and in the representations that were made by members in the last discussion of this bill.

I also want to comment on the matter of representation by population. I think that one man, one vote, is a desirable objective, but representation is also part of the overall objectives. As I pointed out when I spoke last time, it is much easier to contact a lot of

people in a compact city riding than it is in a large rural riding.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): The member does it by phone anyway.

Mr. Root: That's the very point that I want to raise. The member for Windsor West mentioned the telephone, as did the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy). I don't think they are aware that in the riding I represent there are 12 telephone systems; most of them are rural telephones on party lines, and as far as I am concerned as a member I am not going to discuss personal problems on a party line. That may be satisfactory to a member of the NDP, I don't know. In the cities where most people have private lines, perhaps the telephone can be used; but in a rural area one can't do that and maintain the confidentiality of discussions with one's member.

Two factors must be weighed in the matter of redistribution—to try to come as close as possible to representation by population, but keeping in mind the problem of representing people. As I mentioned when I spoke the last time, in the original concept of Wellington-Peel we were given a riding 90 miles long; if a member happened to be living at one side of the riding and there was a problem at the other side, it probably would take four hours to drive between the two points.

The suggestion was made to use a telephone. As far as I am concerned, I am not going to discuss private business on a party telephone. The person in the riding who has a problem will have to drive to see me or I will have to drive to see him. I think these are factors that must be weighed along with the idea of one man, one vote.

I think that whoever does the next redistribution must have flexibility. For example, look at some of the northern ridings—and I have been in them—where you will fly for half a day to get to a remote community to deal with problems. You can't say that in some of these ridings you can get down to 15 per cent as was suggested here. So I think you have to keep in mind the two factors.

In my own area, the riding of Wellington-Dufferin has a very fine member—maybe he could be replaced by one equally fine—representing a compact little riding of the city and two townships. The area that someone will represent, perhaps myself, will take in part of three counties and stretch for 85 miles.

As I mentioned before, we have a multiplicity of phone systems, and you just can't

do business on party lines when you are dealing with people's personal problems. Those are the only comments I would like to make.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to speak after the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin because some of what he said touches on what I wanted to say. I want to speak specifically about northern Ontario representation.

One of the ironies of this bill is that while northern Ontario representation has not been reduced in absolute terms it has been reduced in relative terms, because we have maintained only 15 seats out of 125 now, whereas we had 15 seats out of 117.

One of the ironies of that is that probably northern Ontario is the only part of the province that actually has representation by population. We have slightly more than 10 per cent of the population of the province. If we work out the percentage, we have slightly more than 10 per cent of the seats in the House.

It seems to me that while there are particular problems in rural ridings in southern Ontario, there are enormous problems in terms of communication in the ridings in northern Ontario. I wanted to get that particular point on the record, Mr. Speaker. I am a firm believer in the representation-by-population ideal. I think that it should be adhered to as closely as possible. There will always be some difficulties with that while we have a representation kind of Act.

What does disturb me about northern Ontario is that we still have one of the largest ridings in the province in Sault Ste. Marie, and the two adjoining rural ridings are not all that large in northern Ontario terms but are extremely small in population terms, extremely small, and surely a redistribution there could have taken that into account and perhaps created an extra seat in that area of the province.

The real irony about this whole argument with regard to northern Ontario is that north-western Ontario—those five ridings that cover 58.9 per cent of the land mass of the province—have only 3.5 per cent of the population and have four per cent of the seats. That is as close to representation by population as we can get, so the arguments put up by the commission don't seem to have been applied to northern Ontario nearly as generously as they have to rural southern Ontario.

I probably have one of the smallest ridings in terms of physical size in northern Ontario, and I have to travel only 75 miles from one end of my riding to the other. That's one of the smallest, if not the smallest. It's not the smallest in terms of population. It has a real mix in terms of rural and urban population and I want to put on the record that I think it's as difficult to service the particular problems of an urban centre that may have cultural difficulties, language difficulties, that kind of thing, as well as all the telephone difficulties that the previous member talked about in terms of getting in touch with my rural constituents.

One positive note that I would like to mention is that I was very pleased that the commission agreed with the brief that I submitted and maintained the traditional names of the ridings of Port Arthur and Fort William, contrary to the original position taken by the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman), who wanted the names changed to Thunder Bay North and South. I thought that the historic traditions—

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): They should change his name.

Mr. Foulds: We're going to, in the next election, change the name of the member for Fort William.

I thought the traditional historic backgrounds of both those ridings were quite different, and that while the city is amalgamated into the city of Thunder Bay the riding names would maintain that traditional history. With those remarks I would like to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your patience.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a few thoughts on the record pertaining particularly to only one item in the bill. That is the provision which would increase the membership in this House from 117 members to 125 members.

If one goes back through the history of this House we will see that the numbers of members in the House has fluctuated in both directions at different points in time. There seems to be no optimum number of members to have within this Legislature. If one will examine other elected Houses across this land and around the world one will find there are different philosophies and different approaches to having truly democratic elected representative government.

The biggest elected House in the world is the House of Commons in Great Britain, of

course, which has something in excess of 600 members. I have never visited the place but from what I understand and what I read it is completely unwieldy and too cumbersome to accomplish the work which is placed before it.

It is strange to look at the other side of the coin. One of the smallest jurisdictions in the world is the State of New Hampshire but the State of New Hampshire, surprisingly, has the second biggest number of elected members. The State of New Hampshire runs to about 485 elected members, so this, too, is a very cumbersome place. I don't know how one would deal with 485 members in this chamber. Even the present 117 on various occasions are quite unruly and quite out of control.

I'm sure the minister will understand that my philosophy is that large numbers of elected people do not necessarily represent good government. I'm not saying that 125 is too much or that 117 is too little but no one has ever explained satisfactorily to me why we will add eight seats to the representation in this House and consequently eight more members.

I've had the experience of sitting in the House of Commons in Ottawa, with its 265 elected members, and I'm sure other members who have had that privilege will agree with me that the place is quite cumbersome. It's more than twice as large as this chamber. The membership is twice as large and the place does get out of control once in a while and it is very cumbersome.

It has been suggested by various other people that one approach would be to make the provincial ridings coincide with the federal ridings as they relate to the Province of Ontario. That would give us, I suspect, an adequate number of representatives in this House and would also clear up a lot of confusion in the electorate and the various political parties as it relates to the difference between a provincial and a federal election. Coincidental boundaries, I think, is something maybe the minister should be looking at and maybe there will be another commission established in the future and we should think about that.

To relate a riding or a constituency to strictly population figures is really not realistic as well, I think. Given the large expanse of land we have in northern Ontario we cannot relate riding boundaries strictly to population densities. I'm sure anyone looking at the map of Ontario would understand that this would result in a reduction in membership from the northern part of the province

and the size of the constituencies in that event would be so large as to be almost impossible.

I think serving population is a different matter, however. I had the dubious pleasure of being in the company of one Senator Mendell Rivers from the United States and he was telling me how he deals with a constituency of 300,000 voters. That's quite a large constituency and yet a senator in the United States does cope with that kind of population within his constituency. I would not be afraid if the population figures as presently related to the division of the constituencies in the Province of Ontario were increased to something in the matter of 75,000 or 85,000. I think a member elected from such an area could service that kind of population provided he was given certain other assistance in the form of a constituency office and help within the riding that he chooses to service.

I want to put that on the record for future reference by any other commission inquiring into electoral boundaries, that more members do not necessarily mean better government. I think the more compact we can keep the house of assembly, the elected people, the more potent would be the representation. I would like the minister to respond to that suggestion and say whether it was looked into. Did the commission consider boundaries coincident with the federal boundaries? I would like an explanation of why he found it necessary to increase the representation of this House by eight members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Middlesex South.

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): Mr. Speaker, it is with some regret that I rise to say what I am going to say about the bill because, basically, I agree with the principles of it. I agree with the way in which the description was laid out about the job that was to be done, the terms of reference. I don't do it from a personal interest standpoint. I know that the member for Kitchener indicated that some of us could have that type of interest, and certainly we could, but I think we would all be prepared to live with them. For one, my riding is disappearing. I spoke in favour of that, as did the member for Middlesex North (Mr. Stewart) who is also losing his riding.

I do have to draw to the attention of the House what I feel was a disregard in the particular area of Middlesex for the terms of reference of the commission. I feel that the people in that area have expressed their

opinion very strongly. It hasn't been listened to.

I refer to a number of things that took place during the time and of actions of the commission which I feel were very badly handled. I refer to instances of letters going out to members about proposed changes and other members not being contacted by the commission, for which there seems to be no explanation. I refer to steps that took place during the commission's hearings when counties appeared on the scene after the first proposal to retain their entity as a county, and this was done.

In our last debate, items were brought forth as far as the areas were concerned. I think of the instance of the proposed Huron-Middlesex riding where the member for the existing riding proposed that a township—Tuckersmith—be brought back into his area. It was a natural thing to do because the interests were there and the commission followed suit on that proposal.

At the same time, we were proposing that type of thing for the area of Middlesex in the case of—I'm not going to refer to the total of Middlesex—Adelaide township, part of which goes right into and is connected to the town of Strathroy. It hasn't a large population. It's not going to affect a riding one way or the other politically or in total population because the population of the area is only about 2,000. But everything they do in that community ties into the town of Strathroy. Their hospital board and their area planning board all work together on these things. The roads that run from that area don't run directly to Huron county. If you look at a map, Mr. Speaker, it is much the same instance as the case of Tuckersmith township on the north end of that riding. They are effectively cut off.

I feel that the commission erred badly in not following their terms of reference, the terms of reference being the community interest. Certainly they didn't consider that in that case. As for means of communication, we pointed that out before and they didn't consider it. The existing and traditional boundaries weren't considered at all.

I have to say that I feel that the job done by the commission in that particular area in considering these things and considering the wishes of the people in that area was done badly. I know it's a difficult job, but the simple logic was expressed and put forward—it was there. The people in that area wrote to the commission in large numbers, as did the councils in that area, and yet they were not listened to.

I think at this point there is still an opportunity for a situation like that to be corrected, and I would urge that that situation be corrected. It's not going to make a difference in the totals of the ridings to any great degree. It's not going to make a political difference. I think it's a difference that all parties could accept, and so I ask that this be given consideration when the bill goes to committee.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was somewhat puzzled by the results of the commission's work, in that really nothing changed that much. I appreciate what the member for Middlesex is saying; that overall the electoral map in Ontario is basically the way it was before, namely a small increase in the number of seats and a continued rural bias throughout the province.

I agree with most of the members who have spoken and who talked about the strict representation by population as not being very realistic. I represent a very large riding—a very scattered riding—one that has a population in the neighbourhood of 50,000.

I share the concern of my colleague, the member for Port Arthur, that while the number of seats in northern Ontario has remained at 15, as a proportion of the total number of seats in the province it has actually declined. That bothers me.

I personally don't have any qualms about the number of seats in the legislature. It would not bother me if they increased substantially, because I've always thought that the more elected people you have, the more of a guard that is against a bureaucracy running the province or any other jurisdiction—that the elected members will guard against that. Of course, I think that's in the best interest of all of us. Perhaps the number of seats in the New Hampshire legislature is indeed a guard against civil servants running that state, as opposed to people who are elected to do that job.

The bill itself does not deal with the whole problem of service to the members, and there will be another chance to debate that.

I would say to the minister, however, that if the commission had wanted to keep representation of northern Ontario more equal, there were two opportunities to do that. One was in the Sault Ste. Marie area, where another seat could have been added; and another was in the Sudbury area, where the city of Sudbury could have been split into two seats if the adjoining ridings, Sudbury East

and Nickel Belt, had been taken into consideration as a package. I haven't done the exact arithmetic, but I believe they could still have maintained the guidelines that were given to the commission.

I think that that is something that we in northern Ontario have to guard against. I think that one reason we are sent down here by our constituents is to make sure that northern Ontario's voice is always heard in this chamber. And let's face it, as long as there are only 15 seats out of the 125, the political clout of the north will not be equal to, for example, the political clout of Metropolitan Toronto, which has twice as many members. Of course, I realize the relative populations, too, but I think that that is something we have to guard against.

Most of us admit that there are specific problems to northern Ontario. I think that decreasing that proportional representation in this chamber is not even the first step towards solving that problem. I suspect it's too late now to effect any major change, such as additional ridings in the north, but I do think that the minister should be aware that's how some of us from northern Ontario feel about the changes.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I should like very briefly to endorse the remarks of the hon. member for Sudbury about the number of seats being the same as those in the federal House for Ontario's proportion. In other words, the boundaries being the same for the provincial ridings and the federal ridings in Ontario. But I think the time for this move would be at the same time as the introduction of the ombudsman system, because if the ombudsman system works as it seems to work in other jurisdictions it is going to do the equivalent work of several members and their assistants or their secretaries. I don't think it would find any favour to increase the workload of the members at the present time, but to reduce it at the same time as the ombudsman system is introduced would be the ideal circumstance. I realize that the government has promised this ombudsman system. The "d" is silent, Mr. Speaker, according to my friends from Denmark, in the word ombudsman.

Because it is unlikely that these two are going to coincide, I am not optimistic that the member for Sudbury will have his ideas accepted. But I should like to reinforce his suggestion for a future commission, that if

the ombudsman system has not been instituted by the time a few more years roll around, the two be considered as a package arrangement.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a certain sense of déjà-vu in this debate, because most of the points have been raised before during the course of various debates that we have had on the questions of redistribution. I guess the frustrating part of it has been that the debates have had so little effect on the major points that have been raised about the redistribution as it was first proposed a few months ago.

A number of the specific problems have been resolved. Obviously, my own riding is one of them. The London area is another area which has been affected by specific representations that have been made to the commission and in this House. It seems to me that at least it is worth putting on the record for the next redistribution, which one hopes will come rather quickly, some of the problems that have existed with this one and possibly some ideas for reform or for changing the procedures.

What I would say first, Mr. Speaker, is that perhaps it is impossible for non-political people to arrive at a fair or equitable redistribution. That's a very odd thing to say, because we have always put a great reliance in the powers of an independent, royal commission kind of status.

I just have a contrast in my mind between the Camp commission on the one hand and the problems that have been entailed with this particular redistribution commission on the other hand. If we put in a fairly balanced group of people with direct experience in politics, and in fact, with political labels attached, and have them watching each other in order to try and come up with a fair redistribution, it seems to me that the possibilities are there that we can get a better job, a more effective job done than by putting in people who are independent on the one hand but who, on the other hand, may not be seized with political realities, and may not understand the kinds of situations which have been raised in many cases during the course of these very debates.

It is a bit like the principle of what I do with my kids when there is some chocolate cake on the table and I want to make sure that it is divided fairly. If I divide it and then pass it around to them then nobody is satisfied. If I ask one of them to divide it

and another one to have first choice I am sure one could not get a more fair and accurate division even with a micro metric scale for weighing. If it's a piece of cake which happens to have the icing off one side but to have an extra dollop of icing on the other side, as the minister well knows, being a father himself, there will be the appropriate adjustments made in the division between the size of the cake without the icing and the size of the cake with the icing.

I suggest that same homely principle might apply if the next redistribution commission were to be made up of a representative of the government of the day and of each of the major opposition parties presumably with expert advice from the electoral officers' office and with the sanction, if you will, Mr. Speaker, on the part of the government of the day that the opposition members would not gang up on the government member because of the fact that ultimately the government would have to bring the legislation in. If it were not seen to be fair to all three parties, there might be changes made in the House after the report was in.

I don't think the people who have been on the Camp commission worked in that way. I don't pretend that we may have agreed or that the government or the Liberal Party may have agreed with every recommendation, but I don't think there has been any ganging up of two against one in any of the permutations possible. I think there has been a fair and honest effort by people who are partisan to come to some reasonable kind of solutions. It seems to me the same thing might happen if a redistribution commission, next time, were to be made on a tri-party basis rather than the basis tried this time.

Last September I put forward some comments to the commission and I was looking through my files as this debate was going on to see what had changed between September and now. The major points made then have not really particularly changed and I have to say that with regret.

On the involvement of the public, well, the public has not been involved. The commission did not involve them and this Legislature has not involved them. I guess I have to assume that now we have arrived at this stage there will be no meaningful public hearings held. I would suggest that probably the time for that has passed.

The disparity between rural and urban ridings in southern Ontario is essentially unchanged. I haven't calculated the figures on round 3 of the commission's proposals but the

minister is aware there have been no significant changes from round 2 which would affect that disparity of about 20,000 to 23,000 voters per riding.

If I can put it on the record the rural ridings have an average population of just over 50,000, around 52,000 or so. The urban ridings have an average population of something over 70,000, around 72,000. That has basically not been changed, Mr. Speaker. Certain changes, such as the changes in the riding of Peterborough have increased the degree of disparity even more.

As I recall, I think the largest riding in the province now, in 1971 figures, would have had a population of around 82,000 or 83,000 people. The smallest one would be one of the Algomas. The smallest one in southern Ontario, the riding of Muskoka, would have about two-fifths of that number of people.

Oddly enough both of those have some vacation areas included within them and the commission defended the creation of Muskoka on the grounds that all those poor stockbrokers and company executives and other people like that who have cottages up in that area placed special demands on a member.

Just for the record, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that in the election of 1934 the riding which is now Muskoka was the riding of Muskoka-Ontario. It stretched down almost to the outskirts of Whitby and at that time it had 23,567 voters which I suspect is probably a larger number of electors than there will be in the election of 1975. This is one of the grotesque aberrations which has been created and which we've commented upon in the past.

A riding like Muskoka, in fact, has shrunk rather than expanded. In 1934 there were stockbrokers who used to go up on the Friday night trains to Bala and Port Carling, or perhaps would bravely venture out by car. The problems of the area were certainly no different than now in regard to the vacation areas, but that kind of thing has been allowed to stand by the commission as part of its general bias in favour of the rural ridings.

If the member for Wellington-Dufferin wants to argue that his riding should have 4,000 or 5,000 people fewer than my riding because of the transportation problems, I'm willing to listen to him. Or if a rural member on either side wants to argue that there should be special facilities made available to him, such as paying for an inbound WATS line to his home or to Queen's Park so that he can serve his constituents and they can

get in touch with his without having to pay toll charges, I'm certainly prepared to listen to that, because there are certain problems in servicing rural ridings that don't exist in the urban ridings. But it does not justify a population in rural ridings which is of the order of 30 per cent to 40 per cent below the population of average urban ridings.

May I say I hope in return that the member for Wellington-Dufferin would look sympathetically at people in my situation, for example, when I point out that right now I am spending \$10,000 or \$12,000 per year in my riding to maintain a constituency office to look after the problems of that particular riding. There are some special financial problems, in terms of time, in terms of demands on the member and so on, in looking after an urban riding as well. Obviously these are not to be dealt with in the form of redistribution alone, but I don't want the rural people to pretend that they have all of the problems.

We've talked about gerrymandering, the deliberate rejigging of seats that seems to favour one party over another in a particular area. If it existed at first, I think it has been pretty much cleaned up during round 2 and round 3. And obviously, as the minister will perceive from the way I'm talking, and the way our members and other members in this debate have talked, that is no longer at question.

It seems to me, though, Mr. Speaker, that the overall bias of a commission which favoured rural Ontario as strongly as this commission did, and as the government is doing in putting forward this bill, clearly reveals a pro-government bias there. It's an unconscious kind of bias. I'm sure it can be identified and justified by all sorts of high-sounding principles, but if you want to get down to the gut political realities, without sort of trying to save a particular seat, there's kind of a general aura of protection for the government by saying that the great blue belt that has traditionally run from the Quebec border almost to Lake Huron and Lake Erie and has been held by the Tories, will not be vastly changed by this redistribution.

Mr. Laughren: It will be changed by the election.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right. As the minister is aware, there may be other factors at work this time around in this particular election—

Mr. Laughren: Their ship is sinking.

Mr. Cassidy: But given a normal year, given the fact that the Premier hadn't

alienated so many groups in Ontario society and so on, then that kind of protection could have insulated the Conservative government against very substantial changes and voting sentiments in the swing ridings, which tend to be located in the city.

Mr. Speaker, again for the record, and in order that we will be able to look at it next time, I'd just like to recall that in the terms of reference, which I regret to say, our party, among others, supported back on Dec. 5, 1973, the modifying factors such as community and diversity of interests, communications, topography, population trends, traditional boundaries, special geographic considerations and so on, were all held out to the commission as being of greater importance than the desire to have ridings approximately equal in population.

Secondly, the redistribution commission's instructions allowed it to vary from the 25 per cent ceiling and floor, the variations that were to be permitted, at any time when in its opinion that was desirable. As a number of members have said it took enormous liberties with that particular freedom.

For the record, I would like to contrast the federal legislation of 1964-1965, I guess it is, which provided for the decennial census, and which should have set a model which could have been followed. In that particular case each boundaries commission—there was to be one per province—was told to divide its province into electoral districts so that the population of each district would correspond as nearly as many be to the electoral quota for the province.

Having been told to apply the quota, the commission was told it could depart from the strict application of the rules in the case of special geographic considerations or special problems within the community and diversity of interests. It was also told under no circumstances to vary by more than 25 per cent.

I have put on the record—I can't find it here—the number of ridings which vary by more than 25 per cent in the provincial redistribution. The contrast is more marked when one looks at the number of ridings which vary by more than 15 per cent over or under. The federal redistribution commissioners in Ontario had only 14 out of about 90 ridings in Ontario more than 15 per cent higher or lower than the quota for the province; or approximately 20 per cent. The provincial redistribution commissioners couldn't get it down to less than about 60 ridings: half the ridings in the province are more than 15

per cent higher or lower than the average population per riding.

As the minister well knows, the rural ridings are the ones more than 15 per cent or 25 per cent below their quota and the urban ridings are the ones more than 15 per cent above the quota.

Saskatchewan had a real honest-to-God blood-curdling gerrymander under Ross Thatcher. There was no question about that; it happened to lose him the election, people were so angry. Subsequently, when the New Democratic Party came into power in 1972 it brought in redistribution which has been universally acknowledged to be fair. In that case as well the commission was instructed to prepare a quotient or an average for each constituency, apart from the two or three northern constituencies. It was instructed to prepare a riding map so that each constituency corresponded as nearly as possible to the quotient established for the average population of the riding.

Having done that, it was told it could depart from strict application, again because of special geographic considerations, community or diversity of interests or physical features of a particular riding; it is pretty flat out there anyway. It is probably an easier job to do there than here. The point is that there again they were told to hold to the average population per riding except when there were substantial reasons for varying from it. Whereas, in this case, our commission was told to look at any conceivable reason why a riding should be kept as it was back in 1934, within its original boundaries, as it was, etc. Then, when it got around to it, to see if it could make it correspond in some rough way to the average population of ridings across the province.

Just for the record I would say there are approximately 14 or 15 ridings which vary by more than 25 per cent above or below the average population per riding in Ontario according to this redistribution. That figure has not been appreciably changed by the few amendments made by the committee.

I would like to make one final comment about the tendency of a community or diversity of interests to possible gerrymandering and so on. That is to talk about the strip riding system which has been retained for the city of Toronto ridings. I would say to the minister that if there is any case where the commission could be said to be acting to the direct political advantage of representatives of one political party—that is the government—it would have to be in the refusal to go from the strip to a block riding system for

the city of Toronto ridings. There's absolutely no question about that, Mr. Speaker. The minister has been around Toronto long enough to know that it's been a tradition since time immemorial in the Toronto ridings that the Conservative Party has used votes from north of Bloor in order to obliterate whatever it was that the voters from south of Bloor may have wanted to do. It's the voters from north of Bloor, where the turnout is higher and the socio-economic status is much higher, who have traditionally been involved like that.

If the member for St. David (Mrs. Scrivener) or the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Grossman) or people like that feel, as they have claimed, that they have strong support from working class voters who basically do live south of Bloor St. in Toronto, then obviously what they should do is push the government to bring in a block riding system and then stand for the riding which includes Regent Park or stand for the riding which includes the Hydro block and the islands and the other residential districts that lie to the south and west of this particular chamber.

I'd like to put on the record, Mr. Chairman, the judgement of Mr. J. A. Kennedy, the chairman of the Ontario Municipal Board when the question of strip or block wards was before the OMB. The minister may recall that at that time the city wanted to keep the strip ward system because that was in the interests of the old-guard aldermen who then held most of those seats. It's very similar to the situation perhaps at the provincial level. The old-guard politicians who now hold those seats for downtown Toronto would like to keep the present system as well. Mr. Kennedy said:

These two plans, in the board's view, represent two different schools of thought as to the proper basis for division into wards. The strip plan is based on the principle that in large municipalities it is wise to have a ward representing a cross-section of the city if possible, so that each individual member of council may be taken to represent all the divergent problems and issues representing every part of the city, having been elected in a cross-section ward, which will be affected by these various issues and problems.

On the other hand, the principle behind the suggestion that the city be divided according to the block plan is that each alderman would have a more compact area to serve and will find in the area that he represents the special community problems that pertain to that particular area of the

city. This latter approach is said to result in a greater confrontation around the council table among aldermen who represent these varying problems as they change from area to area.

In the respectful opinion of the OMB, the block plan approach for wards is preferable to the cross-section plan since it creates a greater tendency—indeed, a greater achievement—in having the various conflicting problems from the different areas debated around the council table rather than having such debate occur within the conscience, so to speak, of each individual alderman. It is significant that all the opinion evidence presented by persons well qualified in the field of political science was in favour without exception of the block plan approach, for the reasons summarized above.

No person trained in political science or any other social sciences appeared to espouse the strip plan or cross-section approach. It is also not without significance that a great many ratepayers' organizations, as well as two political parties which intended to take part in the then forthcoming municipal elections, all favoured the block plan. Indeed the only support for the city's plan came from three aldermen who appeared to argue in support of the proposal which they had made.

For the record, the Liberals and the NDP were contesting the 1969 municipal elections but the support wasn't just a matter of political support. The reasons for espousing a block ward system in Toronto, a city, incidentally, whose wards are almost the same in population as its ridings, were based on much broader grounds and on grounds that prevail in here as well.

I have to ask the minister, and maybe he can reply to this, could he let us be privy to the wrangling and conflicts within the conscience of a Margaret Scrivener, a George Nixon, or an Allan Grossman as they struggle with themselves to decide which side of their political personality will come to the fore and whether they will speak for north of Bloor St. or south of Bloor St. in their arguments in caucus or in this particular chamber? I'm sorry that none of them is here in order to comment on that.

I think the minister, though, can see the problems that are involved. I think he knows as well that because of the larger turnout of people from the more affluent areas of these strip ridings it means that on balance the member is liable, as we all are liable, perhaps to lean in the direction of the people who gave him or her the greatest support. As

a consequence, whatever may be in the conscience or the feelings of people who come from the working-class areas of these strip ridings is not likely to have the same expression in this chamber as the feelings of the people who live up in those more affluent areas. That is the problem with the strip ward system.

I would hope that since the minister has some streaks of charity in him—and I don't just mean the lottery that he is conducting so publicly these days—and a certain amount of compassion, I would hope, in his activity within the Church of England, that possibly the government might get up now and say "Yes, we'll see whether we can't redraft those ridings over the weekend." I could do it for the minister in the course of about 15 minutes—draw a dividing line in the vicinity of Bloor St. or Davenport and have ridings that are more homogeneous, and that have much more of a community of interest, a socio-economic homogeneity, and so on, by adopting a block riding system.

I have to confess, Mr. Speaker, that when I get into a car and go along College St. in this city and find the riding boundaries zipping by almost as fast as the streetcar stops, I find it very difficult to understand how it is possible for anybody to represent those people effectively. The means of communication are east-west. The areas are blobs rather than lines, in terms of the way in which they settle. All common sense as well as the expert opinion would suggest the commission should have looked at block ridings rather than strip ridings. I would hope the government would be prepared to make that change now.

All of this is uttered in a certain amount of sorrow and not in anger, Mr. Speaker, and if the debate on redistribution which has gone on for the past nine or 10 months has any effect, I hope it does have an influence in ensuring we do a good job next time, rather than the lacklustre performance we've had to endure on this particular occasion.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to speak before the minister replies? The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, as the debate that followed the tabling of report No. 2 indicated, certainly it has provided an opportunity for the members of the House to really reconsider the whole question of the representative system to which we adhere. Certainly within my short memory as a member of this House I would think the

members of the Legislature, with respect to this redistribution, have had more opportunity to express their points of view on that particular subject and on their particular concerns than in any other redistribution with which I've been connected or with which I am familiar.

There is very little, I think, to be added to some of the points that have been quite interestingly made by members of the House—the member for Kitchener and the member for Wentworth and the others who have spoken. The contributions to the debate on the second reading of this bill, of course, were no doubt points either raised or which should have been raised at the time of the introduction of the motion establishing the redistribution in its initial stage.

The spirit with which these comments have been made is one of hoping that when another redistribution comes before this House and the motion to establish the commission is introduced there would be an opportunity to debate these particular principles and to have these particular points of view underlined at that particular time.

I would want to join with all who have spoken to pay tribute to the work of the commission. I would think it was obvious that it hasn't been an easy job. One of the members of the House has already indicated in his contribution to the debate this morning that it would be very difficult indeed to have everyone pleased with respect to this work.

Certain loyalties develop, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you. This is the second time that part of the riding which I was first elected to represent in 1963 has now been taken away; and certainly over the years a member of the Legislature develops a very close relationship with the people whom he is sent here to represent.

Mr. Cassidy: Was the minister the honorary fire chief down there?

Hon. Mr. Welch: No, that distinction has never fallen to the member for Lincoln; I have never had that particular honour—Indian chief and a number of others, but never fire chief. However, as you know, Mr. Speaker, in fact I think we all share this particular responsibility of putting fires out as far as our representative work is concerned—certain loyalties do develop and when those breaks come, they are not easy.

We had evidence of that following the tabling of the second report. Members would rise in their place and express concerns about

the fact these changes were being made and their regret that redistribution would mean that certain decisions would have to be taken with respect to areas that had formerly aligned with the established ridings over that period of time. So this is understood and these particular comments were made with much feeling at that time.

While I am making that point, I can appreciate very much the concerns expressed this morning by the member for Middlesex South. I know that if the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) were here, as the member for Middlesex North he would support very strongly the views expressed this morning by the member for Middlesex South.

I know by some telegrams which have arrived recently at my office since the Premier asked me to have some responsibility for the carriage of this Legislation, that if the Minister of Housing (Mr. Irvine) were here this morning he would have some very definite points of view to express with respect to the results of the work of the commission insofar as it affected the area which he represents in the House presently as Grenville-Dundas. I am sure that if he were here he would be reading into the record this concern as it has been expressed in telegrams and by mail from those who, having studied the third report, are still not pleased with the result.

So I say that, I am also sure that any number of members—either present today, or who would like to be here, but can't because of some other responsibilities that are connected with their representative assignment here—would express this concern as well.

However, I go back to the establishment of the commission itself, these three distinguished gentlemen. No one questions their integrity. No one has questioned the difficult job they have had in making these decisions as far as electoral boundaries are concerned, given their terms of reference—which terms of reference were debated in the House at that time. In fact, they have had three reports, which are now in bill form. It was my understanding that following the publication of their first report they had over 300 submissions from the public of the province in one form or another. This response manifested itself in report No. 2. And then, of course, the debate on report No. 2, was the opportunity for the members of the Legislature to share their concern with the commission. There was the transmittal of the Hansard records of that debate to the commission, with report No. 3 being the result.

I am not able—and I would think that you would be very surprised if I were, Mr. Speaker

—to go into all of the detail which must have influenced the commission. It was an objective commission established independent of the Legislature, but with terms of reference given to it by the Legislature. And within the framework of that particular motion the commission members addressed themselves to the responsibility which was theirs.

As I have already said, I would join with other members of the House in paying tribute to them for the work they have done, notwithstanding that everyone might not necessarily be pleased as it affects their own particular area.

As far as the rural point of view is concerned, I find that of some interest. I count myself among those sent to the Legislature to ensure that, among the interests which would be mine and the special concerns which I would express, would be those of that part of rural Ontario which makes up the Niagara Peninsula. It's not exclusively rural; there's a very large rural component in the great riding of Lincoln. In many of our ridings we find a very interesting blending of urban and rural components, and I think it's very important that the rural point of view is one which is voiced in this Legislature, keeping in mind the rate by which urban development is of course evidenced here.

The whole question of the production of food, the whole question of the development of land—all these matters are very legitimate concerns that must be kept before us. Indeed, I think it is important when one thinks about the whole concept, and someone today raised the very interesting point about balance. If we were to be very strict on the principle of representation by population, as someone suggested today, we might lose sight of some of those factors, which of course would have to modify that to some extent, and which prompted the Legislature to allow the rate of tolerance with respect to population as it affected the rural areas, the populated areas and of course the north.

Mr. Cassidy: That was grossly exceeded.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The member for Ottawa Centre makes his point that notwithstanding that, there is some question with respect to that, and I appreciate the fact that he has put that on the record because that will be something to be taken into account at another time.

I'm also interested in the comments—and I say this just as an aside—with respect to the population figures that are to be used. With a census in Canada only every 10 years, I

suppose it's going to be necessary to try to have redistributions as close as possible to the publication of census figures, because they can come out of date quickly. But, as I explained to the people in my area as we talk about redistribution, we are committed by our system of government to one which calls for representation by population within these guidelines and with the modifications, some of which we have made reference to. Since the last redistribution was in 1967, I believe, and the population of the province has increased substantially during the intervening eight years, it's only natural that there would be a review of electoral boundaries to ensure as far as is practicable consistent with taking all interests into account, that we come as close to satisfying ourselves that we have a Legislature which is divided among constituencies which reflect this principle of representation.

Many other points have been raised today, and I've listened to them very carefully because I feel, now that this debate on second reading is coming to a conclusion, that they certainly would be of value and worthy of consideration in so far as future redistributions are concerned. I can assure the members of the House that I will draw the Premier's attention to those particular points that have been made.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Committee of the whole House.

Mr. Speaker: Committee of the whole House.

Agreed.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, at this point when we are dealing with this matter, can the minister advise us if it is his intention to provide us with the proposed amendments, perhaps before the bill is called in the early part of the week, or does he intend in fact to call the bill on Monday so that we will be made aware of what they are?

Hon. Mr. Welch: If I might respond to that, Mr. Speaker, I think the important word is "if," because I have none in mind at the time; but if there were to be any changes, as I stated earlier, certainly I would want the hon. members to have a copy of them before they were brought in.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

BUDGET DEBATE

(continued)

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I would comment on the fact that we are fortunately now able to proceed with the continuation of the debate on the motion with respect to the budget.

It has been some days since I was able to commence my remarks with respect to this item, and I am certainly happy that this additional time has now been made available earlier than might otherwise have been the case, so that I would be able to continue.

I would thank Mr. Norman Webster of the Globe and Mail for making a necessary correction to a figure which appears on page 801 in Hansard for April 14.

Mr. Cassidy: It's a \$500,000 error.

Mr. Breithaupt: It is in the fourth last line of that first column.

I had stated that in the budget the Treasurer had added \$208 to the per capita debt of Ontario, but in fact that figure covered a two-year period. The amount added by this budget is correctly stated at \$139.21 per person.

The increase in this debt for the four years from 1971 to 1975 totalled \$227.06. The one-year increase planned for 1975-1976 is more than half as much as that four-year amount.

Mr. Cassidy: But the member was out by \$500,000, is that right?

Mr. Breithaupt: There was an error in the statement; that is correct.

Mr. Cassidy: Of about \$500,000.

Mr. Breithaupt: I didn't work out the additional figure, but in any event, Mr. Speaker, the correction for that mathematical error is now made.

But the situation is certainly a far cry from the Robarts years of 1966 to 1971, when the average debt per capita within this province was only a total of \$196.26. In the four years of this present government we have multiplied our total debt almost three times from the level of four years ago.

I certainly hope, sir, that this is the only correction that will be needed in the mathematics of the first part of my reply to the

budget. I must thank Mr. Webster for reading my remarks very carefully, which is apparently more than the editorial writers of the Toronto Star were able to do.

It should be obvious that funds for health service coverage must come in some form from the taxpayers of Ontario. Any investigation of removing separately collected OHIP premiums naturally would look at the savings in those collection costs and in processing expenses. If they are substantial, as I suspect, and if the matter of employer payment for employees under many of the collective bargaining arrangements can be worked out, then surely this is a matter which any cost-conscious Minister of Health should investigate.

As a result, a simple income tax surcharge might raise the necessary funds from those who can best afford to pay, and at the same time protect the pensioners and others on various allowances, while cutting out the present administrative costs.

I use this solely as an example of one item which I think is worthy of investigation. If my other remarks about savings in the costs of health care remind us of the speeches made by the former minister, the member for Quinte (Mr. Potter), then so much the better. A Liberal government would at least take these thoughts to heart and not ignore them the way this present government has ignored them.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier's lavish Science Centre announcement in November, 1972, the magnetic levitation system has been subjected to growing attack and scepticism by responsible authorities. The government's own figures show that the system's operating costs—assuming that it can ever be made to operate at all—have increased from one cent per passenger mile, the figure used back in May of 1973, to at least three cents per passenger mile, the figure given to Toronto's transportation committee 16 months ago.

The civil engineering costs for the test demonstration system at the CNE jumped from an estimated \$6 million to \$13 million. What are the cost implications for any practical application of this technology? Long after these facts became known, this government has continued to waste public money on this ill-conceived public relations version of an urban transit system.

Nobody knows even yet whether GO-Urban will ever, in fact, go anywhere. Many technical and financial questions remain unanswered. For instance:

1. The Krauss-Maffei vehicle is supposed to be propelled and levitated by a type of

motor that has never before been used for ground transportation.

2. The firm chosen by the government to develop its system, Krauss-Maffei of West Germany, has never sold a magnetic levitation system to anyone and has now withdrawn entirely from the urban system development.

3. The British government has abandoned its experimental work on magnetic levitation systems.

4. A report prepared for the province by the Toronto Transit Commission, which was not made public for nine months, indicates that GO Urban would cost more and have less potential than light rapid transit, another type of intermediate capacity system already operating in about 40 European and North American cities.

5. A report prepared for the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board by the man who has since been hired by the province's Deputy Minister of Housing states that light rapid transit:

could be developed and therefore prepared for application at the same time as the GO-Urban system. Furthermore, there is now evidence that a light rapid transit system could be less expensive than GO-Urban.

6. The provincial government's own figures show that magnetic levitation would use at least twice as much electrical energy as light rapid transit, and other estimates have indicated the power consumption of magnetic levitation could be 10 times as much as light rapid transit.

Ontario cities need a transportation system to meet today's needs, not those of 20 or 30 years from now. There is no indication that this futuristic mode could be developed and operating in time to meet those needs. The expenditure of one more cent on this system cannot be justified.

Despite the Treasurer's (Mr. McKeough) claim to the contrary, the Davis government has not restrained its spending. There has been no credible attempt to control costs. There has been no effort to increase the productivity of government. The taxpayers are still not getting value for their money. We continue to waste money on politically-motivated advertising campaigns and redundant policy secretariats. The proposal to reduce the civil service falls somewhere between confusion and deception.

Mr. Speaker, spending is up 16.8 per cent. The deficit has been increased to \$1.669 billion from last year's level of \$1.030 billion. This is a record one-year increase of 62 per

cent. As the Treasurer must know—certainly his advisers must have told him—when governments spend more than they have, inflation is fed again.

What, then, is the sum total of the government's programme to fight inflation which, in its own words: "Constitutes the main threat to Canada's economic stability and international competitiveness?" It is to increase government's spending by 16.8 per cent. It is to increase the deficit by 62 per cent. How does this square with the Treasurer's statement: "This government has resisted the temptation to take up the current slack in the economy through increased government spending?"

The total divergence between the Treasurer's statements and his free-spending policy might cause some voters to conclude that he doesn't know what he's doing. But others, including this one, suspect that he does. He still entertains the delusion that the Davis government can be re-elected if only they spend enough money. He wants to buy an election with public money. His budget is, as the Hamilton Spectator said, "an undisguised election document." It has nothing to do with responsible financial management. With inflation running at more than 10 per cent annually, this budget just flies in the face of common sense.

That's where the Treasurer has miscalculated. Few voters are sophisticated economic analysts, but every one of them has common sense. After the recurring scandals and indiscretions that have emanated from this government, the voters have developed a healthy cynicism about everything it does. They almost automatically expect a con job from this government, and that's about the only expectation that this budget satisfies.

In a sense, Mr. Speaker, all this has been introductory. Now let's take a close look at the budget itself.

On April 14, I mentioned that the Premier and the Treasurer seemed determined to mimic Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid, determined to go out in a blaze of glory. But on reflection I think that my reference is to the wrong film. We have the same two actors, but their roles are in "The Sting," and the budget they have produced is the big con.

I said earlier that the budget was an incredible document, that it cannot be believed. I have outlined some of the serious inconsistencies between the Treasurer's statement and his policy. Now I would like to discuss the budget's major flaw, the principal source

of its incredibility. This budget is based on three assumptions. Two of them are entirely false and the third is at least very doubtful.

The first assumption is that, "the United States economy will turn around in the second half of 1975." As part of this assumption, the Treasurer has projected that the turn-around will limit the decline in real economic growth in the United States this year to "between 3.1 per cent and 3.3 per cent."

In fact, those expectations are two months out of date. They are from President Ford's budget forecast in mid-February and have since been substantially revised downwards. That same budget's statement projected 8.1 per cent unemployment in the US in 1975. Ford's economic advisers abandoned that prediction before it was two weeks old. American unemployment hit 8.2 per cent in January, 8.2 per cent in February and 8.7 per cent in March.

The US administration has revised its projection for real economic growth this year and now officially expects a decline of 3.5 per cent.

On Thursday, two weeks ago, the US Commerce Department's top economist stated that American unemployment will peak at more than nine per cent and that it is unlikely the US will make any substantial progress toward reducing the unemployment level until late this year. He said further that any recovery in the second half of 1975 will be sluggish.

The Treasurer's assumption concerning American economic performance was known to be wrong before he presented his budget on that Monday night. As a result of developments since President Ford's budget presentation, most economists, including the authoritative Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, are now predicting a decline of four per cent to five per cent in the United States real GNP this year.

The Toronto investment firm of McLeod, Young, Weir and Co., advises in its recent forecast for 1975 that:

At the present time there can be no question that real economic activity in the US is in a state of virtual collapse. Moreover and more serious, the leading indicators do not suggest that the slide is coming to an end. Almost all the key leading indicators, such as new orders, building permits issued, housing starts, continue to head lower.

Manufacturing rose slightly in February for the first time in six months. But retail sales

in March dropped .06 per cent for the first time since November. The Conference Board in the United States, which conducts a consumer buying intention survey, warns that, "if a general economic turnabout is dependent on a surge of consumer demand, it would appear that we still have some time to wait."

Last week, the US Commerce Department predicted that the American economic slowdown will result in dramatic cutbacks of the capital investment plans in the US branch plants operating in Canada. A mid-1974 survey of Canadian affiliates of American companies forecast an increase of 19 per cent in their 1975 capital spending. By the end of the year the companies, most of them located in Ontario, had scaled down their plans and were projecting only a six per cent increase in their plant and equipment expenditures.

Ontario's budget optimistically predicts a 17.4 per cent increase in public and private investment this year. But that prediction, like all his others, were based on the false assumption about the United States economic situation.

The Treasurer's second assumption, that energy prices will remain stable through 1975, may not be false, but it is certainly doubtful. The Premier's eleventh-hour conversion to a position opposing further oil and gas price increases is certainly welcome news for the people of Ontario. It is amazing what the fear of electoral defeat will do to some breeds of politician.

Last year you will remember, Mr. Speaker, he went to the federal-provincial oil price talks uninformed and unprepared. While the premiers from Alberta and Saskatchewan talked about city gate and wellhead prices, the Premier from the largest consuming province, the one who was such a competent manager, just kept nodding his head. By the time it was over he had agreed to a package that cost Ontario's consumers nine cents a gallon for gas.

By the Treasurer's own admission, the Premier's acquiescence a year ago has already cost 22,000 jobs in this province, and will prevent the creation of 38,000 more this year. The agreement depleted the personal savings of every resident in the province by \$10 last year, and will take \$6 more from each of our bank accounts this year.

The Treasurer has calculated further that his leader's blunder last year pushed prices 3.5 per cent higher than would otherwise have been the case. Now, this same Premier wants us to celebrate his strength and determination in protecting our interests. Well,

where was he last year—and where has he been since?

When the Premier of Alberta was campaigning for a mandate to rip off Ontario, where was our Premier? When the Premier of Alberta charged that Ontario's petrochemical industry was trying to bleed Alberta dry, and when he characterized the consumers of Ontario as "bargain hunters," where was Ontario's Premier then? If the member for London South (Mr. White) wants to make speeches about politicians who are tearing this country apart, let's hear him or anyone from the Ontario government say a few words about Premier Lougheed. Why do they avoid the central oil price issue of Alberta's royalty structure?

Now, the Ontario Treasurer has based his entire budget on his leader's last-ditch grandstanding. The Premier's commitment to control oil prices is so weak that he won't even empower the Ontario Energy Board to regulate prices within Ontario. Are we supposed to believe that this same person will keep oil prices down for all of Canada? Certainly, there is no legitimate reason to increase the gas and oil prices paid by the people of Ontario, just as there was no legitimate reason to do so last year. The greatest part of any such increase would only further swell Alberta's already bulging coffers and those of the federal government, too.

The Premier's deathbed repentance on oil prices, like this budget, is incredible; not believable. Everyone at the conference knew he was grandstanding for the voters back home. It was obvious as soon as they saw his companions. He took along the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development so he would seem tall, and he took along the Minister of Energy so he would seem smart. Who really expects that the other first ministers were taking the Premier's remarks seriously?

The Treasurer's final assumption concerns the Canadian economy, which he has predicted will grow by 2.6 per cent in 1975. Again his assumption is false. As the federal Minister of Finance announced, it seems unlikely that, on average, our national production this year will be appreciably higher than last year.

Ontario's Treasurer should have known well before his budget that Canadian economic growth would be substantially less than the 2.6 per cent he has assumed. The Conference Board of Canada was forecasting zero growth a month ago and has projected a national unemployment rate of 8.5 per cent. The 1975 Ontario budget assumed 6.8 per cent national unemployment.

The Financial Post reported the Canadian economic predictions of 12 economists on March 22, 1975, some 10 days before the Ontario budget. Every one of them predicted a real growth rate of less than the Treasurer's 2.6 per cent assumption. Ten of the 12 predicted a higher unemployment rate than the Treasurer has assumed.

The impact of these false assumptions on the Treasurer's budget forecast is dramatic. It is probable that had he used the correct assumptions his forecast for economic growth in Ontario would be cut back to zero from 2.5 per cent.

His forecast for new job creation would also be cut back and his unemployment prediction would exceed six per cent. His forecast for public and private investment would also be substantially lower.

With correct assumptions, the Treasurer's budget itself also changes dramatically. Revenues drop and the deficit soars even higher, almost certainly about \$2 billion. The expenditure forecasts for municipalities, particularly for welfare payments, are also higher when accurate assumptions of high unemployment are used.

The budget is not credible. The entire document is based on false assumptions. Its economic forecast is wrong; the spending forecast is wrong; its deficit forecast is wrong. The fine words about spending restraint do not match the huge spending increase. The claim that the civil service complement is being reduced is supported by inconsistent and incomplete figures.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, the only reliable statement is the one on page 16 of the budget highlights. It reads: "Expiry of the temporary stabilization measures introduced in the budget ensures the long-run financial stability of Ontario." Why wait for them to expire? Why not scrap the whole budget now and avoid endangering the provincial economy at all? This budget more than anything previous makes it clear that the only way to ensure the long-run financial integrity of Ontario is to defeat this government and that is exactly what we intend to do.

While we are on the subject of the budget's incredibility, Mr. Speaker, let's look at some of its specific measures. First, the sales tax cut. The Treasurer claims; "Savings to the consumer will be substantial."

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Has the member any real confidence his party would improve things at all?

Mr. Breithaupt: We are certainly going to try.

How substantial are these cuts, Mr. Speaker? What are the benefits to the consumers? The effect of the sales tax decrease on retail purchases will be a reduction of 1.87 per cent but the Treasurer is predicting that inflation will be running at 9.5 per cent this year. On that basis, the total tax cut will be wiped out entirely within 10 weeks. By year end, when the tax cut expires, consumers will be 6.3 per cent behind where they were on that Monday.

Of course, the cynicism of this tax reduction, this temporary tax reduction, has been pointed out constantly since the Treasurer presented his budget. It bears repeating that clearly this government is more concerned with seeking its own re-election than with restoring long-term stability to the Ontario economy.

What sort of long-term stability could possibly result from a tax cut which lasts less than nine months? Only this short-sighted government would dare to call nine months long-term. What are the plans for next Jan. 1? Will the tax go back up to seven per cent? Or will it be up to nine per cent in order to recoup lost revenues?

The increase in GAINS payments was, of course, welcome. The payments are only 10.8 per cent over last year, barely keeping pace with inflation. Mr. Speaker, we have argued this before, and I repeat, surely Ontario's pensioners should not have to depend upon the whims of the provincial Treasurer to maintain their buying power. These cost-of-living adjustments should be automatic, built into the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is fascinating that the Treasurer tells us in this budget that his measures will add 7,000 pensioners to the 303,000 currently receiving GAINS payments. In last year's budget, when the GAINS programme was first introduced, the Treasurer told us, and I quote: "More than 310,000 people will receive Ontario GAINS cheques in July, 1974." Mr. Speaker, it is now April, 1975, and the Treasurer is telling us that there will not be 310,000 receiving GAINS until next month.

Whose figures are we to believe? If there are only 303,000 pensioners receiving GAINS now, what happened to the more than 7,000 extra who supposedly, started receiving GAINS nine months ago?

Once again, Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer has nothing for the low-income families in Ontario. He has free drugs for even the wealthiest senior citizen but he has no prescription for the more than 400,000 children who are living in poverty right here in On-

tario. In this province, 22.8 per cent of rural children are in poverty; in one-parent families headed by men, 24.6 per cent of these children grow up in poverty—

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): That is true. It's absolutely true.

Mr. Breithaupt: In one-parent families headed by women, 65.2 per cent of children are in poverty.

Under the existing family benefits legislation in Ontario, some welfare families in Toronto have as little as 50 cents per day per person to spend on food. Actual rental rates in Toronto on average are \$37 per month more than what is allowed in the legislation. While the Metro Social Planning Council has calculated that an unemployed mother living with three children would need \$728 a month to function healthily, this government pays no more than \$450 a month and the majority of recipients live on much less. Well, \$450 a month for a mother with three children is \$30 a month less than we are paying a pensioner couple whose main expenditure years have long since passed. Where's the justice? Where's the consistency in government policy? But then, of course, Mr. Speaker, none of those 400,000 poor children have votes.

Mr. Laughren: That's cynical.

Hon. M. Birch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): How cynical.

Mr. Breithaupt: While we're on the subject of hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at the small business tax credit. It only provides help for businesses that are already doing well. There's nothing for the businessman who is on the ropes. The tax credit is applied against a business's increase in investment capital. In other words, it cannot be claimed unless the businessman already has sufficient retained earnings to increase his investment or unless he has a good line of credit. Is it only coincidence that small businessmen without substantial retained earnings are really in no position to donate to party coffers?

It is significant that again this year, in the budget's measures to increase investment in productivity, there is no mention of regional disparities or economic growth in Ontario. By focusing Ontario's growth on the Toronto-centred region, the provincial government has bled people and jobs from other parts of the province, particularly the north and east. As a result, unemployment rates in those parts of the province are unnecessarily high and unnatural inflationary demands for accommo-

dation have been created in Toronto and nearby centres. While the area between Burlington and Oshawa is growing at a rate of 2.6 per cent every year, the area between Kingston east is growing only half as fast, and in northwestern Ontario the population is actually declining.

This budget reveals that the Davis government still has no commitment to attract population or secondary industry to the northern or eastern parts of Ontario. There is no co-ordinated plan to decentralized industrial growth from Toronto. This is nowhere indicated better than by the government's announcement last Jan. 28 that a 10,000-acre industrial park would be built near Prescott. That announcement ended more than six months of worry and uncertainty for the residents of Edwardsburgh township about the identity of the mysterious buyer who was assembling all their land. They learned, despite repeated denials by their own member, the Minister of Housing, and by the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett), that the Davis government was behind the scheme from the beginning.

With typical Tory arrogance, reeves and mayors from the area were summoned to Queen's Park and told of their future, as decided by the mandarins and political advisers in downtown Toronto. They were told that the Davis government is now competing with them for new industrial growth in eastern Ontario. They were told that all the important decisions had been made without their knowledge or assistance.

According to the Financial Times of Canada, the nine largest municipalities in eastern Ontario have about 4,200 acres of vacant serviced land in industrial parks. In Peterborough, the city will service another 100 acres within the next year. But rather than help municipalities attract industry according to local plans, the Davis government wants to build its own industrial site controlled, of course, by Queen's Park.

The decision to buy the land and to establish an industrial park was made by four cabinet ministers only—none of them from eastern Ontario and not, apparently, including the Minister of Industry and Tourism who is now in charge of the project. He is the same man who observed several months ago that "We'd be completely off our nut to build a new industrial park there."

Mr. Laughren: He was right. It is self-fulfilling prophecy.

Mr. Breithaupt: The doubletalk, backtracking, lack of consultation and hopeless confusion even within the Davis cabinet are further signs of the impending collapse of a tired and bewildered government. After almost 32 years in power the Conservatives' judgement is becoming blurred. Their priorities have become muddled. They seem to have forgotten about their decisions affecting the real people—people who care about their future and people who care about their communities.

In the area of housing also, Mr. Speaker, this government is hopelessly confused. Less than two months ago the Minister of Housing confidently promised that Ontario would spend \$550 million this year on its housing programmes. But the figure that appears in the Treasurer's budget is \$241 million less. Once again, whose figures are we supposed to believe? One figure that we do know is correct is that Ontario had the third worst performance record in Canada for housing starts in 1974.

Mr. Laughren: Shameful.

Mr. Breithaupt: In two provinces, Newfoundland and Saskatchewan, housing starts actually increased over 1973.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Yes, whose money?

Mr. Breithaupt: But not in the triple-A province, not in Ontario. Here housing starts dropped 22.6 per cent.

Mrs. Campbell: We got more money from the federal government than any other province.

Mr. Breithaupt: This is one-third worse than the national average setback of 17 per cent. Again, in the first quarter of 1975 Ontario is lagging. So what does the Treasurer propose to increase housing starts? Nothing, absolutely nothing. An almost 160 per cent increase in the budget for the Ministry of Housing results in a 5.3 per cent increase in housing starts, according to the Treasurer's figures. Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is a measure of the ineffectiveness of this government's housing programme.

While nothing is being done to eliminate the supply shortage, the Treasurer is moving to stimulate demand further through his \$1,500 grant to first-home buyers. Even he must know that increasing demand without

proportionately increasing supply forces prices even higher.

In the circumstances, it is perhaps fortunate that the grant itself is so seriously flawed that it will not help anybody who can't already afford to buy a house. Home buyers cannot collect the money until after the deal is closed. That means it is not available to apply against the downpayment. The buyers must continue to arrange their own financing without any help from this government. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the only effect of this grant will be to give the \$1,500 windfall gain to some of the party's developer friends.

In this regard, I would like to quote from a recent speech from the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Housing which concluded:

All I can say to you is that I feel real frustration and resentment at such callous manipulation of people who are unable to help themselves. Housing is a basic need, shelter the right of every man. Let's remove it from the realm of political gamesmanship and put it where it belongs, the No. 1 priority of our times.

Those are noble sentiments but totally inconsistent with what appears in this budget. We are supposed to be impressed by a 160 per cent increase in expenditures by the Ministry of Housing, but what impresses us even more is that last year the same ministry underspent its much smaller budget by some \$13 million, or more than 15 per cent.

In fiscal 1974, this government underspent its housing budget by \$49 million. In fiscal 1973, they underspent by \$54 million. Are we to believe this current spending increase is anything but a public relations gesture? Are we to believe that a housing ministry that lacks sufficient imagination to spend \$103 million to increase housing starts has any intention to spend its \$181 million budget this year? The amount of money spent on home ownership programmes actually dropped after the advent of this new Ministry of Housing by 12 per cent, from \$110 million in fiscal 1973 to less than \$97 million in fiscal 1974. Add the rate of inflation to that, Mr. Speaker, and it is clear that we are making haste backwards with unprecedented speed.

In 1973 the Comay task force reported: "The dominant need of 300,000 to 400,000 families in Ontario is for housing they can afford." Recently a study commission of the Metropolitan Toronto social service and

housing committee revealed that in this city for the first time since the Second World War some families are actually homeless. Home ownership is effectively denied to all but the top 40 per cent of our income earners, and rents are exorbitant and increasing.

As the vacancy rate in our major cities slips below one per cent, two-year leases are being replaced by the one-year lease or in some cases by no leases at all. Even the president of the Urban Development Institute of Canada admits that rents are rising between 12 and 15 per cent on the average, well above the inflation rate.

Low-income families are forced to pay up to 50 per cent of their income for shelter, to the serious detriment of their families and, particularly, of their children. Already a near majority of Ontario's residents are tenants and they find themselves in a marketplace characterized by scarcity and high rent. They are becoming well organized and vocal, effectively making the case for security of tenure and protection from excessive rent increases.

But this budget doesn't contain a single measure to help tenants. As the Toronto Star noted, and I quote: "For the house-hunter, the renter and the home-builder, McKeough's budget is a disappointment."

Of course, this government has a tradition of disappointments in the housing field. Last year, for instance, the Treasurer predicted 100,000 new housing starts. But when the year ended we were 15,000 housing starts short. Where did the shortage go? The Minister of Housing told us his programmes would facilitate 31,100 housing starts last year. In fact, they resulted in fewer than 15,000 starts.

Just look at the trail of broken promises. In 1974, Ontario committed \$8.5 million to the joint Neighbourhood Improvement Programme. But the Housing Ministry estimates contain only a \$3 million budget for the programme, and less than \$700,000 was actually approved by Management Board.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Looks good; better save some more of that.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, as we are approaching 1 o'clock I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Breithaupt moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, on

Monday we will proceed with this debate and the hon. member for Kitchener will conclude at that time. Following that, we will deal with the bills that we were talking about last evening, such as items 8, 7 and 12 on the order paper.

I expect on Monday I will be able to give to the House a list of the estimates to be considered in committee and in the House. On Tuesday, I expect we will finish

the redistribution bill. Also, if the election expenses bill is concluded in committee—I don't know if it's done now or not—we would also deal with that.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, April 25, 1975

Commodity futures, statement by Mr. Handleman	1218
Report on pornography, statement by Mr. Handleman	1218
Ontario lottery, questions of Mrs. Birch: Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. R. S. Smith	1219
Hydro rates, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Lewis	1220
Policing costs in West Lincoln, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Haggerty	1221
Government policy on Ontario Hydro, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Lewis	1222
Status of physically disabled persons, questions of Mrs. Birch: Mr. Lewis	1223
Commodity futures, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Lewis	1223
Minister's jokes, questions of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Lewis	1224
Handicapped persons in licensed premises, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mrs. Campbell	1224
Asbestos studies, questions of Mr. Miller: Mr. Foulds	1224
Certification of tradesmen, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Braithwaite, Mr. B. Newman ..	1225
Awards for advertising work, questions of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Breithaupt	1226
Auto insurance rate justification, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Singer	1226
Arsenic levels, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Germa	1227
Royal commission on building industry, question of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Haggerty	1227
Limousine for LCBO chairman, question of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Shulman	1227
Ontario bulletin contents, questions of Mr. Bennett: Mrs. Campbell	1228
Employment opportunities, questions of Mr. McNie: Mr. Deans	1228
Municipal rebates, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Ruston	1229
Gas company rental charges, question of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Burr	1229
Windsor hospital facilities, question of Mr. Miller: Mr. B. Newman	1229
Liquor advertising, question of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Samis	1230
Report, re Royal Ontario Museum, Mr. Welch	1230
City of St. Catharines Act, Mr. Johnston, second reading	1230
Third reading	1230
Sheridan Place Act, Mr. Beckett, second reading	1230
Third reading	1230

Township of Goulbourn Act, Mr. Morrow, second reading	1230
Third reading	1230
City of Ottawa Act, Mr. Morrow, second reading	1230
Third reading	1230
Township of Bruce Act, Mr. Gaunt, second reading	1230
Third reading	1230
Representation Act, Mr. Welch, second reading	1230
Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Breithaupt	1245
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Breithaupt, agreed to	1251
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	1252



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, April 28, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975



CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 28, 1975

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Hon. W. Newman (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to the Legislature 64 students—and, I might say, very brilliant students too—from Denis O'Connor High School of Whitby, along with their teacher, Mr. Joseph Modeste. I would like the members to welcome them here in the Legislature today.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the member for Rainy River (Mr. Reid), I would like to ask you to welcome to the Legislature some grade 8 students from the Ignace Public School who are in your east gallery this afternoon.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. member for Simcoe Centre (Mr. Evans), I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Legislature, 23 grade 12 students from the Barrie District North Collegiate Institute, who are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Kirk.

Mr. D. W. Ewen (Wentworth North): It's a pleasure for me today to introduce to the Legislature and my colleagues a group of young ladies from the town of Ancaster's Mount Mary Academy. They are up in the west gallery and I would like all the members to show their appreciation.

ESTIMATES

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, I have a message from the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor signed by her own hand.

Mr. Speaker: By her own hand, Pauline M. McGibbon, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1976, and recommends them to the legislative assembly, Toronto, April 28, 1975.

Statements by the ministry. The hon. Minister of Energy.

HYDRO RATES

Hon. D. R. Timbrell (Minister of Energy): Mr. Speaker, I have received a submission from Ontario Hydro concerning proposed changes to its bulk power rates to take effect from Jan. 1, 1976. The proposal provides for approximate increases in revenue of \$208 million from the municipal utilities and \$54 million from the direct industrial customers, or about \$262 million in total. This will result in a rate increase averaging approximately 29.7 per cent to municipalities and approximately 29.9 per cent to direct industrial customers. In reviewing this proposal, the government has three major concerns:

1. That the impact on consumers and industries be minimized by ensuring that any rise in the price of electricity be justified by clearly demonstrated increases in Hydro's capital and operating expenses, and further, that Hydro is doing everything possible to minimize its controllable costs;

2. That Hydro's financial integrity and credit rating be protected by ensuring a proper balance between rate increases and new debt;

3. That the interests of the Ontario public continue to be served by adequate supplies of electrical energy now and for the future.

Let me deal with these concerns in more detail. First, the impact of hydro rate increases will be carefully weighed through the public review process of the Ontario Energy Board. The higher rates proposed must be substantiated by Hydro on the basis of demonstrated and necessary increases in costs in the full glare of public scrutiny.

According to Hydro, the largest single contributor to higher costs is the continuing increase in the price of fossil fuels—which account for between 25 and 26 per cent of Ontario Hydro's total revenue needs in 1976. Other important factors include the high cost of borrowed money, and the expenses incurred by Hydro associated with the necessary processes of public involvement in the planning of the Hydro system.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Oh, come on.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Costs such as these lie beyond Hydro's control. However, there are controllable costs and Hydro is aware of my concern that major efforts be made to reduce these through increased operating efficiency. Together with the government, public enterprises such as Hydro must lead the way for Ontario in the fight against inflation. This means adopting hard lines and making tough decisions.

Second, we must be concerned about Hydro's financial integrity. As a public enterprise, Hydro from the beginning has operated on the principle of power at cost and has taken pride in charging for electricity only what it costs to produce with no profit. It has always fully paid its own way.

As a result, Ontario has enjoyed and continues to enjoy electricity rates among the lowest in the world, and Hydro's financial soundness is well recognized. There are only two sources of funds—hydro rates and capital borrowing; my concern, and that of this government is to ensure that Hydro continue to raise the money it truly needs in the proper proportion from each source so that its credit rating remain intact.

Our third concern is with adequate supply. The average annual growth rate of the demand for electricity in Ontario has been about seven per cent from 1908 to 1970—in effect a doubling every 10 years over a period which included two world wars and a great depression.

Since 1970 this growth rate has actually increased, to about 7.4 per cent per annum. As evidenced by our energy management programme, we agree that growth in total energy demand must be curbed. Nevertheless, this does not necessarily mean that growth in electricity demand will lessen.

As fossil fuels become scarcer and more expensive, a larger percentage of the total energy market may well be served by electricity. Ontario Hydro has considered the conflicting factors of economic recession, energy conservation, and the changing patterns of energy consumption, and is convinced that growth in electric power demand will remain close to the long-term average of seven per cent. The load forecasting techniques on which this judgment is based will be a critical point in the Ontario Energy Board review.

As required by section 37(a) of the Ontario Energy Board Act, I am referring this proposal to the Ontario Energy Board for its hearing and report. The board will hold public hearings, which are expected to commence on June 9. This will provide an opportunity for Ontario Hydro to publicly de-

fend its proposal, and for interested members of the public to study and question it. The board will consider all evidence submitted and opinions expressed before submitting its report by the end of August, 1975.

There was general satisfaction with the first Ontario Energy Board review last year, even though many important issues remained unresolved. Ontario Hydro will again co-operate with the Energy Board to ensure a thorough and fair hearing of these complicated and conflicting issues, and that further progress will be made toward satisfactory solutions.

All interested members of the public will have the right to observe and participate in the rate-making process. It is important that there emerge a clearer understanding of the issues involved in establishing the price of electricity in this province.

Last year, as part of the first public rate review, the board was directed by my predecessor to make a broad survey of Hydro's financial policies and capital expansion programme. One of the most important and beneficial results of this investigation was to identify particular issues which required study in greater depth. After consultation with the government and the interveners in last year's hearings, the board has indicated that, this year, it will place particular emphasis on the following questions:

1. Equity financing—the appropriate balance between new borrowing and increased rates in financing Hydro's capital expansion, and the selection of appropriate financial indicators;
2. The relative size of the demand and energy components of bulk power rates;
3. The size of discounts for interruptible and furnace loads;
4. Export sale and pricing policies;
5. A general financial reserve;
6. Interest capitalization policy;
7. The use of 13th bills;
8. The recovery of operating deficits from particular classes, and
9. Hydro's access to financial markets.

Public notice was given of the board's intent to consider the first four of these in its press release of March 6 of this year, so as to allow potential interveners time for adequate preparation.

The board has authority to consider such additional matters as it thinks fit, or request further study of any issue, but it is intended to concentrate on these nine issues in order

to permit a more detailed examination of each.

The board last year recommended a number of studies to be conducted by Hydro. Because of their scope and complexity, not all of them are yet complete nor would the board have sufficient time to consider all of them in appropriate depth at a single hearing. Accordingly, final reports on a number of important topics will not be forthcoming until next year. These include:

1. Inter-utility productivity comparisons;
2. Depreciation and asset lives;
3. Overall cost allocation, including non-common and overhead costs;
4. Demand elasticity with price variation, and
5. The value to customers of different levels of service and reliability.

However, the board will review with Hydro the progress of each of these studies and may request such information as it considers relevant to the preparation of its report for 1975. The board must be concerned in particular with measures being taken by Hydro to promote efficiency and productivity. The government expects Hydro to adopt measures similar to its own to control staff levels and other operating costs. The board will also explore with Hydro measures to conserve electricity through the government's energy management programme.

Two weeks ago, at the first ministers' conference, this government took a firm stance against increases in the price of oil and natural gas in order to protect the economic well-being of the people of Ontario. Since the prospect of higher prices for any form of energy cannot be welcomed, a publicly-owned utility such as Hydro has a heavy responsibility to justify its rate increases.

The necessity of an electricity price increase will be subjected to a rigorous analysis by the Ontario Energy Board and will be as thorough and extensive as required again to protect the economic well-being of the people of Ontario. To ensure that Hydro's proposed rate increases are thoroughly scrutinized, I invite all interested and concerned citizens to participate in the Ontario Energy Board hearing.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions. The Leader of the Opposition.

GOVERNMENT POLICY ON ONTARIO HYDRO

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to put

a question to the Minister of Energy following his statement. Does he recall that Robert Macaulay, having been retained by the Ministry of Energy to put forward certain alternatives in the hearings last year, very definitely indicated that in his view—which was evidently well prepared; a very expensive and full preparation—rate of growth of Hydro should not be accepted at 7.3 per cent and there was much reason to believe that it could be reduced? Since the minister himself is in charge of a programme designed to conserve energy, is he now saying that this rate of growth which he said has been seven per cent but is edging up to 7.3 per cent, is acceptable to the government, because surely that is one of the parameters upon which the hearings must be based? If that rate of growth could be reduced, surely the cash flow could be reduced as well.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my statement, until five years ago the rate of growth over a considerable period of time—more than 60 years—had been seven per cent on average with a variety of peaks and valleys depending on recessions, depressions, wars and so forth. Since that time it has climbed to 7.4 per cent. In recent months, due to climatic conditions mainly, it has dropped below that figure. This will be, and is, under constant review both by the ministry and in the annual reviews of the Ontario Energy Board.

Obviously if the pattern of the last two or three months continues—if it is not just due to climate; if, in fact, we are making progress getting through to people about energy conservation and a variety of other factors—that will have to be reduced. I don't think it would be wise to do so at this time on a couple of months' experience.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Would the minister not think that a strong programme of energy conservation might have at least part of the effect we would want, particularly if the government is not prepared to accept that rate of growth but something substantially lower, in view of the situation which the minister described as climatic?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows, we are in the second phase of the energy management programme, that being the demonstration phase, and we will keep building on throughout the blocks. There is no doubt in my mind that greater acceptance by the individual citizen and the commercial and

industrial segments of the Ontario economy of the need to conserve and the benefits of conservation, financial and otherwise, will in the long run assist us in bringing this down.

I would have to say this, Mr. Speaker. You simply can't look at hydro, the electricity, in isolation. I've mentioned before in this House that when you consider the situation with supplies of gas and oil and the prognosis that exists with those two particular commodities, you have to bear in mind the possible conversions, perhaps large-scale, to electricity from those two present fuels. So, there are a number of variables in there that in my mind argue against dropping back from the seven per cent assumption at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary; the member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Surely what is needed at this point is a basic and fundamental government policy decision about the role of Hydro and the growth rate which the minister will recommend and accept for Ontario, and some policy decisions about a debt financing, rather than the perpetual parade before the Ontario Energy Board to review rate increases which invariably go up, regardless of the board's recommendations, higher than any consumer would wish. Doesn't the minister think we have come to a point where the cabinet has to declare itself now about Ontario Hydro's growth rate, and not simply refer it to the board again?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I think I just said, given the history of the growth in Ontario, given the recent experiences right up until the end of 1974, given the uncertainties about supplies of oil and gas for the future, that the prudent route to go, the responsible route to go, is at the present time to accept and stay with the seven per cent projected growth.

Mr. Lewis: That's prudent?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: That is prudent.

Mr. Lewis: That's inflationary. It is absurd.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Not at all. Well, I'm not going to get into these things.

Mr. Lewis: Okay.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: If the member is asking is this government committed to growth, I would have to say that this government does not stand for growth for the sake of growth. There's bound to be growth, in new industry, new towns, new institutions—whatever. We've got people coming here from other countries

and other parts of the country and growth is continuous, but growth for the sake of growth, no. Given all the factors I mentioned at the beginning of my answer, I think it is prudent and wise at the present time to hold with the seven per cent projection.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? Does the member for Welland South have a supplementary?

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Yes, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Energy.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary question?

Mr. Haggerty: A supplementary question, that's right. In his statement he said the public will have a right to scrutinize the rate increases. How can he justify that statement when information isn't available to the public to make a reasonable approach to the Ontario Energy Board? For example, for the last five weeks I have had a question on the order paper dealing with Ontario Hydro and the export of energy to the United States. How long does it take to get information?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I don't know where that is but I signed the answer to that question at least two or three weeks ago, so it is caught up somewhere in the process away from my office. I have answered it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): More red tape.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I don't know the dates but the Ontario Energy Board will be holding advance sessions for interveners and on Thursday of each week we'll hold sessions with the interveners to assist them in understanding and evaluating the various materials presented to them. So if the member knows someone or some group that's having difficulty getting information, or had, in last year's review, please let me know and I will draw it to the attention of the chairman, Mr. Jackson, because there certainly should be no excuse for that.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All right, we'll rotate. We will take a supplementary from the member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Thank you. It may sound a bit crazy, but is the government

at some point going to make an evaluation of the energy needs of various industrial, commercial and residential sectors as they grow, and make a determination as to what would be the most appropriate source of energy to be used by those areas, rather than having hydro competing against gas and competing against oil as a heating source, or in other areas? Is the government prepared to decide at some point that the percentage of the overall growth that should be allocated for hydro purposes is one particular percentage, and given the amount of oil and other sources of energy that is available those sources should only be used in certain instances?

How do we decide? I realize that I am worrying with a particular question, but at some stage we have got to decide, surely, the appropriate use of hydro over and against gas and against oil. Is the government going to make those kinds of decisions—to say that a particular subdivision or particular houses, or in a particular area it costs more overall to heat by oil than by hydro and therefore it shall be done by Hydro? Is the government going to make those kinds of determinations?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I am having some difficulty with the question. I tend to read into it, and correct me if I am wrong, that the hon. member is suggesting pricing of the various forms of energy on the basis of their equivalent heating values.

Mr. Deans: No, I am talking about their uses.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: All right; looking at the total situation with gas and oil, one must bear in mind that 80 per cent of the energy consumed in this province comes from outside of this province, so in fact electricity is the only one we can really have a handle on and rely on as a reliable source.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Well handled.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Looking at the situation with gas and oil we will, I think, as we get further down the road, have to consider—and I am not saying that next week I am going to announce anything on this but this is a concern to me—getting into the business of perhaps allocation of supplies and various other things of that sort. It is under consideration and it is a serious concern to me, yes.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I think we have now spent 10 minutes on this one question; I think we perhaps could get back to the

supplementaries in the form of a new question later. Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions of other ministries?

Mr. Gaunt: I was up first.

Mr. Speaker: If everybody is agreeable, I am. The member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: What portion of Hydro's projected growth is earmarked for export, and has this percentage changed over the last year?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The member will have to understand that since Thursday afternoon I have read a lot of figures and I'll have to get those figures for him. They don't come to mind right offhand but I will get them for him.

Mr. Speaker: All right. New question?

HOUSING STARTS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Housing. Is he sticking with his projected 90,000 starts, in view of the figures that have come out of CMHC indicating that for the month of March the number of urban starts in Ontario was 2,258 compared with 5,844 for March a year ago, a drop of 61 per cent? In particular, there is the fact that our starts are down overall in urban Ontario by 58 per cent, which is a performance of something like 16 per cent lower compared with the urban centres elsewhere in Canada?

An hon. member: The minister asked for it.

Hon. D. R. Irvine (Minister of Housing): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am still sticking with my previous statement that we would achieve 90 000 starts, approximately. I also have said before that we are very fully aware the starts will be down in the next two months, but they will increase substantially in the last third and fourth quarter. The figures the Leader of the Opposition has supplied us with today are no different than I had expected.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, then, supplementary: Does the minister not feel a very deep concern that his best efforts are not being rewarded with the kind of speedup in housing starts we must expect if we are going to come even near 90,000, let alone a return to the level previously experienced two years ago?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, certainly I am concerned; and I have relayed that concern, not only here but to Mr. Danson and to the private sector which is responsible for the majority of the starts. We all have to work together, I have said this many times before. I think we will achieve it, but it is not going to be an easy goal, that's for sure.

Mr. Deans: The minister won't get 60,000 starts.

Mr. Speaker: The member of Ottawa Centre.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Since what really counts as far as people buying or renting is concerned are the number of units coming onto the market in the form of completions, and since completions did not fall this year but were projected to fall very sharply in 1975, can the minister now tell us: What is the figure for completions in urban Ontario cities, what is his projection there and what will that do to housing prices and rents?

Mr. Speaker: That's the sort of question which should be left for a new question. We were talking about housing starts and now we are talking about completions. While this is related to the same overall topic, it is really a new question.

Mr. Cassidy: They are pretty much related, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They are very closely related, I think.

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact, you have caught the government policy well, Mr. Speaker; you understand the distinction; congratulations.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre. Is this a supplementary?

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Supplementary: Has the minister considered increasing the OHAP support for municipalities by making it an annual grant over a period of years, instead of this \$600 amount which seems to be completely inadequate in connection with the cost municipalities have to bear in new subdivisions?

Mr. Lewis: Now that's a new question.

Mr. Speaker: I was thinking that. I was reflecting upon it. Could that wait until we get to the new question period? The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

FLOOD DAMAGE ASSISTANCE

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to put a question to the Chairman of Management Board, in the absence of the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier). Is there sufficient information available for Management Board to make a decision as to what kind of assistance will be available to individuals and municipalities that had extraordinary expenditures in connection with the flood on the Grand River, the Nith River, the Maitland, et cetera, and other streams in southwestern Ontario a week ago?

An hon. member: Where is et cetera?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Et cetera is a very full-flowing stream.

Is the minister going to bring forward some assistance, particularly to the municipalities which were able to make use of the early warning system this year much better than last year? In fact, they undertook the kind of expenditure which in the long run is saving the taxpayers a lot of money, particularly in a community like Paris where the damage was much reduced over last year.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I have already spoken to my colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources, who isn't here today. We are going to examine the proposals and requests that were made to us based on the merits of each case, and we will be reporting on that particular basis.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Since this would be a departure, that is requests from municipalities are going to be considered in the same light as requirements for assistance for individuals who had flood damage, is it the understanding that municipalities will be able to participate directly in special additional grants to compensate them for the extraordinary expenditures they undertook?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: At the moment, Mr. Speaker, I did not make that statement. I said it would be based on the policy that's in place.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? The member for Scarborough West with his questions.

ONTARIO HYDRO SPENDING

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to the Minister of Energy for a moment, if I may. I will make it an interrogative. Since his statement today affirmed Hydro's commitment to an expenditure of \$23 billion by

1982, and since one of his prime concerns as I jotted it down was the amount of money that is being spent on interest rates on the foreign loans, and since the level of increase for rates now is somewhere in the vicinity of 30 per cent, can he explain how there is any way in the world that Ontario could afford that degree of capitalization over the next several years? And since the minister knows it is not possible, when will the government policy change?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member either knows something about what I think that I don't, or he has been listening to me talking in my sleep, I don't know which.

Parts of the programme up to 1982, of course, are still under review by the government. As the member knows, a number of projects were given approval in principle in June, 1973, are still being reviewed, one being the possibility of a second station at Bruce, Darlington near Bowmanville, and so forth.

I don't accept the member's conclusion that we can't afford it. In many respects, we can't afford not to do it. I read, over the weekend, some remarks attributed to the hon. member, and I had some difficulty understanding where he was getting his figures, inasmuch as the only way I could see of arriving at his figures, given Hydro's projections, would be to cancel everything and build nothing from now until 1982, that is based on what Hydro has projected.

I don't accept we can't afford it. I would say to the member that when we consider the other factors, the outside sources of energy, the probabilities of growth in demand for Hydro; really, without being committed to growth, as I said, for the sake of growth and without being committed unnecessarily to projects either too early or of the wrong kind, we can't afford to stop everything.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, I'm not asking the minister to stop; but he does concede, that the most recent prediction by Mr. Taylor on 1974-1975 dollars is an expenditure of \$23 billion by 1982 if the programme goes forward, and nothing has reversed as yet. On page 3 of the statement, the minister says, other important factors include the high cost of borrowed money. When will he reach the point of no return in this madness?

Mr. Deans: After the lights go out.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: That's an interesting point. I think some people actually think we

could stop everything in the Hydro system and then when there is a problem say, "All right, patch it up. Build a plant, build a line; whatever."

The enormous lead times, of course, for generating stations, transformer stations and transmission lines are such that we can't do that. We're looking at 12 years' lead time now for a generating station. We can't do that.

I don't know what the member means by the point of no return.

Mr. Lewis: The point of returning the cash.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The government, of course, has to approve Hydro's borrowings and on a regular basis we keep under review the needs and the market. We're not about to over-commit the province. I think the fact that we have a triple-A credit rating at this time is evidence we've managed it very well.

Mr. Ruston: The government needs more than a triple-A credit rating.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Is it because the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) and the Minister of Energy have increasing confidence in their ability to borrow Arab dollars that they can look at this \$23 billion with such equanimity? Is the minister involved in the decision which the Treasurer announced in the question period on Thursday, that an agreement with Arab countries has been arrived at for a loan for Hydro? Is that where the \$23 billion is going to come from?

Mr. Lewis: It's a dangerous business dealing with the Middle East, my friend.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I haven't seen the details of my colleague's announcement.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Those Arab countries are going to require a reshuffling of cabinet.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: What was that?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They only deal with certain corporations.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, this has been discussed several times before in this House. I don't know and I don't think any member of this House could predict with any degree of certainty what the sources are going to be in a year or two. The market is changing in such ways that it is very difficult.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is the government going to borrow Arab dollars? That was announced.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: If that was announced by the Treasurer, he looks after the borrowing, through our advisers.

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): That's our money. It's been recycled.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The provincial secretary is going to have to alter his speeches.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: If members think Herb Gray had something to speak about!

STATUS OF PHYSICALLY DISABLED PERSONS

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a question of the minister of Community and Social Services? Last June the minister made a commitment to the Legislature to review all of those who were deemed to be permanently unemployable but not disabled—some 6,000 to 10,000 people, so he indicated in the debate—and to reduce the number significantly by allowing many to enter the GAINS programme. Is that review completed? How many people have been removed from the category of permanently unemployable?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, that review has not been completed. Quite a large number have been transferred and I would be pleased to send information to the member as to the number that have been transferred. If the member has any specific case he wishes to refer to me, I'd be pleased to review it. I missed his programme last Saturday night but I'd be pleased to review the case he referred to.

Mr. Lewis: Specific cases make the point, and they're for the Minister of Housing. But in this minister's instance, is he prepared to remove now, since it must affect a very few thousand people in Ontario, the discriminatory provision of categorizing people as permanently unemployable, denying them the \$100-a-month additional money or more they would be entitled to were they disabled, since, according to the minister's colleague on his immediate right, as stated last Friday morning, no definition has yet been given to the distinction between permanently unemployable and physically disabled?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, there is a very clear definition, as the hon. member is probably aware, in the Family Benefits Act

between a permanently disabled person and a permanently unemployable person. As the hon. member also knows, there is cost sharing under the Canada Assistance Plan—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: There is cost sharing with the federal government, and there are some very distinct guidelines as to that. So I would like to remind the hon. member these are matters we have to consider.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Nipissing have another supplementary?

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Is the minister indicating that because of the Canada Assistance Plan he cannot do away with those permanently unemployable people that are referred to and put it all under disabled? Is that what he is saying; or is that what he is trying to infer?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, I didn't say that, Mr. Speaker. I think the hon. member will read Hansard and see that. What I said is that we do share under the Canada Assistance Plan and we do recover 50 per cent of what we give under the Family Benefits Act. In order to maximize the amount of assistance we can recover from the federal government, we have been using their guidelines. At the same time, it doesn't necessarily mean to say we are restricted from paying, say 100 per cent of the difference of the cost.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary, if I may. Is the minister saying he will continue to penalize this group? It couldn't be more than 3,000 people in Ontario now, and we are talking about \$3 million a year. The government gave \$410 million to the corporations. Is he saying he will continue to penalize these 3,000 people because he gets a cash return under the Family Benefits Act that he doesn't get for his additional chunk of GAINS payment? Does that make sense to the minister?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: If the hon. member was listening when I spoke, I told him we were reviewing each and every individual case of those who are classified under the Family Benefits Act. Quite a large number had been transferred under the GAINS programme and we are reviewing each individual case.

Mr. Lewis: The minister will give us the numbers, I am sure.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary.

Mr. R. S. Smith: The minister is well aware that this has been going on for about three years and has been under review for about three years now, that's true.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: In all due respect, it has not been three years.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Is there a question?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Yes, I will ask three questions. Would the minister assure the House that if there is no extra cost to the province in so far as the Canada Assistance Plan is concerned, that the permanently unemployable designation will be done away with and the 50 per cent funding by the federal government will be received?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, we plan an income review meeting in Ottawa this week on Wednesday and Thursday with the federal government and the other provinces, and this is one of the subjects that will be discussed.

Mr. Lewis: Change this government's policy.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

RENEWAL OF LEASES

Mr. Lewis: One last question of the Minister of Housing. Will the Minister of Housing request an amendment to the Landlord and Tenant Act, making it necessary that a landlord give cause for non-renewal of a lease to any tenant as a condition under the Act?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly give it consideration, but the Act presently is not under my jurisdiction. It is under the jurisdiction of the Attorney General.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Since the minister has tenant rent review problems referred to him, I thought it appropriate to ask if he recognized that it is a loophole in the Act which allows any landlord to refuse renewal of a lease for no reason whatsoever and a tenant has no protection in Ontario? Does he think that fair?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I certainly recognize that exists in the present Act. Personally, if I was responsible as a landlord, I would not have that happen.

Mr. Speaker: Questions? The member for St. George.

LIMITED-DIVIDEND HOUSING

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): My question is of the Minister of Housing. Some days ago, the minister stated in this House that the proper approach of government was to provide new housing to overcome the problems in the city of Toronto. Does he recall on that occasion he said there would be two programmes for Toronto, one for Metropolitan Toronto senior citizen housing and one for limited-dividend housing? Was the limited-dividend portion of the housing this province is to supply that which has been announced by CMHC for the whole of Canada, of which 3,000 are for this area? Was that the reference?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: No, Mr. Speaker, it was not. I was referring to the \$42 million that we, the Province of Ontario, put into the limited-dividend programme, with some of the units being built in Metropolitan Toronto. I believe the CMHC proposal the hon. member is talking about is one which should close very shortly and should be announced by the minister, Mr. Danson; it is to be hoped that there will be quite a few units in Metropolitan Toronto, but I'm not aware how many there will be.

Mrs. Campbell: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the minister's answer, I wonder if he could say now whether he is aware of what the rentals will be on these limited-dividend housing units? Would he agree they would be around \$200 a month for the poor?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I can't give a definitive answer at this particular time. I will look into the actual proposals that are before us, as far as the province is concerned. I wouldn't have any idea what the rents are going to be for the federal government until such time as the proposal is accepted.

Mrs. Campbell: I was referring to limited-dividend housing.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

HAMILTON AREA HOME PROGRAMME STANDARDS

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Housing. What's the relationship between the very tough inspection

procedures that were pursued by the supervisor of inspectors in the Hamilton area under the HOME programme and the fact that he's been relieved of his responsibilities in that area?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, in regard to the overall inspection of our housing units, whether in Hamilton or elsewhere, I have instructed my staff to make sure that we handle the inspection of all our houses very carefully. There's a review under way right now, and I expect I shall be able to have further details for the hon. member later on this week or early next week.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question: Did the builders in the Hamilton area make representation, either written or oral, to the HOME programme bosses or whatever the minister wants to call them, the directors of the HOME programme, that the supervisor of the inspections in the Hamilton area was too tough, that the inspection procedures he personally carried out were embarrassing to them and that they wanted someone in his place who would be more amenable to overlooking as they had in the past, many of the flaws in the buildings?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, the exact opposite would be the correct answer, because I have instructed my staff to ensure that the inspectors are much tougher in their inspections than they have been in the past and that I don't want to have any more complaints about deficiencies if they relate to our inspectors. So the inspector was not relieved because the builders had asked me, because they have never asked me; and I have no knowledge of them asking any of my staff either.

Mr. Deans: One final supplementary question: How can five inspectors inspect 500 homes adequately? How can they possibly inspect all of the homes of all of the builders currently being built under the HOME programme in the Hamilton area, and expect to be able to check on all of the various steps and procedures required in order to ensure properly built homes?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, that's part of my review and that's one of the reasons I have said I would look into the matters brought forward by the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Essex-Kent.

AUTO PARTS HAULAGE RATES

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Is the minister aware of a special rate structure that Laidlaw Transport now has through the Interstate Commerce Commission to haul auto parts from the United States to places in Ontario; and that the general consensus is that all rates should be uniform? Is he further aware that this new rate structure is not uniform with the usual code in Ontario?

Hon. J. R. Rhodes (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, I would not be aware, because in that case I believe those particular rates would be filed with the Niagara Frontier Tariff Bureau. They are not brought to my attention. I'm sure the hon. member knows the system. I have heard, though, that the rates being charged are lower than the usual rates, and I would hardly think we would complain about lower rates for hauling within the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor West.

CONSTRUCTION WAGE RATES

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): I have a question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware that it is now some six to seven years since the minimum and overtime wage schedules for carpenters and other trades have been revised under the Industrial Standards Act; and when can we expect these long overdue revisions to the schedules to be made and announced?

Hon. J. P. MacBeth (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the schedule that has been referred to is obviously not a very accurate schedule. We have under consideration at the present time the possibility of updating it, in view of some of the complaints we are meeting in the construction field. But as I say, it hasn't been done for some time and I can't predict when it will be done. It is one of the things we are looking at, sir.

Mr. Bounsall: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?

Mr. Bounsall: Supplementary, yes. Is it one of the functions of the construction industry review panel to come up with those wage schedules and revisions; and if so, is the minister asking them directly to take action at this moment on this overdue problem?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: I'm certainly not asking the panel to take action on it at the present time; and I'm not going to say we are going to wait for the panel to report. As I say, it is one of the instruments they may use in their examination and we don't want to rule that out. On the other hand, I'm not ruling out the possibility of the ministry doing something about it in the interval.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

HOME IMPROVEMENT FUNDS

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Housing. Is the minister aware that approximately 22 per cent of the homes in the NIP area in the city of Windsor will require more funds than the maximum of \$5,000 available under the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Programme; and that 11 per cent of the homes in the same area will require more than the combined \$7,500 worth of funds under both the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Programme and the Ontario Home Renewal Programme? Is the minister aware that nearly all of the 11 per cent are people who, under this programme, would be unable to borrow enough money, so that all of the work over a maximum of \$7,500 would have to be financed? And is the minister aware that these 11 per cent of homeowners are subject to prosecution in the courts and could lose their homes because of their inability to comply with the minimum housing standards? Will the minister, in response, raise the maximum loans available under RRAP and OHRP; and will the minister provide funds to non-profit groups which could help the poor and the elderly to keep and repair their own homes?

Mr. Speaker: Order please, lengthy questions oftentimes take up more time than the answers, especially when they are multi-part. I would ask the members if they would try to ask the question once, not three or four times. The same thing with the answers, of course.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I'll try to do my best, Mr. Speaker. The responsibility for the RRAP programme is not a responsibility of the Province of Ontario, but is a federal programme and in this area one can piggy-back the RRAP funds and/or the OHRP funds. We provide, as I hope the hon. member is aware, funding for non-profit organizations, which could be either a municipality or a group within the municipality, and I would be quite

receptive to any application they wish to make in this regard for that particular area he is talking about.

But I would think that with all the funds that are available through the federal government and ourselves, there should be no one evicted because of the house not being up to standards.

Mr. B. Newman: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware that the combined funds available under both the provincial programme and the federal programme would be insufficient to enable those people to repair their homes, and that they are unable to borrow funds because they are poor and elderly?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: No, Mr. Speaker, I have to say to the hon. member, with all due respect, I can't see how the homes would not be repaired to the standard they should be, if they make full use of both programmes. They might not have a home at all to begin with.

Mr. B. Newman: It's not enough.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

TRUCK LOAD COVERS

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: When may we expect additional regulations under section 66 of the Highway Traffic Act to ensure the proper covering of trucks, especially those loaded with gravel on our highways?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, that regulation will be forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Etobicoke.

STRIKE AT NCR

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Labour. Is the minister aware that on April 1, 1975, when local 28B of the Graphic Arts International Union struck the National Cash Register of Canada Co. in Rexdale, it sent a telegram to management asking that negotiations begin at once? And is the minister aware that to date the management has not even acknowledged receipt of the telegram? Will the minister use his good offices to urge the company to commence negotiations immediately; and will the min-

ister consider meeting with a representative group of the union members from local 28B of the Graphic Arts International Union?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: I think there were four questions there, sir. To the first and last question, no; to the middle two, yes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nipissing.

HOUSING FOR METIS AND NON-STATUS INDIANS

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Housing. Was he aware of the meeting of the Ontario Métis and non-status Indians last Monday to which he was invited in regard to housing for those specific people; and could he tell the House why he did not attend that meeting?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Yes, I would be only too pleased to, Mr. Speaker. The meeting was called for April 21, I believe. I was in Kitchener at the time at a housing conference, which was well attended by about 450 people. At that time some of my colleagues in the House were also there.

I arranged with the Métis group and with Mr. Danson to have my parliamentary assistant and my deputy minister there at the same time for the session of which the member speaks.

The meeting was held at 2 o'clock and went on to 4 o'clock. I am hopeful that I will be able to sign an agreement. I have extended an invitation to Mr. Danson to sign an agreement this Thursday when he is in Toronto, which will relate to two agreements, one being the one to which the member has referred, covering rural and native accommodation in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

OTTAWA FESTIVAL OF FLOWERS

Mr. Cassidy: I have a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism. Did the minister's ministry give a grant of \$9,000 to the spring festival in the city of Ottawa? Was the grant linked with the requirement that York Advertising Ltd. be used as the agency? And was it also linked with the requirement that the ministry's money be given directly to York Advertising rather than be paid to the city, and if so, why?

Hon. C. Bennett (Minister of Industry and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, we are participating in the Festival of Flowers in the nation's capital. Our only requirement and suggestions were that the Province of Quebec should go into the project jointly with the Outaouais authority and the Ottawa-Carleton region in the promotion of that particular part of Ontario and Quebec.

There was no indication that any advertising agency had to be used, sir. It was entirely at the discretion of the organization at the local community level. We have only participated by nominating one representative on the organization and we have gone no further into the situation with them. The bills related to the cost of the programme on which we are sharing costs will be submitted to us and are not to exceed \$9,000.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

USE OF WOOD AS FOOD

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Has the minister been in touch with Prof. Murray Moo-Young, at the University of Waterloo, who has developed a technique for changing the cellulose content of wood into protein, which he claims has a great possibility for use as cattle feed and maybe eventually human food?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I have not been in touch with that professor, first of all. There is a research project going on at Kemptville Agricultural College which is making use of the fibre content of wood as cattle feed. It's a research project completely.

Mr. Good: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: As this process does not use the fibre content but the cellulose content, would the minister have someone in his ministry contact the professor at the University of Waterloo to see whether there is potential in his discovery, which is evidently reaching quite a prominence now in the media?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Thank you. We'll take a look at it.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? The hon. member for Windsor West.

WCB VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION PROGRAMMES

Mr. Bounsall: I have a question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware that when the Workmen's Compensation Board sends a worker back to school through a vocational rehabilitation programme, should that worker become ill for a day or longer on a problem not related to his injury, the board deducts the full amount of those days off the Workmen's Compensation allowances; if so, does the minister feel this is at all fair?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware they were doing that. I'm not sure whether it is fair or not. I suppose if he was on the job ordinarily, depending on what agreements they may have, he would have lost a day's sick pay. I'll examine it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Downsview.

VISIT TO INDIAN RESERVES

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): A question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development: Presuming this past weekend was the weekend when he and his cabinet colleague journeyed to Grassy Narrows, could he advise the House what success he had in solving the problems and what methods have been worked out for feeding the Indians there whose only resource for food is mercury-polluted fish?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, in the first place, I think I should correct the member. He is not quite as familiar with matters relating to Indians as I am. Fish is not their only source of food; I'll tell the member that. Yes, I was there all day Saturday and I'll have a statement before the House tomorrow. It's being prepared at this present moment. We dealt with quite a number of things; I think we have resolved that particular problem.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa Centre.

FILM CENSORSHIP

Mr. Cassidy: A question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, Mr. Speaker: In view of the minister's comments after he went to view that selected series of shorts at the Ontario film censors' office; in view of the fact the Ontario government through the film censor has control over the

films exhibited in the province; and in view of the fact that a number of scenes of explicit violence have been permitted by the film censor over the past few years—ranging from films like "Bonnie and Clyde" and "The Godfather" to some like "Straw Dogs" which are very violent, to others which defy mention in this House—is it the minister's intention now to instruct the film censor to take a different attitude toward film violence than he has in the past? If so, why were these instructions not carried out sooner in view of the government's current campaign?

Hon. S. B. Handleman (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, certainly it is not my intention to instruct the censor. The censor has to make judgement decisions based on the best information available to him as to what is acceptable in Ontario society and what is not acceptable. Those are always judgement decisions and I don't believe I would impose my judgement on him or his board.

In my view, what they have allowed to go is acceptable in society. There may be some exceptions, but for the most part what they've cut out is not acceptable and I would certainly vouch for that.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: The minister is saying that what has been allowed to go through the film censor over the past few years is generally acceptable and he would not wish to have seen it changed. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I am saying in my judgement from what I have seen, which is not very much because I don't generally attend the cinema, what is being allowed by the censor according to public opinion surveys is acceptable for the most part. There will always be differences of individual opinion. I think we have to try to find some balance between restrictive censorship and complete permissiveness.

Mr. Breithaupt: Can the minister tell us if the films he has seen, the clips from which are acceptable, are any different from the kinds of film being shown on television?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I think I have just answered the question by saying I hadn't seen too much of what the censor has released because I don't attend films on any large scale. From what I've heard and the reports made to me, those films which are shown in the cinemas are acceptable; and many of them are not shown on television.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Wells presented the annual report of the board of governors of the Ontario Institute for Studies and Education.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the standing administration of justice committee be authorized to sit concurrently with the House for its consideration of Bill 35, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act, and Bill 36, An Act to amend the Corporations Tax Act, 1972.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

BEDS OF NAVIGABLE WATERS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Haggerty moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Beds of Navigable Waters Act, 1975.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide a uniform interpretation of the deeds of property bounded by navigable waters so that the high water mark shall be deemed to be the boundary of such property.

If the member for Ontario South (Mr. W. Newman) were here he would perhaps endorse the bill. I think the intent of the bill is to ensure that the shoreline shall remain as Crown lands.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

BUDGET DEBATE (continued)

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I would like to start my remarks today with some references to the Ontario home renewal programme.

This government had promised to spend some \$10 million on this programme but, in

fact, has spent less than \$1.5 million. The Minister of Housing (Mr. Irvine) has told us over the past period of time that some 3,750 homes would benefit under the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Programme. In fact, only 1,800 houses were affected, and fewer than 1,300 of a promised 2,000 new units were approved under the community-sponsored housing programme.

Mr. Speaker, we don't need another round of deception from the government. What we need is some effective action, some effective programmes to build houses.

There is no shortage of land for housing in this province; there is only a shortage of serviced land. But this government, instead of servicing land, has decided to bank it: 17,000 acres in North Pickering; 10,000 acres near Prescott; 2,300 acres in north Whitby; 1,500 acres in south Oakville; and 11,000 acres in Walpole township for the new city of Nanticoke.

Most government landbanks remain undeveloped, even in areas where serious shortages of serviced land are forcing housing prices higher and higher. At least in some cases the government has increased the final price to the house buyer by paying unconscionably high prices to private land assemblers. We have already documented the \$2 million profit paid by the Ontario Housing Corp. for land in Milton that was held for less than seven months. In addition, the government's stated policy is to release its land at market value rather than at cost. In other words, the government is also profiteering and reinforcing rather than offsetting high market prices.

The purchaser must pay for this government profit over many years at very high interest rates. For instance, if the government profit adds \$10,000 to the land's final selling price, the home buyer with a 20-year mortgage at 10 per cent interest would wind up paying some \$19,000 extra. That additional \$10,000 would add \$95 per month to his mortgage payments.

Is landbanking an appropriate activity for the government of Ontario to engage in? Should the whole process of development be questioned? Why should the province be assembling large tracts of new land, rather than creating appropriate conditions for development around existing towns away from the large metropolitan areas?

Perhaps the time has come to consider a massive land servicing programme rather than massive investment in landbanking. If the land speculation tax is effective, then one of the primary justifications for landbanking no

longer applies. The question then becomes: Where is it appropriate to foster the building of new homes?

In a recent article entitled "Land Control and Land Prices," it was stated, and I quote:

Two objectives are being pursued by landbanking: recapture for the community of the increase in land values which has been created by the community, and cheaper land for the user. The two are obviously mutually exclusive.

Provincial landbanking policies have in the past been developed with the first objective in mind. The sale of banked land at market prices, which is the present provincial policy, has not resulted in cheaper land. In fact, it can be argued that the entry into a tight land market of a financially strong buyer inevitably causes a serious rise in land prices.

Certainly this has been true in the Kitchener-Waterloo area where 3,000 acres have been tied up in an undeveloped government land bank for eight years now. With money in short supply, the question is whether available money should be tied up in banked land or in providing services for land.

Throughout Ontario, there are many communities with considerable growth potential to provide accommodation for an increased population now and in the future. These communities already have sewage and water systems, schools, churches and recreational facilities. Surely it is more logical, practical and economically feasible to encourage these existing communities to expand and to assist those now wanting to expand rather than developing new town sites.

New towns, like the government's effort at Nanticoke, first arose in European countries several years ago. In the 1960s in the United States, new towns became a vehicle for corporate enterprise. It is interesting that there have been few successes in the United States and the activity there has been very modest in scale.

Of the eight largest new towns in the United States, comparable to the Ontario scene, the expected completion date is 21 years after the year the land was initially acquired. Every new townsite has an average acreage of 12,500 acres. In considering townsite assemblies made by the Ontario Land Corp., even if we assume they might achieve the same timetables as the US experienced, it is clear that very few homes will rise on these new townsites in time to be useful in the present crisis.

In the United States, the failure to improve the quality of life far outweighs the successes.

New towns tend to be sterile. Former urbanites, immigrating to new towns, say they left the city because of congestion, pollution, taxes and the increased presence of undesirable people. To their dismay, they find in the new towns many of the conditions they hoped to escape. They pay heavily for their dependence on cars which, in turn, require spiralling investment in highways. The physical infrastructure of roads, utilities, sewers and water lines has to be developed from scratch at current prices, resulting in a very high initial cost rather than the incremental cost involved in adding to an already existing community.

In this province we need serviced land. We need affordable housing and we need jobs. At the present time here in Metropolitan Toronto, 26.2 per cent of our construction workers are out of a job. We have the building materials, the land, the skill and the labour force. Surely it is not beyond the capacity of this government to put these elements together and devise a practical workable plan to build houses within the financial means of Ontario citizens.

We are tired and the people of Ontario are tired of the succession of schemes touted by this government with great fanfare which within a few months prove themselves ineffectual. None of the programmes, not the HOME programme nor OHAP nor the integrated housing scheme, addressed the fundamental problems of municipal financial inequities. Local councils throughout the province are erecting barriers to moderate housing costs because the servicing costs would further increase property taxes. Just last week the Newmarket Era editorialized:

York regional council has a number of things to weigh before deciding whether to throw its support behind Ontario's crash housing programme. First, it must establish the financial implications. If, as council has been told, deficits created by this type of housing will be long-term burdens to York's taxpayers, Mr. Irvine will have to improve his offer of a three-year offsetting grant.

There is no point in the Minister of Housing continually berating the local municipalities. They are victims of the horse and buggy tax system that forces assessment planning upon them and which this government has refused to change.

The Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) makes much of his commitment to local government in his budget but like so much else, his actions do not match his words. In fact, the increased municipal grants do little more than

meet the commitment the municipalities forced from the former Treasurer (Mr. White) at the Edmonton trilevel conference in 1973. The \$67 million surplus on that commitment reflected in this year's budget is no greater than the \$67 million shortfall which resulted last year.

Are our municipal leaders to be ecstatic simply because this government is meeting a two-year-old commitment? Perhaps they should, because it is so unusual.

Another 1973 commitment was to deconditionalize a larger proportion of provincial grants to municipalities. This budget is a step backward. In the 1975 budget unconditional grants to all municipalities are being increased by only 9.8 per cent compared to a 17 per cent increase for conditional grants. Many municipalities have argued over the years that the province should introduce an unconditional grant system which would return control of local affairs to the municipal level. That occurred, basically, at the city of London meeting with the Treasurer on Jan. 29, 1974.

In the 1973 budget, 11 grants were proposed for deconditionalization. In the 1974 budget, nine grants were deconditionalized and 15 grants proposed for deconditionalization. However, the system of municipal grants has long been rigidly tied to conditions imposed by the province. Concerning this question, Lionel Feldman has stated in "Ontario 1945-1973: The Municipal Dynamic" that:

The 1973 budget statement suggests that there is at least concern about this process of assumption of functions and responsibilities. This, at least, is one interpretation of the proposals for "deconditionalizing" certain grants. The difficulty is that when particular grants are examined, grants such as arena programme, library, museum, weed control, there is not one major municipal programme area from which the province is proposing to remove conditions.

Mr. Speaker, my review of the budget has unearthed a large number of inconsistencies. I shall only mention five of the most obvious.

Firstly, on page 3, the Treasurer proposed a cut in the retail sales tax in order to stimulate the purchase of automobiles, among other items. The inconsistency arises when upwards of 75 per cent of vehicles used in Canada are made in the United States and elsewhere; so that any real benefit for job creation will not help Ontario to any appreciable extent.

Secondly, on page 4, the GAINS payment in fact declines for every increase in income.

The inconsistency arises here in that there is really no incentive for savings income or indeed for any other outside income. This increase will be reduced to nothing after one year of the OAS-CIS cost-of-living adjustments. This kind of indexing in Ontario simply guarantees that pensioners fall further and further behind.

Thirdly, on page 7, we have the small business tax credit. This is only going to help those who in fact are doing fairly well. The amount is only available when there is retained earnings or a line of credit; so this is inconsistent in that the person who really needs the help cannot in fact obtain it.

Fourthly, we have a stimulus for the purchase of equipment such as the excavator crane referred to on page 10. But surely this is inconsistent with the approach by both municipalities and the province itself when we look at the lower priority for capital construction this year. The Treasurer states at page B-17 that "the government has postponed capital projects where feasible."

Finally, let us turn to page C-9. Here the inconsistency is almost bad enough to be called distortion. Ontario Hydro's needs are simply removed from the balance sheet. The Treasurer waves his magic wand and the wants of this vast empire disappear.

The Treasurer recognizes, as we do, that Hydro borrowing will be immense and he is hiding the figures by not including them in this table. Last year, Hydro borrowed about \$500 million on its own, and the province borrowed \$375 million of that amount, which was added to the final figures. This year, Hydro is expected to borrow \$1,350 million, as set out on page A-20. Will Ontario have to use its credit on behalf of Ontario Hydro in other markets? In other words, will this become a contingent liability for the province? If so, the figures should be shown, and I suggest that the amount would be close to \$550 million.

Any borrowing by any agency for which we are ultimately responsible should be presented in the budget. To have the nerve to state that the figures are not available is deception, and is not acceptable to us.

Well, so much for a few of the inconsistencies in the budget.

On page C-8, the Treasurer states there is certain financing to be determined—an amount of \$575 million for this year. Where are we going to get this money? I expect there are three sources available.

They could, of course, send the former Treasurer off to Kuwait or Saudi Arabia to

use his wiles and try to obtain "alms in the name of Darcy." I do not expect his abilities will be any more successful or acceptable abroad than they are right here in Ontario. The ultimate result would only be to put serious pressure on Canadian exchange rates, which would likely wipe out any commercial edge that such borrowing might have over the long term, even if it was available.

A second source might well be any change and increase in the funds which we are now obtaining in the non-public borrowing category from the Canada Pension Plan and from our own civil service, from municipal employees and from the teachers. The Treasurer no doubt expects that this bonanza will continue for the foreseeable future, but has he noted an article which appeared in the *Financial Post* on March 15, 1975? Donald Rumball writes that this cash flow of money available for immediate spending is now beginning to decline and will actuarially be reduced to zero in 1982. Then where will the funds come from? Education, hospitals and medicare have all benefited from these payments, which this year alone will amount to about \$750 million. Where do we go in a few years when the well is dry?

If the benefits from this programme are increased, as the Canadian Labour Congress asks, then the cash flow will drop to zero in three years, as more of the moneys collected are immediately paid out in benefits. The government is placing what the writer calls "an intolerable strain on future generations" if the programme changes as suggested are ever implemented with the approval of this government.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer is not really thinking about going anywhere other than the traditional New York market, which is the third choice open to him. If that is his view, then I warn him that the traditional bond market there appears to have dried up. The US Treasury is gobbling up the money supply and upsetting the bond and money markets, and such fresh fears of a credit crunch are commonly discussed on Wall St., that any recovery of the American economy is likely to be harmed by the continuing pressure.

I suggest the Treasurer refer to the April 12 issue of the *Financial Post* and read the article which sets out the delay of various security issues and the lack of sales for others. Both British Columbia and the city of Montreal have postponed their planned borrowings. The American Treasury states it must finance some \$80 billion this year from this market, and the interest rates which may have

to be paid are going to be excessive, if the money is, in fact, available at any price.

If we are, in fact, looking for funds from any other areas then perhaps the Treasurer can explain where those areas are. The three that I have mentioned seem the only practical ones available, and our chances of unquestioned success in any one of them for the future several years appear to be more and more remote.

In the midst of all this, the Treasurer in his budget preparation meetings met with the Ontario Chamber of Commerce. The report for that meeting states the Treasurer is committed to the spending of an extra \$100 million per year within the next two years to process the tax returns of the income tax which the province is now apparently committed to collect, separate from Ottawa. The Treasurer is reported to have given the view that there is little or no hope of this decision being reversed.

He states we are to have two tax forms to complete, instead of one, because of what he refers to as a certain "rigidity" in discussions with the federal authorities. If that happens, then we are likely to have to hire an additional 4,500 civil servants to give the province the capability of setting up its own income tax division. As the chamber puts it: "The result of this initiative by the Province of Ontario will be more government as well as more taxation."

I have heard, Mr. Speaker, that this report may be in error, and that the Treasurer apparently has denied, by letter, the report of what went on at this meeting with the Ontario Chamber of Commerce. I would certainly hope that he would take the first opportunity in this House, or elsewhere, to correct this information if, in fact, he states that the meeting as reported is not accurately reported.

Certainly to proceed now with the separate collection of an Ontario income tax on the basis that that decision is irreversible is a most serious step. I would certainly encourage the Treasurer to correct this particular error if, in fact, the meeting as reported is not the real decision of this government.

Mr. Speaker, the public view of politics usually focuses on specific issues and people. We who are active in politics, whether as elected officials or supporters of a particular party, tend to do likewise. We act and react to hundreds of daily events with the result that distinctions in the philosophies of the various political groupings become blurred. There are many who say the only basic difference between political parties these

days is that the one with power wants to keep it and those without power want to get it. It seems appropriate, therefore, that perhaps I could attempt to dispel that widespread belief.

To do so, I naturally turned to Oliver Mowat, a founder of Liberalism in Ontario. An article in Ontario History by A. M. Evans reports Mowat's opinion on the matter when he is quoted as writing to his mother in 1844 that "the difference of avowed principles between the two parties is all moonshine." But, when he later became involved in the political life of Canada, even Mowat agreed that:

Every man must take a side; then he helps to mould the future policy of that side. His motions have the support of his party. He is powerful for good, if good is his object. He gives his adhesion to the only principle on which free government appears to be capable of being worked—that is, a distinction of parties.

Mowat recognized that our parliamentary democracy requires organized alternatives to the government. He justified the party system, not through the specific differences in parties, but simply by the necessity for alternative people and policies to ensure that the electors have a choice.

Although Mowat was born a Conservative, he became disenchanted with the Conservative administration of his day. He was 17 when William Lyon Mackenzie led his feeble revolution against the tyrannical rule of the Family Compact and its Conservative supporters. And he must have watched with interest when, 12 years later, the Tories reacted to the establishment of responsible government by a Liberal-dominated assembly by stoning the Governor General and burning the Parliament Buildings.

Eventually Mowat's disgust with the Conservatives reached the point where he claimed: "Nothing was too bad in legislation or government for them to adopt if it helped to secure their places. Opposition to such a government has become a duty." Mowat's outburst reflected his frustration with a particular government at a particular time, but he went on to explain his choice of party by saying: "Such a choice must be made as parties stand when the choice is made and not as they stood at some former period; and once it has been made, an up-right man must do his best to keep his party right as well as to obtain for it success."

Since Mowat went on to become Premier for 24 years, he obviously obtained success

for his party and he must have kept his party right too, because the policies he put forward convinced the majority of people in each successive election that they should choose the Liberal Party "as the party stood when the choice was made."

Today our party and every party in a democracy faces a similar challenge. We must continually adapt our programmes to meet the needs and demands of a changing society. Our task is to form a government by winning broad support among the electorate. Our policies, therefore, must express only the highest common factor of opinions behind which majority support can be mobilized. In any democracy this means that the ideological content of a platform must, of course, be broad.

No viable political party in Ontario, or elsewhere, is prepared to take a substantial philosophical stand which, when compared to the positions put forward by its competitors, would leave it excluded from a substantial area of public concern and policy. Ours is a diverse province, spread across a huge geographic area and populated by persons of wide-ranging economic, ethnic, religious and linguistic backgrounds. No party in these circumstances can afford the luxury of a pure or rigid ideology.

This tendency to overlap and, in fact, walk all over each other's toes, usually close to the middle of the road, has led to some confusion in the basic ideology of modern provincial parties. This was relieved to some extent in 1970 when the NDP flirted with the return to the CCF ideals of nationalizing industry but, with the expulsion of the Waffle a year later, organized labour regained control of the party and its philosophical direction.

It is a subjective view, indeed, when I charge the Conservatives with the same kind of undeviating commitment to the business community of this province, and reserve for our party the essential Liberal position established historically, and now more important than ever, of representing individuals, including labourers and businessmen rather than the organizations with which they are associated. While we have no qualms whatever about organized labour, or any other groups substantially supporting a party, we have final confidence in the decision of the individual as he or she enters the polling place to follow Mowat's advice and make a choice, "as parties stand when the choice is made."

As a member of an organized group, whether it is a union, the medical association, the teachers' federation or some other group of citizens co-operating for their own welfare and advancement, the elector must and will make a decision, using his or her own judgement of the comparative qualities of the candidates and his or her concern for the issues they espouse.

The Liberal attitude is that people must not be worn down into uniformity. For the politician and the civil servant, this issue means how they will respect the rights of individuals against the power of the state. For society as a whole, it means respect for the rights of the individual against the community at large. In the classic statement of John Stuart Mill:

If all mankind minus one were of one opinion and only one person were of a contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind.

There are countless occasions in government when the most expedient way to get things done is to ride roughshod over the rights and freedoms of the individual. A decision by the province to expropriate 17,250 acres in Pickering township—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): What about the 33½ per cent the federal Liberals voted themselves?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Kitchener has the floor.

Mr. Breithaupt: I don't see how that is particularly relevant with respect to the remarks that I'm making at the moment since that, as I recall, was supported by members of all parties in the federal House of Commons.

Mr. Stokes: That's not so.

Mr. Breithaupt: In any event, Mr. Speaker, that decision by the province to expropriate that acreage in Pickering township without the normal hearing of necessity is a good example of the kind of thing of which I'm speaking. The Liberal Party believes individualism must not be trampled by expedience; we must achieve our goals without sacrificing diversity.

Opposition to irresponsible political power of man over man is, therefore, the keystone of our Liberal philosophy, but it extends beyond that to oppose unwarranted privilege of any kind. The original revolt of Ontario

Liberalism against the Family Compact was an assertion of political equality. For the individual, freedom is incomplete without access to opportunities. It is a basic Liberal principle that we must continually remove barriers blocking the avenue of independent, individual progress.

The task of the Liberal is therefore to fight for this elusive goal, a society in which every individual will have an equal opportunity to learn, to work, to strive, to grow, to achieve, to succeed and, of course, in Ontario I suppose we'll have to include to stand. This does not mean, of course, that every individual will be equal or will secure an equal share of the fruits of society. People have always been and will continue to be unequal in ability and diligence. Their rewards will, therefore, differ and should differ. But until such person has an equal opportunity to establish his or her own goals and work towards them, our society will have need for Liberals.

The political issue is the extent to which government will intervene to ensure that expanding opportunities spread quickly throughout all the community. Liberals are prepared to utilize government actively. Historically, Conservatives have tended to avoid governmental action, preferring solution to problems by non-governmental intervention. Recently, however, Ontario's Conservative government has been interfering in the lives of individuals with increasing frequency. The object of this government action has not, however, been to equalize opportunity but to appropriate more and more powers to the provincial government.

Extensive government control is also, of course, basic to the NDP philosophy.

This is an issue on which the philosophy of the Liberal Party differs sharply from those of the other two parties. The local autonomy cry is firmly entrenched in the programme of all political parties but in an examination of Conservative practice it is obvious that the tendency is to centralize substantially many of the responsibilities of government such as assessment and planning which should, in their main application if not in the broad policy, be a function of local government.

The grants by which the province supports the municipalities are really vehicles to leave the decisions in the hands of provincial authorities. The municipalities are left only with the responsibility to raise the residue of funds and to carry the political ashcan when certain planning and development decisions are not locally popular.

The issue of local government is one, once again, on which the Conservative and Liberal philosophies are sharply distinct and the same can be said to a great degree with regard to certain other issues. As we rapidly approach the next provincial election, we in the Liberal Party are applying the philosophic principles which I have just outlined to the development of a programme that will present the electors of Ontario with a clear and responsible alternative to the present government.

It is consistent with our philosophy of individualism that we require substantial involvement from our members in the formation of policy and responsibility from the leadership of the party to account for positions and actions taken. The process is well under way and the results of it will see a platform in place whenever an election is called.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall, I am certain, the items which were contained in the motion on the budget which I had moved following the 1974 budget brought in by the then Treasurer. On that occasion, the motion contained five parts of criticism and I should like to review them with you. The contents of that motion were as follows:

This House regrets the lack of any government policy to effectively deal with the problems of inflation in areas of provincial concern.

This House regrets the government's failure for an effective review of price increases by using a standing committee of the Legislature for such a purpose.

This House regrets the government's failure to have a satisfactory policy to reduce housing costs and review rents and to stimulate new housing constructions through such measures as the removal of the provincial sales tax on residential building materials and the servicing of lands in provincial land banks and other areas.

This House regrets the government's failure to control exorbitant increases in the costs of regional governments implemented by this government.

This House regrets the government's failure to have any effective programme to equalize the costs of living throughout the province or to plan for the balanced development of northern and eastern Ontario.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Excellent.

Mr. Breithaupt: In each single particular, the criticisms of the budget of 1974 are entirely accurate and relevant to the budget of

1975. The government has failed in every one of those areas and the failures prove that this government is not getting better; it's just getting older. It would appear the government simply is either unwilling or incapable of learning from its mistakes. Perhaps it is, in fact, both.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Time for a change.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, it may be that I will have somewhat more influence if I reword and rewrite last year's comments even though the motion could be put exactly as it was last year and cover the most glaring failures of this government which have continued for yet another year.

However, in the hope that a new approach will get the attention of all the members of the Legislature and may bring the desired result that is so badly needed, I would amend the resolution to read in another fashion.

Mr. Breithaupt moves that all the words after "that" be struck out and the following added:

In view of the present economic difficulties in Ontario, particularly uncontrolled inflation, substantial and growing unemployment and a critical housing shortage,

This House regrets that the government has failed to propose measures that will restore confidence in the provincial economy;

This House regrets that the government's budget is based on inaccurate assumptions;

This House regrets that the government has proposed an inflationary level of spending which will result in a substantial deficit and will further undermine the strength of our provincial economy;

This House regrets that the government has failed to propose any measures that will alleviate the almost complete absence of reasonably priced accommodation;

This House regrets that the government has failed to offer a sincere programme to increase productivity in the provincial civil service or to propose any measures that would restore stability to labour relations in the public and private sectors;

This House regrets that the government has failed to demonstrate any competence in dealing with the serious economic problems of economic growth or any determination to reduce either unemployment or regional disparity.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Until tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, I recognize that there has been some degree of misunderstanding in the way the business was called and I did speak to the leader of the NDP in regard to his contribution in the debate. Now, because this has developed, I would ask that he withdraw his motion to let us go along with the debate and we will allow him to start the debate at 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon or following the question period.

Mr. Lewis: Well, Mr. Speaker, just a note of explanation: I wasn't here at adjournment on Friday, but it said rather specifically that the budget critic of the Liberals would finish today and we would go on to bills. I'm sorry, but some of the materials I want to use, I will not have until tomorrow. I'd be glad to withdraw the motion and continue the debate tomorrow, if the House leader would like. Do I take it he wants to proceed with the budget debate?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, that is correct; and we'll allow the leader to proceed, as I said, at the first item of business tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member agree?

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Does an hon. member wish to take part in this debate?

The hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Old reliable. Is he going to run that speech through again?

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the Leader of the Opposition for that round of applause. I truly appreciate his support in the many things that I say.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): There is not much other support here.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The member is alone. There is not another member sitting near him.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): There are only four members from his party.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox has the floor.

Mr. G. Samis (Stormont): Where is the rump today?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It's very well padded indeed.

Mr. Samis: The spirit of the rump is weaker than the flesh.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The rump can look after itself.

An hon. member: Not in here they can't.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: By disappearing this afternoon, they showed they know how to look after themselves.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: To think, Mr. Speaker, of the Leader of the Opposition being so cheeky, especially in view of my silence when the deputy leader of the Liberal Party spoke just a few moments ago—I would, of course, expect similar respect.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We should do what the Tories did and just leave. But we won't bother the member.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Without being provocative, Mr. Speaker, I would like very much indeed to address myself to the budget and in support of the many matters that are contained in the budget, which I think meets the current economic dilemma that confronts not only Ontario but I think Canada and the world as a whole.

The economic situation is fluid indeed. This government has responded to the concern that we are being faced with recessionary times. At the same time as we experience and see the effects of inflation, we are concerned about stimulating the economy. What the economists call stagflation has certainly set in. If we look to our neighbours to the south, we can see what that great nation is doing in terms of putting many billions of dollars into the economy to stimulate a sagging situation there.

We in Ontario have taken the lead—there is no question about that—in this budget in anticipating what the American population has already felt and in doing what we can to stimulate our own Ontario economy and in that way, of course, to assist I would think the rest of Canada as a whole. We've already heard that there will be a mini-budget which will be put into effect fairly soon by the federal government. It is expected in May. We can look forward to measures taken by the federal Minister of Finance, hon. John Turner, which no doubt will reinforce the position that Ontario has taken and do what the federal government can do to stimulate our economy as a whole.

We are no doubt suffering from very turbulent times. We've heard of labour disputes. The House leader of the Liberal Party made

reference to labour and to the unrest that exists in labour today. I'm frightful that the problem in connection with labour strife is symptomatic of a concern generally among the population, not only of Ontario but of the rest of Canada in regard to the escalating inflation that has beset the nation. This is a matter that we have to deal with. Unfortunately, the population is being conditioned to accept very high settlements in terms of wages and these wage settlements are eventually felt in terms of further increase in costs.

We here in Ontario have experienced increases in settlements that were unheard of just a few years ago. We have recently heard of proposed increases sought in regard to the trades—the carpenters, the electricians, and so on—that in terms of the newspaper reports are bringing those workers into the area of something between \$24,000 and \$36,000 per year income. Surely this is not a situation that could be tolerated in our economy and yet the population as a whole, management and government as a whole, is being conditioned to accept very large settlements, whether it be 12 per cent, 16 per cent, 22 per cent, 46 per cent or what have you. They are all very large settlements and should be brought into line. But it has been said, and I think there is a certain element of truth in the statement, that we have to bring the economy into line in terms of escalating costs in order to settle our other economic and social ills.

It would seem that the budget is doing really two things, and implicit in those two things is, in my estimation, an emphasis on the people of Ontario and the private sector of Ontario. In other words, the emphasis is away from government spending and is being concentrated more and more on spending by the people of Ontario and by assisting in the generation of additional economic activity by business and industry in this province. I think that that's a good thing.

Mr. Speaker, you will note from the budget that every ministry will have to absorb increased costs in those ministries as a result of inflation. Effectively then, their budgets will be cut back to that effect. Also, the total number of persons in terms of personnel will be cut back through attrition, so it is anticipated that there will be a net effect of a 2.5 per cent decrease in the total civil service complement by the end of the fiscal year.

At the same time as the budget proposes that government spending be curtailed, it is doing everything it can to put those dollars into the hands of the little man—the old age pensioner, the businessman, the farmer, the ordinary working person. If we can talk in

terms of philosophy, it is saying, is it not better for people to make their own decisions as to how their money can be spent rather than a government skimming off a big part of their incomes and determining for them how that money is to be spent?

When we look at the budget and we see a sales tax cut of two per cent—from seven to five per cent—we can see that that translates into many millions of dollars in terms of additional purchasing power for the people.

I am convinced that that is a good thing and is generally welcomed by the population of Ontario. Again, we can see that the shift is to the people who are trying to acquire housing, and there the province and this government is saying, "Here, let us help those people who are prepared to help themselves." If they are working hard and trying to scrape enough money together to buy a home then we will give them \$1,500; \$1,000 initially and two subsequent payments of \$250 for each of the two succeeding years to help them to finance their first home.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is significant that that programme is much superior to the federal programme, which provides for a \$500 payment but only in regard to new houses. The Ontario programme applies to old houses as well as to new houses and there is no limit on the amount of money that a person can pay for the home in order to qualify for this particular plan. The limitation, of course, is that it be a first home. I think that has also been well received by the people of Ontario as a temporary measure, of course, to help to stimulate the construction industry and at the same time to assist people in acquiring a home.

The enriched payments to the elderly through the GAINS programme have been very well received and no doubt assist in the older segment of our population keeping pace with the rise in prices and the pressures that they feel. I spoke earlier, Mr. Speaker, of the labour problem and I think we must always be mindful that our elderly population does not have a strong bargaining agent in terms of a trade union or other type of organization. They have worked hard throughout their lives to make a living, to raise their families and, hopefully, to live in a reasonable semblance of comfort during their later years. With the change in our economic system, with increased prices, they are finding it difficult to keep pace with modern times. Therefore, there is no question in my mind that the increase in the GAINS programme will assist them to meet their bills as they become due.

The inclusion of all persons of 65 years of age or over in the plan which will enable them to obtain drugs free of charge, I think, is a very excellent part of the budget. It helps, again, those elderly persons who, in this period of life, find it more necessary to use the services of our doctors, our hospitals and, of course, to purchase drugs. Now it is possible for them to obtain their drugs in accordance with this plan which would effectively put more money into their hands in that they will get this service free. That again is a manifestation of this government's concern for the elderly and to assist them further in their later years.

Mention was made in the budget of income tax cuts for those persons of modest income. That certainly coincides with the federal philosophy and, I think, meshes very well indeed with that programme so that persons on lower income will not be taxed.

The budget is concerned in regard to the stimulation of the economy through further production. The amendment which exempted the sales tax on production machinery was debated very hotly and it is my conviction that this exemption will certainly encourage and stimulate industry to purchase machinery it otherwise would not have purchased. I think it should be made clear that when we are talking in terms of industrial production machinery, we are also talking in terms of construction machinery such as heavy earth haulers, front-end loaders, crawler-type tractors and excavator cranes. We are also talking of manufacturing equipment and machinery such as mechanical presses, air compressors, grinding machines and lathes. We are also talking in terms of mining machinery, earth boring machines, mounted rotary rock drills and ore crushers. All of these types of production and construction machinery will be exempt from the sales tax.

I mentioned that we are in very fluid times, speaking in economic terms. We are hopeful that the economic picture will brighten toward the end of this year, nevertheless manufacturers, producers, will have to determine whether or not to proceed with an expansion of their plants and with the upgrading of their machinery. In that regard there is no question in my mind that the elimination of the sales tax will certainly stimulate their thought considerably, and, hopefully, entice them to replace outdated or worn machinery and to also engage in plant expansion, so that they will be prepared for the next round of increased production.

The fuel cost reduction is certainly going to help the municipalities. It will apply to

their road maintenance vehicles. It will help the school boards and the hospitals. The response, certainly in my riding, has been very good to date in regard to that. It further assists the municipalities in keeping down their costs, again, in a period of rising municipal costs and a period of raising mill rates.

The budget helps the small businessman. The return, I believe, of the compensation for the collection and remission of the retail sales tax was a very good proposal. And while we have heard it said that why should the large merchandisers be paid for the collection and remission of the tax, the proposal is to put a maximum limit of \$500 in any fiscal year for the collectors of the taxes. Therefore, the very large merchandisers will not be compensated for any more than \$500. At the same time, the small businessman will be able to retain three per cent of the tax collected up to the \$500, which will help him out indeed, for a service that he was doing for nothing. That, again, was welcomed. I think it should have been implemented—and, of course, is being implemented.

The assistance to the farmer is something that is necessary. Farming, as many members know, is a type of business or industry that is risky indeed. It seems that never a year goes by without some segment of the farming community having difficulties. And when everything else seems to be going right, the weather goes wrong. Each farm is really an individual business. They have different conditions. Their lands are different. The drainage is different. Their problems are different. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the beef industry today is suffering dreadfully in terms of its input costs and the cost of its product.

So, the announcement that this government will dovetail into the stabilization plan that is being worked out at the federal level to the tune of some \$20 million, I think is welcome news indeed. Previously the programme certainly wasn't working out too well, when one had to start averaging prices over a period of 10 years. Now, of course, with the foreshortening of that period to five years and taking 90 per cent of the cost rather than 80 per cent of the cost, I think that with the province's intention to assist in those weaker areas, this should help the farm producers on many of those commodities.

It's a very difficult thing when we talk in terms of helping the farmer, because I think the farmer is misunderstood—especially in the urban areas. It is often said, and, I believe, thought, that a farmer can merely add his input costs and feed those into the

total price of his product. Well, he cannot do that. In certain commodities that is possible, if he is growing tobacco or certain of the cash crops that may be negotiated in terms of price to the canners, but not in terms of general farming. Therefore, with escalating input costs the farmer—and today I mentioned the beef farmer—is often in desperate straits.

Something must be done to assist the farming community. This really worries me, because it is essential, in my estimation, that Canada be self-producing in terms of what it eats. We have all seen what has happened in regard to energy and especially in terms of oil; Canada can be self-producing in terms of its oil requirements. I believe that our agricultural community should be treated in such a way as to ensure that this Province of Ontario and this Dominion of Canada is not dependent upon foreign countries for the food on its table. And if we are not careful that could happen.

We all know what has happened in terms of certain commodities that we do not raise here, such as sugar. We also know that we could have had a sugar business in Ontario had there been some firm federal policy in terms of imports, tariffs and a programme that would ensure the survival of the sugar beet industry. For example, there could have been a commitment that at least 25 per cent of our local requirements would be home-grown, and we could have protected those producers to that extent until they got themselves established and got their operations going. Then we could build from there. Instead of that, it fizzled and we have been subjected to escalating costs and incredible increases in sugar prices. We must always be mindful of the need to grow sufficient food and to ensure that our agricultural community is kept intact and can produce the commodities that we need to feed the population of this province and this country.

The budget provides for an increase in the exemption from succession duties, which I believe will help the farmers and other persons. There was, as we know, a basic exemption of \$150,000 which has now been increased to \$250,000. When we think that there are many farms that have been handed down from generation to generation, each generation contributing to the capital of that farm, building it up in terms of equipment and buildings, and then when we measure the impact of inflation on the land and on the buildings we can see that it doesn't take long before a good farm could be taxable for succession duty purposes. I think this cer-

tainly assists in that regard. It also provides for the forgiveness period when a farmer wants to transfer his farm to his family. That was previously 25 years and now it is shortened to 10 years.

A similar situation applies in terms of a family business. The basic exemption for gift tax will be raised from \$2,000 per recipient and a net aggregate of \$10,000 per year, to \$5,000 per recipient with an aggregate of \$25,000 in each year. It is therefore possible to give to members of the family, within a reasonable period, an asset that a person owns—such as a farm—which might be in excess of the \$75,000 limit which applies today.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, there was a once-in-a-lifetime special exemption for farmers under the Gift Tax Act which permitted the gifting of \$50,000. That, as I mentioned, has been raised to \$75,000. That provision extends, as well, to the small businessman. The transfers between spouses, of course, are exempt and will continue to be exempt.

I mentioned that I could see a shift in government policy in terms of concentrating on the private sector on the community as a whole in terms of spending and cutting back on government spending. In fact, the restraints that have been imposed on government spending were pointed out a few moments ago. With the reorganization of government it was necessary, and no doubt it will continue to be necessary, to streamline government operations. We're always talking in terms of business having to streamline to cut expenses and to keep competitive. We often forget that probably the biggest single spender is government. It is certainly necessary for government to pare its expenditures and to streamline, to cut costs and to cut deadwood if necessary. In my opinion, it is always necessary to cut out the deadwood.

Mr. Stokes: It's one thing for the government to say it is doing it, but it's another thing to do it.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The commitment was made and the commitment is being followed up. If, perchance, this great province of ours was ever ruled by a socialist party, a socialist government, one would see the biggest civil service that anyone would ever see in any place in the world outside of the eastern countries and the Soviet Union.

Mr. Stokes: Just because he says it, that doesn't make it so.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: There's no question in my mind that the NDP would homogenize society and turn into a civil servant everyone it could. At the same time, they sit there and condemn the present government for too large a civil service. What I am saying is that we are taking steps to streamline and to pare the costs—

Mr. Stokes: The facts don't bear it out.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: —in terms of total numbers of civil servants; and the complement will actually be cut by 2½ per cent next year.

Mr. Stokes: It's gone up by six per cent in the last year. Just because he is saying it, it doesn't make it so.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It's happening. I don't wish to repeat or reiterate what I said, but for a party that is committed to the takeover by government of the means of production of this country, I don't see how anything can be accomplished but additional civil servants, additional people on the public payroll. That is precisely what would happen under any government that the New Democratic Party would ever form.

Mr. Stokes: That's not so.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): It didn't happen that way in B.C.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: As a matter of fact, I've sat here and I've heard members of the NDP talk in terms of confiscation.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Confiscation?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Confiscation of the natural resources.

Mr. Deans: Confiscation?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Yes, indeed. Not expropriation with compensation, but actual confiscation—and that shocks me.

Mr. Deans: Of what?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Of the resource industries.

Mr. Deans: That's not so. That's not party policy at all.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: If the member will check the record he will see the interjection by the—

Mr. Deans: That's misleading and, in fact, the member for Prince Edward-Lennox should withdraw it.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That's not misleading at all. If the member for Wentworth consults his colleague, the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel), he can confirm precisely what I've said.

Mr. Deans: That's completely wrong.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That shocks me. And to expose the member for Wentworth shocks him, I can see that.

Mr. Stokes: It's not true.

Mr. Deans: That is a typical Conservative statement; inaccurate, misleading. I don't understand how the member can get away with that sort of thing.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Because I've talked—

Mr. Deans: He should withdraw from the chamber.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The truth shall make the member grieve.

Mr. Deans: He is a disgrace to say such a thing.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Yes, sir. We see how it hurts.

Mr. Deans: To say a thing like that—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: It cuts him to the quick when he is exposed by one of his colleagues.

Mr. Deans: Incredible. I have never heard such balderdash. It is absolute nonsense. How can he stand there—

Mr. J. A. Taylor: He has heard it and no doubt in due course he will regurgitate it.

Mr. Deans: How can he stand there, as a representative of the Province of Ontario, and say things like that which he knows have no foundation?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I wish he'd take the smirk or smile off his face when he talks like that.

Mr. Deans: I have no smile. How can he stand there as a representative of the public and say things like that, knowing full well there is no foundation for them?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: He is being exposed for what he is, Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to become provocative but I can see—

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, are you going to allow this?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has the floor.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): He's not doing a very good job of it.

Mr. Deans: Are you going to allow him to make those kinds of irresponsible statements? Totally inaccurate.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: If he will check the record he'll find out for himself. The real

responsibility, Mr. Speaker, is this member denying the facts.

Mr. Speaker: Would you come to order, please?

Mr. Gaunt: I think they are both exposing themselves.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Except that the member for Wentworth's exposure is indecent indeed. The assistance to the—

Mr. Deans: On a point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: On a point of order. The member for Wentworth, what is your point of privilege?

Mr. Deans: I want that remark withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: What remark is that?

Mr. Deans: The remark made by the member who was just speaking who said that my exposure was indecent. I want it withdrawn and I want an apology. That was completely uncalled for. It's unparliamentary and I want it withdrawn.

Mr. Stokes: And not true. It's false.

Mr. Speaker: I'm sure the member for Prince Edward-Lennox will withdraw the remark about the member for Wentworth being indecent. I'm sure he'd want to retract that statement.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, may I point out that in—

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I want a withdrawal without explanation.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, may I point out—

Mr. Deans: On a point of order, it is either withdrawn or not withdrawn. There is no opportunity for discussion.

Mr. Speaker: If you give the member for Prince Edward-Lennox—

Mr. Deans: He is not entitled to explain. Either he—

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Who is boss around here?

Mr. Stokes: He made the statement.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Prince Edward-Lennox will withdraw it. He has indicated he'll withdraw it. I'm asking him to withdraw the statement saying the member for Wentworth is indecent and I'm sure he'll do that.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I didn't say that.

Mr. Stokes: He did.

Mr. Deans: He did.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: How can I withdraw something I didn't say?

Mr. Stokes: He did.

Mr. Deans: He did.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Let him read the record back, see what was said and not be so sensitive. Any interjection is out of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The Deputy Speaker will report this to the Speaker tomorrow and after we have had a chance to look at the records the Speaker will deal with the matter. The member for Prince Edward-Lennox may proceed with the debate on the budget.

Mr. Stokes: The member is being reported to the Speaker.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The member for Thunder Bay doesn't intimidate me.

An hon. member: Why doesn't he take it a little deeper?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: If the member could learn to be quiet maybe he wouldn't expose himself to the ridicule he's been exposed to.

Mr. Deans: I see. Now he is softening it a little. Maybe if he would tell it as it is, we wouldn't have to interject.

Mr. Speaker: I don't believe there's a quorum.

Mr. Speaker ordered that the bells be rung for four minutes.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, I see 18 members.

Mr. Speaker: Nineteen.

Mr. Deans: No, you see 18 members.

Mr. Speaker: Nineteen plus the Deputy Speaker makes 20.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Proceed.

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): Well, there's a group down in committee too.

Mr. Stokes: No way. Either we have a quorum or we don't.

Mr. Kennedy: He said 20.

Mr. Eaton: What about all the fellows down in committee?

Mr. Ferrier: Ring the bells again.

Mr. Speaker: Do I understand there is not a quorum?

Clerk of the House: There is not a quorum here, sir.

Mr. Kennedy: I see 20.

Mr. Speaker: Our orders indicate if there is not a quorum that we record the attendance of those present and adjourn the House until tomorrow—

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): There are 20 people in here.

Mr. Speaker: —unless we have unanimous consent to do otherwise, but that's what the order says.

Mr. Kennedy: Mr. Speaker, there is a quorum now. There is a quorum.

Mr. Stokes: There wasn't when the Clerk counted—

Mr. Kennedy: With respect, Mr. Speaker, there wasn't a quorum; I have just counted now, and there is.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I announced the procedure when the Clerk announced that there was not a quorum. I understand there was not a quorum, so that is the procedure.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Mr. Speaker, I don't know—

Mr. Stokes: Is the Deputy Speaker challenging the Speaker's ruling?

Mr. W. Hodgson: Calm down. I am asking for a ruling of the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think we have no other course but to do this, unless we have the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): That's a rule of the House.

Mr. Speaker: It is a rule of the House.

Mr. Kennedy: Let it be recorded that there are two Liberals.

An hon. member: And three NDPers.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Those who are in the House at the time the Clerk announced there was not a quorum will

please come forward and sign the attendance register.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question on procedure. Who instructs the Clerk to take the count at the particular time?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Speaker.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Well, the Deputy Speaker or acting Speaker at the time hadn't instructed the Clerk at that particular time to take a count.

Mr. Stokes: That is automatic.

Mr. Speaker: Well, a count was taken and the Clerk reported it. So, based on the standing orders—

Mr. Deans: On a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Deans: My recollection, though I don't have my rule book with me, is that in the event that the bells have rung for four minutes and no quorum is present, the bells shall ring for a further period and then the count shall be taken and reported.

Mr. Speaker: As I understand, I think I'm clear that if you're in committee, the bell rings for four minutes and if there is not a quorum then it is reported to the Speaker, who shall request that they be rung for four more minutes and then the House shall adjourn if there is not the required attendance.

I declare the House adjourned until 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon and the members who were present when the bells stopped ringing—I understand there were 18 or 19—will sign the register.

The names of the members were taken down as follows:

PRESENT

Mr. Speaker	Paterson
Deans	Rollins
Dymond	Root
Eaton	Scrivener
Ferrier	Stokes
Hodgson	Taylor
(Victoria-Haliburton)	(Prince Edward-Lennox)
Hodgson	Villeneuve
(York North)	Winkler
Kennedy	Worton
Maeck	

The House adjourned at 4:25 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 28, 1975

Transmitting estimates of certain sums required for the services of Ontario, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor	1257
Hydro rates, statement by Mr. Timbrell	1257
Government policy on Ontario Hydro, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Haggerty, Mr. Deans, Mr. Gaunt	1259
Housing starts, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Deacon	1261
Flood damage assistance, questions of Mr. Winkler: Mr. R. F. Nixon	1262
Ontario Hydro spending, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Lewis, Mr. R. F. Nixon	1262
Status of physically disabled persons, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Lewis, Mr. R. S. Smith	1264
Renewal of leases, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Lewis	1265
Limited-dividend housing, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mrs. Campbell	1265
Hamilton area HOME programme standards, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Deans	1265
Auto parts haulage rates, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Ruston	1266
Construction wage rates, questions of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Bounsall	1266
Home improvement funds, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. B. Newman	1267
Truck load covers, question of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Burr	1267
Strike at NCR, questions of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Braithwaite	1267
Housing for Métis and non-status Indians, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. R. S. Smith	1268
Ottawa Festival of Flowers, questions of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Cassidy	1268
Use of wood as food, questions of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Good	1268
WCB vocational rehabilitation programmes, questions of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Bounsall ..	1269
Visit to Indian reserves, question of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Singer	1269
Film censorship, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Breithaupt	1269
Report, board of governors of Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Mr. Wells ..	1270
Beds of Navigable Waters Amendment Act, Mr. Haggerty, first reading	1270
Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. J. A. Taylor	1270
Adjournment for lack of quorum	1283



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, April 29, 1975
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975



CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 1975

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to the House a large number of constituents from Middlesex South, seated in the west gallery and the Speaker's gallery. They are on a trip organized by the Strathroy Progressive Conservative Association and I ask you to join with me in welcoming them to the House.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to the House some 40 students in the charge of Mr. Bob Derkson who are from the community of Emo in the Rainy River district. These students and their teachers have come over 1,200 miles, Mr. Speaker, by bus; as you are aware that is further than the distance from Halifax. They are down here to see the Legislature, the Science Centre and all the other things of interest in Toronto.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Natural Resources.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I know the members will want to join me in welcoming one particular group here in the gallery this afternoon. They are from the Evergreen Public School in Kenora. Earlier this morning we had a group of students from the Pinewood Senior Public School in Dryden.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

MERCURY POLLUTION AT INDIAN RESERVES

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Mr. Speaker, because of unacceptably high mercury levels, inhabitants of the Grassy Narrows and White-dog Indian reserves have been advised not to eat fish taken from the waters of the English-Wabigoon river system.

On April 26, I and my colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources, visited these two reserves to discuss the question of alterna-

tive fish supplies. We met with Chief Andy Keewatin, of Grassy Narrows, and Chief Roy MacDonald of Whitedog, and with councilors and band members of both reserves.

As a result, Mr. Speaker, we have agreed to undertake the following actions as quickly as possible.

1. Community freezers will be installed on both reserves for the purpose of storing uncontaminated fish for the use of band members.

2. Access will be provided to nearby uncontaminated lakes so that fish may be obtained by the bands for their own consumption.

In arriving at the foregoing, sir, we were assured by the bands that they wish to administer the programme when it is established, and they will choose fishermen from the bands to keep the freezers stocked with fish obtained from these lakes. This programme provides a clear alternative to the consumption of mercury-contaminated fish and, if followed, should eliminate the health hazard associated with this problem.

We are hopeful that with the increasing co-operation of the band council, who are aware of the problems posed by the mercury-contaminated fish, with an increased emphasis on nutritional education and with an alternative fish supply available, the consumption of contaminated fish will cease. I have already spoken to the federal Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. We will be meeting shortly to work out the details of a co-operative programme with respect to the foregoing.

Mr. Speaker, other matters of concern to the Indian bands were also discussed at length and the Minister of Natural Resources will deal with these.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Does he want to know what's going on?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Does the minister want applause for that? That's quite impressive after all these years.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Lewis: Freezers on the reserve four years later.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Just before an election.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

EMPLOYMENT ON INDIAN RESERVES

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, further to the statement by the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development, I would like to make some additional comments which stem from our recent visit to the Grassy Narrows and Whitedog Indian reserves.

At the outset, let me say that I was most impressed with the attitude, the interest and the desire of the two chiefs and their people to find gainful employment in order to replace welfare.

Mr. Lewis: That's nice of the minister. That's really sweet.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): I wonder if they were impressed by him.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister will continue.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The ministry staff are exploring commercial fishing opportunities in uncontaminated waters in the general vicinity of the two reserves.

Mr. Lewis: They must be pleased. White father gives them a little beneficence.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Because of the size and other characteristics of these locations, it may be that commercial fishing would be limited to alternative years or particular species.

As well, our staff will continue working with the people of the two reserves to provide additional advice in the development of cutting plans for timber already licensed to the bands concerned to increase employment and production. It may also be that some assistance in training and the use of particular equipment or the acquisition of equipment itself may be required.

Arrangements are being made to engage local native people for work in clearing the rights of way in the vicinity. This is the type of work that can be scheduled for times of the year when other employment opportunities do not exist. For instance, this work can be scheduled so as not to conflict with

gathering of wild rice, commercial fishing or guiding.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, my ministry will be taking steps to ensure that wherever employment opportunities exist in our normal programmes, such as tree planting and fire-fighting, these opportunities will be made available to the people of the Whitedog and Grassy Narrows area.

Mr. Lewis: That's pretty impressive stuff.

GRAND RIVER FLOOD INQUIRY

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I will be tabling the report of the royal commission inquiry into the Grand River flood of 1974. The commissioner, His Honour Judge W. W. Leach, presented his report to me this morning, and I am pleased to make his findings public.

As my hon. colleagues in this House will remember, the royal commission was set up on my recommendation through an order in council approved on June 26 of last year. Under the Public Inquiries Act, a commission was issued to appoint Judge Wilfred Wesley Leach, judge of the county court of the judicial district of Haldimand, to inquire into and report upon the nature, extent and causes of the flooding of the Grand River on May 16, 17 and 18, 1974; the resulting damage from the said flooding; and in particular the action of the Grand River Conservation Authority, participating municipalities and the relevant ministries of the government of Ontario in the operation of major dams and reservoirs and the flood warning and communication systems; and to make such recommendations as he might deem fit.

As Judge Leach says in his report, the inquiry began on July 9 of last year and sat for 43 days over a period of four months. More than 100 witnesses were interviewed and other investigations were carried out.ittings were held in Grand Valley, Kitchener, Cambridge-Galt, Brantford and Cayuga. The large majority of the time was spent in Cambridge-Galt, which had suffered the heaviest damage from the flooding.

The findings of this independent inquiry is in a 94-page report. Judge Leach offers 21 recommendations and winds up with the conclusion that he was satisfied that the Grand River Conservation Authority, prior to and during the flood, operated the dams properly and in accordance with the established policy: "With only two dams, they are trying to carry out a seven-dam responsibility."

In addition, the commissioner supports the comment about the conservation authority that: "They did the best they could with the system they had, under the circumstances."

Mr. Speaker, the Grand River flood last year caused a great deal of hardship and property loss to many residents of the watershed. It was with the intention of discovering the most effective warning system and of preventing as much as possible serious damage and hardship in the future, that this inquiry was recommended.

As I advised the House last week, this year's flood crisis in that watershed two weekends ago, passed with relatively little damage. Of course the crisis did not turn out to be as bad as last year's, but I think it is also fair to say that the situation was faced better—with proper warning and preparation by all concerned—partly because of the awareness that was raised through the discussions of the commission hearings during the past summer and fall.

Judge Leach says floods are a natural phenomenon and cannot be totally abolished no matter what remedial action is taken in the watershed. He adds: "As long as people continue to live in the flood plains, there will be flood victims."

Mr. Lewis: Did he decide that? That's quite a judge. He's probably reading about Noah.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Did the minister agree with that?

Mr. Lewis: Who is this man? He has the wisdom of Solomon.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: However, his recommendations include the following:

Immediate construction of the Montrose reservoir to control the Irvine River and to provide flash flood storage. This would substantially decrease flood damage in the Cambridge-Galt area;

That the Grand River Conservation Authority carry out an exhaustive analysis of the alternatives before proceeding with the construction of other reservoirs;

That basin planning in the Grand River be tackled by a multi-disciplines planning team established by the provincial government;

That flood warning systems be upgraded by the conservation authority and by the municipalities, and that communications between them be improved;

That a co-ordinated flood disaster plan be initiated by the provincial government; and

That the flood plain be thoroughly mapped and no building or development be allowed within the regional flood lines.

Judge Leach also makes specific recommendations concerning Cambridge-Galt, Kitchener-Bridgeport, the Grand River valley, and Dunnville.

In his account of how the flooding came about, Judge Leach mentions that the reservoir at Guelph is under construction. This \$15-million project is approximately one-third completed and should be ready for the spring runoff next year.

As the hon. members will find, Judge Leach has produced a very readable and attractively presented report with the hope that it may get widespread attention. In that spirit, Mr. Speaker, we are holding a news conference in Cambridge-Galt this afternoon in which I will participate by conference telephone, so that local media representatives can read the report at the same time as their counterparts in the press gallery here.

A final point: Judge Leach comments in his report that this year the Grand River Conservation Authority, the city of Cambridge-Galt, the regional police and the Emergency Measures Organization have responded to his urging to develop a workable plan to help alleviate flooding in the future. As he says:

It was most satisfying to me that the GRCA and the officials of Cambridge-Galt, who were at loggerheads following the flood, are now approaching the problem in a constructive and reasonable manner, with a desire to try and avoid the mistakes of the past.

Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, I commend the Leach report to the attention of this House for all to read and to appreciate.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Did the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) not tell the minister that he did away with EMO?

Mr. Lewis: There are some revelations in that one.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.
The Leader of the Opposition.

MERCURY POLLUTION

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development following his statement on the nutritional system in Grassy Narrows. Does the minister feel that this government has

fulfilled its responsibility to the Indian community there simply by the procedures and the solution that he has put before us—the provision of freezers and so on?

Would he not agree that someone is responsible for the permanent interference of the basic fishing grounds for those Indian communities, which were guaranteed to them as long as the grass grows and the wind blows, and that somebody should be taking some initiative to see that they are compensated for the loss of this fishing ground?

Would the minister not feel that he, in his particular policy position, along with the chief law officer of the Crown, is the one person in government who should be in a position to give some initiative to assist the Indian community in this long-range responsibility and not just to provide the freezers. If that is the solution after four years what the devil has been holding him up?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, my colleague has pointed out that programmes are going to be put into effect which would replace the lost income of those people who were involved in commercial fishing. The whole matter of the responsibility, and whatever action the Leader of the Opposition feels should be taken, is under consideration by the government, having regard for the very complicated matters involved in it.

Mr. Roy: Blame the others.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The federal government apparently has absolved itself of complete responsibility in most of these matters. We are doing our best.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In fact, we are stepping in many instances which, technically and legally speaking, are the responsibility of the federal government.

Mr. Lewis: That's thoughtful.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): The minister usually hid behind the technicalities.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because we have some concern and we know that neither the Indians nor anyone else cares to be involved in an argument about whose responsibility such an important thing is, we are doing our best to step in even when the responsibilities aren't legally ours.

Mr. Lewis: The minister looks concerned.

Mr. Roy: That's what he is doing.

Mr. Lewis: It took him five years to visit the place.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would be the last to say the minister is not concerned, but surely if he is going to be part of a government which deals with all of the people in the province, including the Indian residents—

Mr. Martel: He could do some dredging.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —would he not think he should take some initiative to foster some kind of court action which will lead to the compensation of the Indian community for the loss of these hereditary fishing rights, which are apparently now permanently lost?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, obviously if the Indians have lost any of their hereditary rights that is a legal matter, a constitutional matter.

Mr. Roy: Right. What is the minister going to do to help them?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Those people who are involved in considering the constitutional and legal matters with respect to this particular problem are studying it at this particular time.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister said he wouldn't hide behind the gallery.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I haven't even got my honorary QC yet.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He is concerned, he said so.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I've a list over—Of course, we are concerned and those people, the law officers—

Mr. Martel: It only took him four years.

Mr. Lewis: Why doesn't he just turn down the thermostat?

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member was castigating the government because it was doing nothing to substitute for the loss of the—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: After four years it has given them a freezer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —protein food supply for the Indians in those particular reserves. We've resolved this problem and now all the

member can think of to say is it's a little too late.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: One can't say that's responding. It is not responding.

Mr. Cassidy: Is there power there or is the government getting a long extension cord?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A supplementary from the member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Why need there be a legal battle at all since the contaminants causing the pollution of the rivers and the fish were released within provincial jurisdiction? Therefore, why is it not possible, as part of the minister's response, to provide a financial formula showing the difference between the income earned in 1970-1971, before the cessation of fishing; the welfare payments subsequently paid, and what the income would have been throughout that period? There might then be some compensatory income, until all the Indians on the reserve are re-employed in the fashion which has been announced today by the Minister of Natural Resources.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, we are doing everything we possibly can within the ambit, as I say, of our legal responsibility—and over and above that—to compensate for whatever loss the Indians have sustained because of the contamination of the water in those lakes.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The government is not going to compensate them at all.

Mr. Lewis: What does that mean?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are doing everything we can; just what I say.

I can tell members we are the only jurisdiction at this particular moment which is taking any interest in it at all.

Mr. Lewis: All right. I have one further supplementary.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As a matter of fact, I will tell the member—I want him to hear this; this is very important—

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): He won't understand it anyway.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is very easy, when in opposition, to say one should do this and one should do that, and take an interest in this and take an interest in that. I wonder if he appreciates the fact that in Manitoba,

where there is an NDP government, the government has completely opted out of giving any kind of health services to the Indians on the reserves on the basis that it is a federal responsibility.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Come on now.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We haven't done that. We insist on looking after those people whether they are a federal responsibility or ours.

Mr. Lewis: What is he talking about?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): The pollution comes from Ontario.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is the minister not aware, for example, that in the Province of Quebec, where there isn't an NDP government—

Mr. Lewis: Not yet.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —there has been an agreement of the transference of a very large sum of money to the Indian communities which have lost their hunting and living rights in areas which have been injuriously affected by decisions of the government? They have lost their rights and they are being paid. Why shouldn't the Ontario Indians be paid?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, that's a completely false comparison. There is no relationship to this situation at all.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Not at all.

Mr. Singer: The comparisons the minister makes are nothing.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, one last supplementary, on a completely consistent comparison I hope: How is it that the government found money to compensate the St. Clair fishermen for mercury contamination of exactly the same kind, but never found money to compensate the Indians of Whitedog and Grassy Narrows?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, if I can reply to that particular question, the member is entirely wrong, because the Indian commercial fishermen in Whitedog and Grassy Narrows received the same treatment as the St. Clair fishermen; exactly the same treatment.

Mr. Lewis: But not the guides, not those who were depending on the income; just the commercial fishermen. Why did the government not compensate the guides for loss of income?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A final supplementary from the member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: Can I ask the minister if he and the Indians arrived at any programme for the continuing monitoring of the Indians' health; and what he is going to do to improve the Indians' actual health in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, if I could respond to that particular question, this is an ongoing programme and the federal Department of National Health and Welfare are very closely connected with this particular matter. So I am confident that as we move ahead the Indians will be involved in that particular type of monitoring.

I might say that as my own ministry monitors the levels of mercury in the fish in the Wabigoon and the English river systems, the local Indian people will be involved as part of the work force in that particular field.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions by the Leader of the Opposition?

PROTECTION OF TREATY RIGHTS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to put a question to the Attorney General: Has he given any consideration to entering into a suit on behalf of the Indians at Whitedog and Grassy Narrows to achieve compensation for the loss of their undoubted fishing rights, based on the treaties which say they have those rights as long as the wind blows and the grass grows?

Hon. J. T. Clement (Provincial Secretary for Justice): No, Mr. Speaker, I have not considered that matter with my officials, but I will look into it. I am not familiar with having received any advice or instructions or help from my law officers in that matter.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary question: As the chief law officer of the Crown, the minister would agree that it is his duty to protect the rights of all citizens, including the Indians in the northwest part of the province; and will he, after he looks into this matter, give us a report as to the possibility of such legal action on behalf of those residents of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, assuming for a moment that the Indians may well have some form of action—and I am not admitting this, because I am just not familiar with it—it would, of course, be a civil action, and it's unlikely that we would undertake the car-

riage of a civil action on behalf of any group; on behalf of the people of the province collectively, yes, but not on behalf of any individual group.

Mr. Stokes: Where do they have the funds to initiate a civil action?

Mr. Singer: What is the government bringing the Dow action for?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa East, a supplementary?

Mr. Roy: In view of the minister's answer that this is a civil action—

Hon. Mr. Clement: I say I suppose.

Mr. Roy: Yes, let's suppose that it is—why won't he do like the federal government, which has been providing funds to Indians to make appearances at commissions and this type of thing; or would he approach, for instance, the Law Society and the Legal Aid Plan to give them some assistance on that basis, should it be a civil action?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, at this point it's difficult to talk in a conjectural vein, but I am just saying that I don't think it is the duty of the Ministry of the Attorney General to undertake civil litigation on behalf of any individual group; on behalf of the people of the province collectively, yes, if there was a cause of action.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, would the Attorney General not agree that the Dow action was undertaken apparently on behalf of the fishermen in Lake Erie and that loans were made out of another fund; and at least the Provincial Auditor thought, like some of us, that if the Dow action ever got to trial and the province was ever successful the loans made to the fishermen would be repaid out of the profits of that action. If all of those presumptions grew up, how can the minister now opt out of aiding the Indians, when he and his colleagues attempted to aid the fishermen in Lake Erie by this devious method?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Dow action was brought on behalf of all the people of this province, not only on behalf of the fishermen in the Lake Erie area; and accordingly that is why the matter was instituted at the request of the Attorney General.

Mr. Martel: I am sure all of Ontario would support the ministry in this instance.

Hon. Mr. Clement: But I repeat, I do not think that it is incumbent upon the Ministry of the Attorney General to undertake civil litigation on behalf of any particular group in this province.

Mr. Roy: It could assist them.

Mr. Lewis: That's an interesting statement.

Mr. Speaker: Further questions? A supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: Given the very particular circumstances here where the province was responsible for the loss of economic well-being, does the minister think anyone in the province would object if he intervened, either on behalf of or in conjunction with the Indian bands in the northwest, to seek court action—although I think there are other ways of doing it?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, I don't quite understand the question from the leader of the NDP. I don't think that it's wrong; in fact it's the obligation of the Attorney General to intervene in those matters, particularly constitutional, where the rights of people of this province are affected. I say I don't think it's incumbent on our ministry to undertake civil litigation on behalf of any particular group within this province.

Mr. Speaker: Further questions? The Leader of the Opposition.

GRAND RIVER FLOOD INQUIRY

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Natural Resources, following his statement about the tabling of the royal commission report. When he is on the press conference, whatever it's called, this afternoon, is he prepared to announce to the people of the community affected by this year's floods that the same financial assistance—that is a three-to-one matching of the dollars raised for assistance locally—will be the continuing programme of assistance? And is the minister also prepared to say to the municipalities, which this year had an early warning of the flood situation and spent money to protect their citizens, that the government is prepared to compensate those communities for the special expenditures entered into by way of protection against the flood waters?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I think I indicated to the members of this House in a question asked of me last week that I was asking for a full report from my staff

as to the extent of the damage, that we would look at it from a broad point of view and that each area and each question would be dealt with individually.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Is there any reason the same formula used last year would not apply this year? And why would the minister not be able to announce that municipalities would get the special assistance they really require if they're going to make use of the early warning system that has been forthcoming from the royal commission hearings?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member is aware that the actions of the conservation authority in the various municipalities and an early warning system prevented much of the damage that could have occurred had they not been prepared. So the indication to me at this point in time is that the extent of the damage was nowhere near what occurred last year. In fact, in essence, there wasn't any flood disaster.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, but it's just as bad.

Mr. Speaker: Further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Wouldn't the minister agree that while the damage is not as extensive because of the early warning system it is just as bad for those individuals whose homes were flooded? I mean, it's certainly as bad for them as it was last year.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): That's what the minister seems to miss.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: That's what I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. member doesn't get the point. We're going to look at each one individually.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh yes, I get the point.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: One final supplementary.

Mr. Gaunt: When does the minister feel that all of the estimates of the damage will reach his office? I had understood that would be done last week.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I have no indication from the staff, Mr. Speaker, at this time when the estimate will be in. I think it will be in very shortly.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING PROGRAMMES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, I would like to put a question to the Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet, if I could have his attention for a moment.

Was the Management Board, with the approval of the various ministries, concerned with the special advertising programmes that we are seeing on television and hearing on the radio and reading in the dailies and the weekly newspapers, that by a good estimate would amount to a \$10 million supplementary advertising programme that is under way now, involving the first-home buyer programme, the student jobs programme, the fair share of Ontario's tax credit programme, the consumer advice programme, the seatbelt programme, the liquor ads programme and the Wintario programme? Was this put to the Management Board for special consideration, or was it, in fact, a decision made by the Minister without Portfolio from London South (Mr. White) who was in charge of saving the Conservative Party's bacon at the next election?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, the programmes really have nothing much to do with the member for London South—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They have everything to do with him.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Everything.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister stonewalled on this question last week; now don't do it again.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: If the members are listening for the balance of the answer they may learn something.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Teach us, teach us.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: All right. Now all of the programmes that are in place right now are part of the ministerial budgets; with the exception of the homeowner grant programme, that was considered on a special basis and granted about two weeks ago.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Will the Chairman of the Management Board, who in fact is responsible for the approval of these expenditures, table in the House the information associated with all of these programmes which are coming thick and fast? We want to know what agencies are responsible; and

we particularly want to know the tendering procedures which resulted in the award of the contracts.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I have already given notice to the House of almost all of the estimates of the government. They are all there and in place and can be questioned when the minister is before the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would particularly like to ask the Chairman of the Management Board then if he is refusing to gather this information, which is of some considerable sensitivity, since there are those who are subjective enough to think that it is clearly an advertising programme to put forward the Conservative Party in an election year?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is absolutely untrue, Mr. Speaker. Some of these were in place long before any of the influence of the member for London South's position was brought forward and had nothing to do with him or whatever his duties might be.

Mr. Speaker: Any further new questions?

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: Is the Chairman of the Management Board saying, with respect to the figures attached to this omnibus "save-the-bacon" campaign which the government has launched, that he won't undertake tabling the information that was asked by my colleague the member for Ottawa Centre, and asked again today?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, I am not objecting to it. It's a matter that requires a great deal of detail and I think it should be—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The government will never get to those estimates.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Just a moment, Mr. Speaker, in all common sense it's a question where, if they want that detailed a reply, it should be on the order paper.

Mr. Reid: We don't get answers.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: What is more, my hon. colleague the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman) objects to such questions as saving anybody's bacon.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: The minister should not object to it when it comes from the provincial secretary.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He doesn't object when we go to the Arabs to borrow money.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I think we have had enough questions on this matter. We have spent about 18 minutes now. Any further questions from the Leader of the Opposition? The member for Scarborough West with his questions.

COMPENSATION TO INDIAN FISHERMEN

Mr. Lewis: I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. How many Indian fishermen engaged in commercial fishing were compensated by the government subsequent to the mercury contamination?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, there was no compensation paid to any commercial fishermen in the Province of Ontario anywhere.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They were loans.

Mr. Lewis: All right, loans. The minister has implied that the loans will become grants, so he had best be careful. How many Indians in Grassy Narrows and Whitedog were compensated on a programme equivalent to that of the Lake St. Clair fishermen, whether by loan or by grant?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, if my memory serves me correctly, there are about 552 or 560 people in Grassy Narrows and I think there were 17 commercial fishermen. That shows the extent of the commercial fishing industry in that particular community.

Mr. Lewis: Did those 17 get loans prorated the way St. Clair Lake fishermen did? For all the others who acted as guides and whose livelihood was dependent on fishing of one kind or another, was there any compensation worked out?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, the member knows quite well that we don't pay compensation. The government has never accepted the responsibility for compensation for pollution damage and for loss of job opportunities. I would say to him that the Indian people, as the member for Thunder Bay accepts, do not depend on one source of income; for example guiding, to which he refers. That is only one of the many jobs they take during the course of a year. They could be picking wild rice in the fall, they could be fall-fishing later on, they could be cutting pulpwood during the

wintertime or they could be trapping in the spring. It's just part of an overall parcel in their economic life.

Mr. Lewis: Can the minister table the dollar value of the loans made to the Indian bands in northwestern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I'd be glad to.

Mr. Lewis: Thanks very much.

THIRD WORLD GRANTS

Mr. Lewis: Can I ask the Minister of Culture and Recreation—I think this would fall within his portfolio—what is the government's response to the interchurch brief, the endless requests to his government for Ontario matching grants in aid to the third world?

Hon. R. Welch (Minister of Culture and Recreation): Mr. Speaker, my policy minister, the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mrs. Birch), convened a meeting last week with representatives of that particular group. There was to be some follow-up but I wouldn't presume to answer the question for her. Perhaps the member would like to redirect it.

Mr. Lewis: Fine. Could I redirect it then to the Provincial Secretary for Social Development? What is the government's response to the repeated requests of the interchurch committee for matching grants from the Province of Ontario in fields of economic aid to the third world?

Hon. M. Birch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): Mr. Speaker, last week the Premier (Mr. Davis) and several of my colleagues had a very good meeting with representatives from the various church groups interested in this specific request. After 2½ hours of dialogue we decided there would be continuing consultation with Mr. Hilliard, who has been appointed as a special consultant, and senior members of the government, to continue to discuss ways and means that this province can be of help.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary, is it true to say a decision still hasn't been made on matching grants, which many of the other provinces have now agreed to.

Mr. Renwick: The government turned it down.

Mr. Lewis: It's still up in the air.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It's still under consideration.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: By way of a supplementary, can the provincial secretary explain what Mr. Hilliard's duties will be? Is he going to be travelling the third world to look at the need and see how our food products or our expertise might fit into that programme? Finally, has there been any assessment of the cost of the participation that has been asked for by the interchurch group?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: To answer the Leader of the Opposition's last question first, as he knows they are asking for \$9 million from the Province of Ontario.

As far as Mr. Hilliard's duties are concerned, the terms of reference are very broad. He will be travelling, he will be talking to people in the third world; and he will be talking with people at the federal level, as well as continuing discussions with the members of the church groups that were represented and with CIDA.

Mr. Lewis: Who is Mr. Hilliard?

Hon. Mr. Welch: He is the former Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Mr. Lewis: He's going off to the third world? What is he going to do?

Mr. Deans: He's going to look around.

Mr. Lewis: Is he going to buy some land? What is the minister talking about? He will use up the \$9 million in travel.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): He's opening an Ontario office in Saigon.

Mr. Speaker: Was that a question?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the leader of the NDP has not seen the press release announcing Mr. Hilliard's special duties. I'll make sure that he receives one.

Mr. Lewis: No, I didn't. Thank you.

EQUAL PAY FOR WOMEN

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Minister of Labour a question? Has he set up a ministerial steering committee on equal pay legislation to discuss concepts and implementation of equal pay for work of equal value? Does Marnie Clarke, now in the ministry's women's bureau, head that committee? Is that committee having difficulty getting funding; and in fact to this date has not yet met?

Hon. J. P. MacBeth (Minister of Labour): Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is such a committee set up, and I believe Marnie Clarke is the woman who is chairing it—I'm not sure, but I think it is Marnie Clarke who is chairing it.

As far as I know, there is no difficulty with money. We're having shortages for the whole ministry's operation. We'd like more money, I think that's general, but I don't think there's any specific shortage in regard to hindering their work at all.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

DAYCARE REPORT

Mr. Lewis: I have one question of the Minister of Community and Social Services. He has an interministerial committee on residential services for children, which produced a report by John Anderson and Edward Magder. The report was submitted to the cabinet in early April. Will that report on residential services throughout the province be tabled in the Legislature?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): This was an internal report, Mr. Speaker, submitted as the hon. member mentioned, to the social policy field. At this time I do not believe we will be making it public.

Mr. Cassidy: Why not?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It is an interim report and the matter has not yet been finalized.

Mr. Cassidy: That is rubbish, just rubbish.

Mr. Lewis: Can the minister explain to me why, in one instance after another, whether it's daycare, family planning or group homes, his ministry suppresses valuable public information? Doesn't he think a report which deals with zoning bylaws, per diems and quality of care should be a public document when drawn up by people so eminent in the field?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, as I just told the hon. member, this is not the final report. It's an interim report.

Mr. Lewis: But it is a very thorough one.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sarnia.

HYDRO RATES

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to direct to either the Min-

ister of Energy or the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman)—whosoever wishes to reply. Is the minister aware that Ontario Hydro charged for their December billings at the January increased rates and ripped off the people of Ontario to the tune of millions of dollars? Is he aware that this has been verified by the Ontario Energy Board for me? Is he aware that the Ontario Energy Board has no jurisdiction in this connection?

Would he consider, on the facts, that he might recommend to his cabinet colleagues the appointment of a board of review to look into this ripoff and to order the rebate of these millions of dollars to the people of Ontario? While he is at it would he order the Ontario Energy Board to order Union Gas to do the same thing?

Hon. D. R. Timbrell (Minister of Energy): Mr. Speaker, if I may answer the second part first, I think it was probably the very first question I was asked following my appointment as Minister of Energy.

Mr. Bullbrook: Forget about the second part; answer the first.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No, don't forget the second part.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The rate case is continuing with Union Gas and that is being considered by the Energy Board.

I'll take the first part as notice. I don't know how long the member has had what he considers to be proof of this. I wish he had brought it to my attention sooner.

Mr. Bullbrook: I will send it to the minister and the Premier forthwith.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Make it "fifthwith"; right now.

Mr. Roy: He wouldn't know. He is only the minister.

Mr. Bullbrook: I will get it to him right away.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Parkdale.

COMMUNITY HEALTH PROGRAMMES

Mr. J. Duksza (Parkdale): In the absence of the Minister of Health (Mr. Miller), can I direct this question to the Provincial Secretary for Social Development?

I wonder if the provincial secretary could tell the House how many community health

programmes and centres have been now funded? How many is she extending the funding for? How many are under consideration and is she going to fund any of those proposals which have been submitted to the Minister of Health?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I'd suggest the question would be more properly directed to the minister of the operating ministry, Health.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa East.

USE OF FRENCH IN COURTS

Mr. Roy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General. On May 3, 1971, the Premier made a statement that he would be studying ways to permit the use of French in our courts, and this was subsequently backed up in the Throne Speech of 1972. Could the minister outline for us what steps have been taken to realize this objective?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, about six or eight months ago, under the direction of my predecessor, the law officers of the Crown embarked upon a programme to attempt to prepare a summons, starting with summary convictions matters, both in French and English.

They have met with considerable difficulty in translating some of the phrases which are used extensively in the courts in English—following too closely and this sort of thing—and interpreting them into French so that the meaning would be known to the reader of that document. There is no difficulty in having the printed portion of the form either in French or English or both. The difficulty is in the translation of the nature of the offence, and this is the difficulty in which we find ourselves at the present time.

There is a second difficulty, which is somewhat temporary at the present time, I hope. That is, if one embarks—I think it would probably be on a regional or area basis. hopefully—

Mr. Roy: Just follow my bill.

Hon. Mr. Clement:—upon the straight use of French in the provincial courts of this province—or some of them—one must of course have personnel both at the bench and at the bar—

Mr. Roy: We have them.

Hon. Mr. Clement:—and court interpreters or stenographers capable of dealing with the matter in the French language.

To this, Mr. Speaker, is added a third consideration, and that is if a matter proceeded to appeal there would be the question of a translation which can be looked after very quickly, because as you know, most appellant bodies in this province are not bilingual. We would necessarily have to interpret into English the evidence which was given at the trial in the first instance in French. These are matters with which we are concerned and on which we are presently working.

I cannot give a firm target date at this point but I want members of this House to know we are concerned about it, particularly in the northeastern Ontario section, a certain area in southwestern Ontario and portions of northern Ontario.

Mr. Roy: May I ask one supplementary to this?

Mr. Speaker: One supplementary.

Mr. Roy: In view of the fact that these statements were made in 1971; and in view of the fact that as far as the translation is concerned the government could have got assistance, I suppose, from the Province of Quebec; and in view of the fact that when one talks about appellant courts we have French-speaking judges now in the appellant courts and in the Supreme Court of Ontario; but lastly, would the minister not do something expeditiously so he will avoid situations such as he has presently in Ottawa—which I brought to his attention a couple of weeks ago—where certain individuals are prepared to defy the law if they don't receive summonses in French and, in fact, they are prepared to go to jail?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the member did mention two instances to me, I believe some three or four weeks ago. May I point out to the member—and he knows very well—that the interpretation of phraseology in the English language is a matter of interpretation by the courts and is constantly being decided by the courts, and has been ever since courts originated. Then to suddenly embark again into another language and ask for the judicial interpretations of phraseology in another language again compounds it. I suspect—

Mr. Roy: The minister is giving the same answers his predecessors did.

Hon. Mr. Clement: No, I haven't even read the answers that my predecessors gave; but

I want to assure the member, and other members of the House, that it is a very difficult matter. You just cannot literally translate some of the phraseology and retain the meaning from the English to the French. And it's very difficult to find the answer.

Mr. Roy: They have a system in Quebec.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Cochran South.

OPERATIONS AT REEVES MINES

Mr. Ferrier: I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources growing out of the meeting we had with him and officials on April 1 concerning the closing of the Johns-Manville Reeves mine. Can the minister inform the House if the medical team that he said would be going to Timmins to inspect the miners will be going and when? Secondly, has he been able to set up the meeting of the senior official of Johns-Manville, himself and a member of the head office staff of steel workers?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I have had discussions with my colleague, the Minister of Health, on this particular point, and he has confirmed that a medical team will be going to Timmins. The exact timing I haven't available at this point in time. I would hope to have that in the next day or two. In connection with our meeting with the Johns-Manville officials, I think it is fair to say that we have had some difficulty in convincing them they should meet with us; but we intend to proceed and they will be meeting with us. The exact date of that meeting is not confirmed at this time.

Mr. Speaker: One supplementary.

Mr. Ferrier: Is the Johns-Manville company refusing to meet with the minister?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, they are not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. Is the impression correct that the provincial Treasurer gave at the PMLC meeting last week that he does not intend to proceed—or there is no immediacy to proceed with the passage of the Environ-

mental Assessment Act? He more or less gave me the impression that it may not be brought forth in this session. Is that correct?

Hon. W. Newman (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, that is incorrect. I did meet with the PMLC last week to discuss the bill. I met with the Canadian Environmental—

Mr. Good: Did he? I was there.

Hon. W. Newman: I did. I was there last week. The member thought I wasn't there, didn't he? He just wasn't watching. I was there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I did meet with them—well, whenever the last meeting was; a week or 10 days ago. They asked for a further meeting with me with staff. I said we would set it up. I believe we have a date set up for that meeting. They are asking for a further report to the PMLC, and they want to meet with me when that report is in. It is expected around the middle of May.

I met with the Canadian Environmental Law Association this morning. I have a couple of other groups who want to meet to discuss the bill. I said when I tabled the bill in the House that I would leave room for discussions with the various groups. Maybe the member would like to hand me his comments on the bill some time prior to second reading in the House.

Mr. Speaker: One supplementary.

Mr. Good: Since my colleague, the critic, and I have already received at least 10 or 15 copies of letters to the minister reflecting gross concern about the inadequacies of the bill, is the minister prepared to bring it in in quite a different form before we do pass it?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, we feel it is a very fine bill, but I am not prepared to suggest what changes I may or may not make until I have met with all the groups involved.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East.

CLOSING OF BURWASH CORRECTIONAL CENTRE

Mr. Martel: To the Minister of Government Services: Has Bruce Martin Real Estate in

Sudbury been hired by the ministry to get rid of the houses in Burwash?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): No, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. J. R. Rhodes (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Is that the member's house?

Mr. Martel: A supplementary question: Does the Minister of Government Services intend to announce shortly what the government intends to do with the facilities at Burwash?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Martel: When?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kitchener.

NEW KITCHENER COURTHOUSE

Mr. Breithaupt: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Government Services with respect to the postponement of construction of the new courthouse in the city of Kitchener. Can the minister advise us of the reasons for the delay, and as a result the continuing inconvenience to some 200,000 people of having to have various cases handled in very inadequate, although hopefully temporary, quarters in the former Preston municipal building?

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): We need one in York first.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, as I am sure the hon. member knows, the site has been purchased for the new courthouse and registry office in the city of Kitchener. An architect from the city of Kitchener has designed a new building. That building was not included in the group of projects that was approved by cabinet to proceed in this particular year. It is ready to go, but it was not included in the priority list of projects for this year.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

ONTARIO LOTTERY

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I've a question of the Minister of Culture and Recreation. If I'm correct in my understanding that the proceeds from the lottery are to go to cultural and recreational endeavours in the province, would it make sense that the sale of tickets be undertaken by many of the groups which might benefit from the proceeds, thereby enabling them to take advantage of the

commission, so that they might not need quite as much money?

Mr. Breithaupt: Like service clubs.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes.

Mr. Deans: Will the minister then undertake to take a look around the province, isolate such groups and offer them the opportunity? For example, the seniors' club in Stoney Creek probably could benefit from such a thing. Maybe one or two of the hockey organizations could benefit. In other words, there are all kinds—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Churches.

Mr. Deans: —that I might suggest to the minister—that would be enabled to raise funds.

Mr. Roy: The NDP associations.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, that's certainly an excellent comment. In fact, when we were debating the lottery corporation bill on second reading, the point was made quite clearly—

Mr. Deans: Is the minister going to do it?

Hon. Mr. Welch: —that within the framework of the commission money I would hope that there would be an opportunity for many non-profit, fraternal, or service clubs to sell tickets.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I think the Canadian Legion should have the whole thing.

Mr. Roy: The distributors will like that.

Mr. Deans: How can they get into it?

Hon. Mr. Welch: All they do is get in touch with the Ontario Lottery Corp., which in turn may get in touch with the distributors.

Mr. Deans: Will they get priority over the distributors?

Hon. Mr. Welch: As far as I'm concerned, if the member has any that he would like me to pass on to the Corporation, he should let me know; I'll look after that right away.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Would the minister make the same apply in regard to the distributors, where the real problem is and where the real money is being made by certain people across this province?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I think when the member for Nipissing raised some question about the distributorship, it was explained to him that the lottery corporation, in order to get the lottery under way, took a very deliberate decision to utilize a distribution system already in place.

Now, the member isn't commenting on the effectiveness of that system, but I've asked the Ontario Lottery Corp. for some explanation. They found a system already in place and put the tickets through that distribution system, having called all those distributors in and satisfying themselves, as an independent body established by this Legislature, with respect to their ability and capability in fact to do the work. There were seven or eight other areas and I'll be glad to provide the member with a list of these distributors.

I think experience obviously—and I'm speaking from an individual viewpoint—is showing that there are many retail outlets that don't have tickets and that the distribution system might well be reviewed by the lottery corporation with respect to its effectiveness and, indeed, as the member for Wentworth pointed out, that the emphasis should be placed to a large extent in sharing some of this commission money with nonprofit and service clubs which was always—

Mr. Roy: Now we are talking.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Just look at Hansard, I said that at the time of second reading.

Mr. Deans: It didn't happen, though.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Now if in fact it is not, then I think the member for Nipissing would agree that we should ask the corporation to take a look at the distribution system, and take a look at the number of retail outlets. It's obvious that with a draw of this kind—it is modest compared to the Olympic Lottery—there is a need for literally thousands of retail outlets in this province.

I can't see any reason why we would stand in the way of having as many people as possible selling the tickets. It is to the advantage of the lottery corporation and ultimately to the programmes to be supported by the lottery.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, the minister went off again not on the distributors but on the retail sale of the tickets. What I am interested in is the distributors and I would ask him if he would ask the Ontario Lottery Corp. to review the situation so that some change could be brought into that area of distribution to the retail outlets.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect to the member for Nipissing I don't know what he has been doing for the last five minutes but I said just that: I would ask the lottery corporation to review, among other things, the distribution system.

Mr. R. S. Smith: He said so much else on it—

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think it is important—the member for Nipissing might not agree—to make sure that the full picture is told quite carefully, not just one isolated area. I think the success of the lottery speaks for itself. We want to make sure it's sustained and I am sorry the success of the lottery is troubling the member for Nipissing.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): He doesn't like it.

Mr. R. S. Smith: The minister should have two red tickets for the member.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

HURON STEEL PRODUCTS CO. LTD

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism. Is the minister aware of the difficulties facing Huron Steel Products Co. Ltd. in Windsor to remain open longer than the end of May? Will the minister have his officials look into this situation and do everything he possibly can to see that company stays in operation so that the 115 or so employees may have employment?

Hon. C. Bennett (Minister of Industry and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, I shall take that as notice and reply to the member later.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

TAINTED FISH IN ST. CLAIR RIVER

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Natural Resources: Has the minister been able to determine what is causing the tainted fish in the St. Clair River? Has he yet been able to ascertain this?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I don't have a full report on that, and as soon as I have I will make sure the member is fully aware.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Essex South.

GOVERNMENT BOOKSTORE STOCKS

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Government Services: Is the minister aware of a letter from the Ontario Nurses' Association complaining about the lack of availability of certain statutes at the government bookstore, such as the Crown Employees' Collective Bargaining Act and related Acts? If the minister is aware of this, what steps are being taken by his ministry to make sure that these best seller documents are available to the public of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I do recall a letter from a nurse; I don't recall it being the association but it is quite possible she was representing the association.

We have been working for over the past 1½ years on implementing a policy of printing additional copies of all statutes possible and having them available. We have a great many of these statutes now printed and available but we have not got through the total programme as yet. One of my staff was personally in touch with this lady and explained this to her, and since that time I have replied to her letter.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay.

SPECIAL-OCCASION PERMITS

Mr. Stokes: I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. When is the minister going to undertake to allow people at the regional level in the Province of Ontario the authority to issue special-occasion permits rather than having them go through all the bureaucracy down here, particularly in view of the poor postal service we have in the province?

Hon. S. B. Handleman (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): I certainly concur with the member on the need for regionalization and decentralization. This is one of the proposals he will find in the suggested code for procedures and regulations which was sent to him about a week or 10 days ago. We are waiting for comment before proceeding with actually enacting regulations.

Mr. Stokes: I have given the minister comments.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We certainly feel there is a need for regionalization. That is one of the proposals we have made and we are waiting for reaction to it.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Bernier presented the report of the royal commission inquiry into the Grand River Flood, 1974.

Mr. Lewis: Does it really say that floods are a natural phenomenon? Does it really say that?

Mr. Martel: It says floods are almost as nice as that mine in northern Ontario.

Mr. Ewen from the standing administration of justice committee presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill 3, An Act to regulate Political Party Financing and Election Contributions and Expenses.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

An hon. member: No, committee.

Mr. Speaker: Who is the minister involved with this? It has to go to committee of the whole House, yes. All right, so ordered then—the committee of the whole House.

Mr. Morrow from the standing procedural affairs committee presented the committee's report which was read as follows:

Your committee recommends:

That the sittings of standing committees, with the exception of the estimates committees, be not recorded.

If a matter or bill referred to a standing committee is deemed to be of special interest, the consent of the House must be given to have the deliberations of the committee recorded.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this report be adopted?

Mr. Deans: No.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, if I may, if the report is to be debated, I would appreciate it being referred to the order paper on a government order, and we will call it later for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed.

Mr. Deans: Well, how can you do that, Mr. Speaker, if I said I don't concur in it being adopted?

Mr. Singer: It is being put on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker: It is being put on the order paper for debate. This is the same thing that, I presume, is going to take place now. So ordered.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that estimates of expenditure for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1976, be referred to standing committees as follows:

To the social development committee—the Ministry of Community and Social Services, the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, and the Ministry of Culture and Recreation;

To the administration of justice committee—the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations;

To the resources development committee—the Ministry of Industry and Tourism, the Ministry of the Environment, the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, the Ministry of Labour;

To the miscellaneous estimates committee—the Ministry of Revenue, the Management Board of Cabinet, the Provincial Auditor;

To the procedural affairs committee, the Office of the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this motion carry?

Mr. Deans: May I ask a question in regard to this? This is why we had to deal with the other one first. Am I to assume from the opening sentence of the report, which you have referred to the order paper, Mr. Speaker, that all of the committees dealing with the estimates will in fact be recorded?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, I will reply to the point this way; that I will call that order prior to the consideration of any estimates and then that solves the member's concern.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

TRAINING SCHOOLS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Potter moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Training Schools Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, the effect of this bill will be to repeal section 8 of the Training Schools Act, 1965.

PUBLIC UTILITIES AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. B. Newman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Public Utilities Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to provide for a utilities review board before a public utility can shut off water, hydro, gas or oil. It would set uniform procedures before any of these utilities could be turned off.

ANSWER TO WRITTEN QUESTION

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Before the orders of the day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to question No. 8 on the order paper. (See appendix, page 1333.)

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

BUDGET DEBATE
(continued)

Mr. Speaker: The member for Prince Edward-Lennox.

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned yesterday I was about to comment in regard to the assistance afforded by this government to the local municipalities. I would point out that the growth of payments by the province to local municipalities has increased dramatically within the last five years or so.

For example, if we look at the years 1968 to 1973, which is a five-year period, we will see that the transfer payments to the municipalities and their agencies increased from a total level of \$1 billion in 1968 to a total of \$2 billion, or double, in 1973. If we look at the support given to the boards of education we will see that the province's level of support now averages 60 per cent of school board spending.

I would also like to point out that there is a commitment on the part of the province to ensure—as a matter of fact, the word guarantee could be used—an increase in transfer payments to local governments at the rate of growth in the province's total revenues. In other words, as the gross provincial prod-

uct increases so will the transfer payments from the province to the municipalities increase by that proportion.

A pledge was also made by the province at a tri-government meeting in Edmonton, at which time the three levels of government were represented, and that pledge by the Province of Ontario is to pass along to local governments 100 per cent of the revenues from any increase in unconditional grants with the federal government. In other words, any increase in tax sharing with the federal government will be passed along to the municipalities.

In the current budget there is an increase in transfer payments to the municipalities and their agencies covering some \$380 million. This is a growth rate of 16.3 per cent.

I think it significant that the increase in unconditional grants is being directed towards policing costs. There is a concern for law and order, no doubt, throughout Ontario and I dare say throughout the whole of Canada. The Province of Ontario has responded to a public awareness of an increase in violence and an increased concern, even apprehension, for the breakdown of law and order in many cases and for the disrespect for authority throughout society. There seems a lack of respect, not only in the homes for the parents, but in the schools for the teachers, in the streets for the policemen and even in our court system. This, no doubt, is a problem that is confronting in general terms the whole of the western world. I think it important that we respond to the need for peace, order and good government, especially to ensure that police forces throughout this province have adequate equipment and personnel to ensure that their communities are properly policed.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government should give leadership in this regard. I think that leadership might be first shown by respect on the part of the federal government for our existing laws. In that sense, I am talking about the perennial commutation of the death penalty which is to be administered when a police officer or a prison guard is murdered. That has not been the case for the past 12 years. Notwithstanding the law in that respect, it seems that the federal cabinet sees fit to commute those death penalties. In my opinion, it is essential that strong leadership be shown at that level and that that message be passed along to the provinces and, of course, filtered through to the entire community.

Mr. Speaker, I will wind up my remarks on that note. I understand that the Leader

of the New Democratic Party is anxious to get on with his address. I thank you for your attention.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity of replying to the budget address in the absence of my colleague from York South (Mr. MacDonald), who is pursuing other and profitable matters, I hope. I also recognize, and I think I should say this at the outset, that the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) is not here for a good and sad reason. He had an engagement which took him away and he was kind enough to phone me in advance and let me know of his absence. And it is the kind of absence which, alas, occurs; and members of the Legislature have to attend to such duties. I hold no resentment whatsoever.

The budget, Mr. Speaker, already has a sense of *déjà-vu* about it. It's been scrutinized, analysed and largely eviscerated by the opposition. What little lustre it had is already gone. I'm therefore going to turn my attention a bit to some other aspects of the budget; a slightly different interpretation of budgetary content.

Before I do, if it isn't untoward, I'd like to make some comments on the submission by the budget critic of the Liberal Party. He made an extended contribution to this debate, Mr. Speaker. It was a most literate presentation, as I think he himself knows. The member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt) has a deft and pleasing turn of phrase. In reading back over the remarks, I rather enjoyed them.

The analysis, as the Speaker knows, was also deft, except for a small \$0.5 billion error. But we are all prone to those oversights, now and again. A mere string of beads of the Liberals, I would have thought, to make a \$0.5 billion error—what's \$0.5 billion? And I wish, on the occasion of the delivery of the speech, that there has been many more government members present, and particularly cabinet ministers, because it was the kind of a presentation which should have been listened to more carefully.

As I listened to the member for Kitchener, and as I reread his remarks, I took issue with the speech in three areas. I want to put them on the record, because they're perhaps relevant to the chamber, if nowhere else.

First of all, in the whole extended address—knowledgeable though it was—there were virtually no alternatives provided from beginning to end in that budget address. It was filled with implicit impossibilities, but noth-

ing really elaborated, which has become indicative of the Liberal Party of Ontario. There were, I admit—let me think—in the areas of health and land servicing, specific indications of what the Liberal Party would prefer. But overall there was no sense of an alternative in terms of social and economic priorities, in terms of the way in which the tax system might be used. In that sense, I think it was shot through with contradiction.

There were mutterings of restraint in the speech—very many of them delivered by the member for Kitchener—but when you look at the remarks devoted to education, to colleges and universities, to health, to the civil service, the total implication of the speech is of expansion. So, on the one hand there is restraint; on the other hand there is expansion—and it becomes a budget reply into which any one can read everything; a kind of chemistry lab with endless contractions and evaporations. "Now you see it, now you don't," is a Liberal view of the budget.

The member for Kitchener is as good a Houdini for the Liberal Party as anyone else. I was much struck by the sentence which began to talk about cost-cutting and then ended with the removal of health premiums. When the Liberal Party put forward its tentative proposition of removing health premiums, there was no suggestion as to where the money would come from. Then Norman Webster had the inelegance to write his column, and it became necessary to show where the money would come from, and the member for Kitchener said he thought it would come from an income tax surcharge. Fair enough, except that the loss of OHIP revenue is \$564 million, and an income tax surcharge to cover that loss would be a surcharge of 33 per cent in all of those income categories, excluding pensioners and those on assistance and the very low-income earners, to which the member for Kitchener himself referred. He made that very particular exclusion, and he's right of course. I think it's probably worth noting then when putting a policy that it would cost everyone who pays tax in Ontario 33 per cent more of their personal income tax than they are now paying. That may be a beneficial decision to make.

We too would wish to eliminate premiums in one or two stages. But we know the addition to the income tax it's going to take, and we have talked, as I will talk, of the additional revenue through resource taxation which will be available. What is being advocated is that the provincial tax should move from 30.5 per cent of the federal income tax to roughly 40 per cent of the federal income tax to compensate for the loss of over \$500

million. I would have thought that a party that is putting alternatives in advance of an election would want that spelled out.

The second thing that worried me a little about the presentation was the total absence of policy, which was then atoned for in the finale in those apologetic and defensive touches. They weren't always apologetic and defensive. The member for Kitchener who dearly loves his colleagues described them as occasionally fractious and in high individual spirits. That's quite a characterization of the Liberal caucus, causing the member for Huron-Bruce some internal distress. I externally manifest in laughter. I would have thought that fractious is certainly true.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): I always laugh when I am distressed.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, he always laughs when he is distressed. He is better than many of us—better than most.

I would have thought that that was a fair characterization of the Liberal caucus. The member for Kitchener then went on to say:

It is consistent with our philosophy of individualism that we require substantial involvement from our members in the formation of policy and responsibility from the leadership of the party to account for positions and actions taken. The process is well under way and the results of it will see a platform in place whenever the election is called.

That's reassuring to Ontario. If it were called tomorrow, the Liberal Party would have one platform. If it were called a month hence, it would have another platform. Individual participation, consisting as it does of filling out questionnaires, is salutary for the democratic process.

I worry though about that fellow from Carleton East (Mr. P. Taylor), that chap, that newly elected MPP who went to Brockville and said—I will paraphrase him almost exactly. In fact, there is a fantastic blow-up of it in the office of the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy). If the Liberals want to feel momentarily enthused, let them walk around the north wing to the oval office. As they peer in the window, they will see his blow-up of the remarks of the member for Carleton East, who said in Brockville, of course, the Liberal Party had policies. He just didn't know if they applied to Ontario.

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): Right on.

Mr. Lewis: That's not bad for a political party that wants to be government. I often

think that whenever the member for Carleton East stands, he sends a shiver of fear through the entire Liberal caucus, if not through the government. But he's doing yeoman's service. I have to speak at the member for Ottawa Centre's nomination later today and I have enough quotes from the member for Carleton East to fill a night. It is only because I have more from the Ministry of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett) that I'm not using them.

I wanted to say something about the other part of the Liberal presentation, because I listened carefully while the member for Kitchener put it. It was his effort at the end to place the Liberal Party in philosophic context and a very careful effort to define the Liberal Party as a party of individualism, of civil rights, of general civil liberties. As a matter of fact, if I recall, he quoted John Stuart Mill, and he used that famous quote, that if there is one amongst us, in effect, then let him be heard or let him overrule the majority. I want to say something about that because it has been bothering me for weeks or months. I suppose it doesn't mean anything in the Legislature of Ontario but I am going to put it on the record anyway.

I was at a meeting in St. Catharines with the now Minister of Culture and Recreation (Mr. Welch) and the member for York Centre (Mr. Deacon) not very long ago. It was a meeting of teachers at which we were all asked to begin by defining our political philosophies in five or 10 minutes or less. The member for York Centre put again the same proposition of individual liberty, civil rights and fundamental freedoms as being what distinguishes the Liberal Party from other parties. I really choke on that. As a democratic socialist I want to say something about it.

As I thought back over the last 20 or 30 or 40 years of Canadian history and when I rambled intellectually and mentally on my poli-sci courses with Paul Fox and others, four epic moments of the deprivation of civil liberties came to my mind. One was the Press Act, which I think was Aberhart; one was the padlock law, which was Duplessis; one was the incarceration of the Japanese Canadians in the Second World War, courtesy of the federal Liberal government; and one, of course, was the War Measures Act.

I want to say something about that, Mr. Speaker. The first two—the Press Act and the padlock law—were acts of a quasi-fascist regime in both cases; one fundamentalist and authoritarian, the other authoritarian and racist.

The incarceration of the Japanese Canadians is one of the saddest chapters in our history and well I remember Howard Green—I guess he was then the Tory member for Vancouver-Quadra or Vancouver Centre—and Andy Brewin fighting the Liberal Party desperately in that period on the question of civil liberties. It was the same in some ways with the War Measures Act with isolated and incidental federal Tories joining with certain New Democrats.

I wanted to say, Mr. Speaker, it has been true about Liberals—whether it is Smallwood, Hepburn, Thatcher, Trudeau or Mackenzie King—that there lurks in the Liberal Party a basic authoritarianism. It is just beneath the surface and it is perfectly capable of strangling civil rights in this country on a whim or a fancy in a way which I have not yet seen evident in other traditional political parties.

There is a kind of combination of intellectual elitism and philosophic opportunism which allows for both views—the positive view and the negative view—to be put simultaneously; even in a kind of microcosm here in the Legislature it's possible. It's possible for the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon) to be talking about the free collective bargaining rights of teachers at precisely the moment when the members for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy) and Carleton East are saying they should be ordered back to work by law.

It is possible for the Leader of the Opposition to be saying, "We believe in free collective bargaining between boards and teachers" at precisely the moment when the member for York Centre is advocating taking an entire school board under public trusteeship. It is possible to make all the ritual incantations about civil liberties at precisely the moment when the member for Carleton East is talking about power being the name of the game.

I don't think there is anything in John Stuart Mill or anybody else applicable to contemporary Liberalism. I agree with the member for Kitchener. Sir Oliver Mowat was the last survivor of true Liberalism—and he died in 1903. From that day to this, for 70 years, the civil rights have been easily trampled by Liberals in this country. This claptrap about individual liberty, civil rights and individual freedoms is not a distinguishing feature except where it chronicles the Liberals in an adverse way.

It is an ironic thing. The Tories, as much as I could happily do them in, all of them,

tomorrow morning and see them lose every seat in the House with great pleasure—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: There is that funny linking between Burke on the one hand, best represented in his letter to the electors of Bristol, and the populism of a John Diefenbaker on the other, as silly and intemperate and arbitrary as he can often be, just as the occasional arbitrary instincts of the left are often tempered by a certain Utopian inheritance from the 19th century as well. I do not see that, and have never seen that, in the Liberal Party, federally or provincially. Those whose convictions were a matter of social philosophy rather than expedient manipulation—and I speak of the Crolls and the Kieranses and even the Gordons—those for whom conviction wasn't infinitely manipulative for the sake of political gain, those people have left the Liberal Party, because it makes no sense for them in terms of civil liberties.

Well, I've said it, it bothers me. It has bothered me through the provinces. I've heard it uttered for the last number of weeks and months, Mr. Speaker. It's a false argument. It's a party that's more capable of arbitrary behaviour than any I know and one whose record is stained beyond belief in this country in all of the chapters that I've indicated. I thought there had to be a certain ultimate irony in the member for Ottawa East standing up to introduce a Bill of Rights for Ontario as though rights were central to Liberal philosophy. They're central when they are expedient and they are abandoned when they are expedient to abandon.

As for the budget document itself, I'm not going to cover and recover the ground. Very simply put, Mr. Speaker, the basic flaw with the budget is that it's a political document rather than an economic analysis. For a number of years, up to and including the Treasurer's last budget, the budget was in fact an economic analysis. I can remember sitting in this Legislature—I suppose this will be the last budget address I may make in advance of an election—I can recall sitting in the Legislature years ago when Ken Bryden represented the NDP for Beaches-Woodbine, and Ken always making the argument with the member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan) who I guess was Treasurer at the time, that the budget should not just be a statistical compilation, nor should it be an assertion of political priorities. He argued

that a budget should be a document which gives some economic analysis, some long-range terms, some rationale of what the social and economic priorities of the government are. Gradually the hon. Mr. Allan's budgets began to reflect that inclination and so did those of his successors.

In this budget document, it's all abandoned. It has abandoned the basic integrity of economic analysis. It embraces pre-election polemic. The budget is a pamphlet, not a budget. It is a political pamphlet and as such it will be abandoned in toto after the next election by whichever political party comes to power, presuming it will not be the Tories. The budget takes liberties with the truth, it toys with assumptions, it uses inaccurate figures and it has exaggerated on unsubstantiated claims.

As a matter of fact, it is interesting that when the opposition responded to the budget initially, the provincial Treasurer, while he was in the hustings, invoked major critics to shoot us down. In his most recent speech, I guess to the Chamber of Commerce or whatever it was, such a group—my colleague from Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) showed me—the Treasurer, in order to prick the bloom of opposition sentiments, quoted the criticism of Donald O'Hearn—we all know him, he's a columnist, itinerantly about in Queen's Park—and Joe Morgan, a commentator on CKEY.

You will forgive me if I don't throw in the towel, Mr. Speaker. Okay? I mean, Donald O'Hearn and Joe Morgan, that's pretty potent intellectual company—if either of them read . . . read the budget—but I'm not willing to give up, Mr. Speaker, whatever the provocation from those two giants of financial analysis. As a matter of fact, it says something about the hon. Treasurer that he has to rely on Joe Morgan and Don O'Hearn. I don't read Don O'Hearn—somebody will tell Don that—and I don't hear Joe Morgan—someone will tell Joe that, and that should give him another little diatribe tomorrow morning for five minutes. The member for Oshawa (Mr. McIlveen) can run out and tell him and then perhaps cast his lot in another riding. I listen to Peter Gzowski these days and others on other days.

The budget was filled with bravado and audacity but it lacked wit, analysis and content. There are a number of things that we in the New Democratic Party want to say. My colleagues will elaborate on them as the budget debate proceeds. I want to cast our response in a slightly different context and offer a New Democratic Party view of alternatives and, in many instances, state our priori-

ties and how we would have achieved certain goals and how we would use the same dollars that were taxed from Ontario or released for Ontario by the Treasurer.

I am going to take issue on 10 points. Some of them are categorical, some of them are elaborative and some of them will have statistical documentation that I hope I understand, let alone the Legislature understanding. I shall start this way.

Point No. 1: The assumptions of the budget were wrong or perilous. The budget made an assumption about the rate of real growth which is already categorically wrong and the member for Kitchener put it on the record. The budget makes an assumption of a rate of real growth of 2.5 per cent; it is more likely now that the rate of growth for Canada will be zero per cent and that for Ontario it will be a minus factor.

The budget makes an inaccurate assumption about housing starts. It makes an inaccurate assumption about energy prices; certainly since Hydro tabled its request, the assumption about energy prices is completely false. The talk of restraint in the budget is particularly false. There is constant invidious comparison in the budget of what the Province of Ontario is doing by way of restraint, compared to the federal government, and then we look at a little table on page B-17 of the budget which shows that the federal expenditure intentions of 1975-1976 over 1974-1975 are up 11 per cent while in the same period Ontario is up 16.8 per cent. So much for assumptions and premises.

Whether the budget is measured on a national accounts basis or a full employment basis, it is an expansionary budget. I am not sure we object to that, but it is inflationary in any event; and if it is inflationary, it should be admitted as such and the context in terms of the tax policy becomes quite different. What we want from the government, as we have asked many times, is leadership and straight talk; in this budget we get neither.

The most absurd rationale of the budget, however, Mr. Speaker, is the assertion in the budget that the upswing in the Ontario economy prophesied by the Treasurer—which is unlikely to occur on the basis of any economic assessments of the last several weeks—that the upturn in the Ontario economy is tied to and will flow from the upturn in the economy of the United States under President Ford.

As a matter of fact, the budget says: "In this environment [that is, the United States] stimulative fiscal measures are in process which should grip in after midyear and be-

gin to turn the economy around by year-end." Boy, we've come a long way since 1971, haven't we? In August, 1971, it was William Davis vs. Richard Nixon; in April, 1975, it is Darcy McKeough courts Gerald Ford.

It's really ironic that a party that fought the 1971 election largely in opposition to the tariffs which had been put in place by the United States in August of that year, should now be counting on the United States to allow an upturn in the Ontario economy in the third and fourth quarters of this year. So low have the Tories fallen that they tie their strings to Gerald Ford. You know, Mr. Speaker, you can rely on anyone in the world—but don't use the president of the United States and that economy and the Republican Party and the recession they are now in as some kind of security for Ontario. Tie us to that and you have tied us to an albatross, Mr. Speaker. There may be a very serious economic impact from the United States. That is something that is cushioned and countered in Ontario. That's not something which Ontario assumes will come to our benefit.

It's a ridiculous way to base budgetary prophecies, to tie us to the United States. Has this government no shame? Are they lackeys forever? Must they even now assume that if the United States doesn't upturn, Ontario won't either? There isn't a major economic assumption in that budget which is worthy of the name or worthy of respect, and that's why it's a political document, not an economic document.

As point No. 2, Mr. Speaker, the debt is perilously high. It is, as my colleague, the member for Riverdale, pointed out in one of the debates on the tax legislation, not higher than the Smith committee allowed of nine per cent of gross provincial product, as I recall. And it is now 7.1 per cent—somewhere in that vicinity—of gross provincial product. So there is still some room for movement, but you are perilously close to the line in this sense, that in order to service the debt this fiscal year—in order to pay the simple interest on the debt this fiscal year—will require \$677 million of the taxpayers' money.

I don't know whether you have looked at the budgets of the various ministries, Mr. Speaker, but \$677 million is more than the individual budget of three-quarters to four-fifths of the ministries of the government. There is something profoundly wrong in a government which pays out so much public money on interest to service a debt.

It is worse than that, as has been pointed out, Mr. Speaker, because so cowed was the

government by the figures which emerged of \$1.7 billion, that it has for the first time managed not to include Ontario Hydro's borrowing accounts in the measurement of deficit. They knew, as we know—and I will deal with that a little later—that if they put the Ontario Hydro's insatiable lust within these deficits, they will never be able to explain it to the people of Ontario.

It seems to me that the accumulation of a debt this high is not so much measured in terms of the range that it has yet to go within the gross provincial product. It seems to me that it is not so much measured in terms of per capita cost. But it seems to me that with a debt this high, what is more important is the amount of money required to service it. That's what really bothers me; the interest bothers me more than the debt. The debt we can in a sense sustain. The interest we cannot sustain. What the problem is is the disincentive to setting reasonable social and economic priorities.

Every time a government sits down and is faced with that measure of debt and with that measure of interest, they are retarded in their planning. It is like an obstacle course before every social priority they set, so they can't compensate the Indians of the Grassy Narrows and Whitedog reserves. Why? Because the simple amount of money, however minuscule, now causes a trauma in the Treasury Board, given the amount of money that they are spending. The mountain labours for years upon years, and it brings forth a freezer for Grassy Narrows and a few promises of economic benefit. But the compensatory equivalent is not part of that. And, as I am standing here, Mr. Speaker, it's like every other government policy.

Now anything which has a dollar sign is measured, not in terms of merit, social value or worth, but in terms of the size of the debt and whether or not that debt is negotiable politically. That's what's wrong with the debt. That's what's wrong with the interest payments and that's why something has to be done about it.

Point No. 3: The centrepiece of the budget, in their political grandiose terms, in their stage management, is the reduction of the sales tax from seven to five per cent for nine months. Mr. Speaker, it has been said a thousand times that that's not only a cynical matter—I forgot something, but I will bring it in later—that's not only a cynical matter, but it is a discriminatory matter once again penalizing the poor.

Now I am going to put an argument here which is carefully documented and which we

think is significant. In the monetary euphoria of tax relief the implication was that on a reduction from seven per cent to five per cent somehow the benefits will be distributed in a way which all will mutually accept and all will find mutually useful. Many of the implications are forgotten. In fact, the incidence of the tax is a perfect example of what the Tories think and how the Tories behave.

The research group in the New Democratic caucus put together a number of figures which I find really fascinating. It's a good research group, as the members know. The figures which they provide stand up on all occasions. I've often thought to myself, because I take such pleasure in using the material, that we have here the core of an economic planning board for Ontario were we to have the fortune of forming a government. We have six or eight people in total; maybe a few more who do research for us at maximum. The government has an entire civil service. The figures which have been found about the reduction of the sales tax are really interesting and let me give them to you, Mr. Speaker.

What the NDP research group did was to tabulate the actual savings per family at various income levels for the nine months of 1975 to which the reduction applies. Is the member for Oshawa with me? I can see he is mesmerized by learning of the numbers. The fact is we took from TEIGA—Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs—the tables which it prepared for 1973 incorporating the sales tax change from five per cent to seven per cent. We corrected for inflation in 1974 and 1975, obviously, with the removal of the food component. We tabulated over a year and then reduced it to the nine-month period.

Just listen to what benefits the people of Ontario feel from the Tories and the way in which those benefits are distributed in income terms.

If one is under \$3,000 family income, the nine-month saving in 1975 is \$11.24. It's about \$1 plus a month. Am I right? I haven't figured it out.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): No, it's less than that.

Mr. Lewis: I'm sorry, that's right. No, it's for nine months, so it's \$1 plus a month. That's really quite something. What does it work out to? About four cents a day? Is the government sure it can afford it?

For \$3,000 to \$4,000, it's \$18.59. For \$4,000 to \$5,000, it's \$26.75. For \$5,000 to

\$6,000, it's \$32.53. For \$6,000 to \$7,000, it's \$37.91. For \$7,000 to \$8,000, it's \$37.90. For \$8,000 to \$9,000, it's \$44.72. For \$9,000 to \$10,000, it's \$45.28. For \$10,000 to \$11,000, it's \$52.50. For \$11,000 to \$12,000, it's \$61.37. For \$12,000 to \$15,000, it's \$66.27. For \$15,000 and over, it's \$91.49.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): That's graduated in the right direction.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, that's certainly graduated. What's interesting about this is that when the calculations were first made in 1973, these figures were listed this way to show how the incidence of the increased tax would only marginally harm the lower income groups. But when we take the tax off, a different impression emerges.

Do the members know what happens statistically? The saving for each income class in percentage terms is approximately 0.58 per cent in this flat rate reduction. If that flat rate reduction, Mr. Speaker, were a constant—if we were dealing with something that went on for a long period of time, gradually eradicating the effects of a regressive tax, then one could accept it. But when it is applied for a nine-month period so that all we have got is a kind of absolute dollar value clutch for those nine months, making no significant impact on the households or families who experience it, what happens is that everybody with an income of \$12,000 and over is provided with \$66.27 and those with less than \$4,000 get \$18.59. A touch of inequity has been allowed in the budget which only Tories can mastermind. It is almost beyond belief that any group of people could come up with a reduction in tax so injurious in its application to those at the lowest level of income.

What I want to add—I fear I am going to be late for my nominating convention, but I warm to all this; it's fascinating material and it leaves the budget in tatters, I think. What I want to show those members of the Tory party who are here in such numbers, is that there are other ways of doing it. Suppose they are a provincial government, which they are, and they are looking at a way to generate consumer purchasing power, to generate disposable income, and they have a number of alternatives at hand. What is the alternative they choose? The reduction of the sales tax from seven per cent to five per cent for nine months?

What might they have done? Let me give one example. What they might have done, which we would have done under any comparable circumstances—although let

me hasten to preface this by saying that our social and economic priorities would not be so bizarre; we would never find ourselves in this position. What they might have done was to create a new tax credit, largely reflecting the increases in the cost of living, which would give a credit of \$150 to those with a gross income of \$6,000 or less, and slides downwards, so that those at \$15,000 get nothing. Now there is the use of redistributive tax policy in a way that removes injustice rather than reinforcing it. What the Tories have never understood in their budgets is that you don't reinforce inequality, which is precisely what they did with their budget initiative.

The sliding scale would be based on the following formula: A tax credit of \$150, minus 1½ per cent of taxable income, just to keep the parallelism with present tax credits. The total cost of the system for one year would be an estimated \$322,430,000. That estimate is based on what would accrue to a family of four. You see, for \$330 million over nine months the government has consolidated inequity. For \$322 million over a year we would redistribute income in a way that is beneficial to those at the lower income levels.

Let me tell you how it works out. If you are earning between zero and \$6,000 of gross income, you get \$150. If you earn between \$6,000 and \$8,000, you get \$124.62. If you are earning between \$8,000 and \$10,000, you get \$83.57. If you are earning between \$10,000 and \$12,000, you get \$52.23. If you are earning between \$12,000 and \$15,000, you get \$18.07. And if you are earning \$15,000 or over, you get nothing.

How does that compare with the government's reduction of the sales tax? It means that at a level of \$6,000—let us take that arbitrary figure—the NDP would have returned \$150 to the families of Ontario, whereas the government returns \$43.38, the difference being \$100 or better. At \$8,000, we would have returned \$99.23, while the government returns \$50.53, a difference of \$50. At \$10,000, we would have returned \$67.90 and the government returns \$60.37, for a difference of \$7. At \$12,000 and \$15,000 the government continues to return more and more as we return less and less. Over \$15,000, the government returned between \$88 and \$120, whereas we would return not a single penny.

How is it that a political party can fashion in one blow a tax reduction which is so expediently designed to coincide only with the period of an election campaign and, in the other blow, have it apply unequally and

unfairly to the families of Ontario? One has to admit that it takes a certain inspiration to conceive of such inequality simultaneously administered. But that's what the Tories have done. They're not a happy crew over there and they're not an apt crew over there either. The cynicism with which every single proposal the government advances is greeted is a measure of the lack of public trust in the way in which it manipulates budgets and people.

Point No. 4 is housing. The budget fails in three fundamental aspects in housing. It doesn't provide supply. It, therefore, has nothing to do with price and it has absolutely no application to the tenant rental market whatsoever. Every subsequent figure and analysis which has emerged bears this out. I'm going to put some of the more recent stuff on the record in machine-gun fashion.

A comparison of the housing starts in June, 1974, through to March, 1975, compared to the similar month in the previous year reads as follows: June, 1974, down 45 per cent; July, down 19 per cent; August, down 42 per cent; September, down 41 per cent; October, down 45 per cent; November, down 41 per cent; December, down 57 per cent; January, 1975, down 30 per cent; February, down 53 per cent and March, down 63 per cent.

In Hamilton, the fiscal year decline in 1974-1975 over 1973-1974 was 29 per cent. In Kitchener the decline was 48 per cent. In London the decline was 34 per cent. In Ottawa the decline was 43 per cent. In St. Catharines-Niagara the decline was 27 per cent. In Sudbury the decline was 51 per cent. In Thunder Bay the decline was 35 per cent.

The programme announced by the government, compared to its intentions stated earlier for the year 1974-1975, works out this way. For OHAP, the shortfall was 66 per cent. For family housing, the shortfall was 59 per cent. For senior citizens, the shortfall was six per cent. For community integrated housing, the shortfall was 47 per cent. For the HOME programme, it was 18 per cent and for community sponsored housing, 20 per cent.

It is inconceivable that a more abysmal record could have been achieved by any group of men and women working at it assiduously around the clock, which clearly the ministry has been doing. The budget sets out a geared-to-income housing component of 10,600 units. As a party, we now have checked the waiting lists in the various largest municipalities across Ontario, and here they are for your consideration, Mr. Speaker.

In Metro the family waiting list is now 8,247; Windsor, 518; London, 226; Hamilton, 879; Ottawa, 728; Sudbury, 227; Thunder Bay, 175; and Sault Ste. Marie, 298; for a total waiting list of family units of 11,298. For senior citizen accommodation in Metro, there are 2,890 on the waiting list; in Windsor, 1,185; in London, 700; in Hamilton, 1,621; in Ottawa, 914; in Sudbury, 296; in Thunder Bay, 458; and in Sault Ste. Marie, 427, for a total of 8,491 or 19,789 families and senior citizens now on the waiting list for housing, for which programme there has been projected a total of 10,600 units.

In other words, the government has deliberately planned for a kind of housing dread to infect large numbers of families who will never have any prospect of geared-to-income housing under the present budgetary proposals. The figures I read are terribly deflated. The numbers on the waiting lists are very low. Not only are they higher on the waiting lists for small communities for which we have no information but the number of people who are not on the waiting lists frequently outnumber those who are, because people get tired of applying for housing in this province, Mr. Speaker, and simply don't do it. There is no point, as my colleague from Wentworth says, *sotto voce*. Therefore, the real truth is they are looking for 36,000 units in Ontario for 18,000 families and 18,000 senior citizens and 10,600 are available.

Let me add something to that because it speaks again to something which the member for Wentworth said in the chamber—I guess when we were discussing the reduction in the sales tax on machinery and equipment—about the numbers of jobs which could be created by additional housing starts. Let me just give the members these figures to ponder over.

If we require 18,000 family units and we were to build 18,000 units, it would cost us \$18,347 per unit based on the calculations from Housing Ontario, 1974, for a total of \$330 million. The senior citizens' per unit cost for 18,000 units is \$9,737 or a total of \$175 million. If we add that total cost together we have almost exactly \$500 million; it is \$505 million.

The federal allocation for public housing for Ontario in 1975 is \$50.4 million and assuming the same in 1976, it would mean we could expect \$100 million from federal funds. The total cost to Ontario to satisfy the needs of those on the waiting lists for family housing and senior citizen housing in the next two years would be \$404 million. The remission of sales tax on machinery and equipment in

that period of time is \$410 million. The figures exactly match.

The difference—and it is a difference which strikes right at the heart of what divides Tories and New Democrats — as anybody from the Urban Development Institute to Housing Ontario can tell us, is that the number of jobs created for every unit of housing starts and the number of jobs released through a programme of this kind would reduce our unemployment rate spectacularly. The number of jobs released by virtue of reduction in the sales tax on machinery and equipment cannot even be tabulated by this government because not a single job will be created in the \$410 million ripoff for the corporations.

We have suggested a thousand times, if once, the purchase of land, and mortgage money provided through the Ontario Savings Bank with interest rates pegged at six per cent through use of a tax credit. We know where additional money can come from and how the housing money can be made available but I shall deal with that in my peroration.

Point No. 5, Mr. Speaker; the sales tax exemption for production machinery. I'm not going to beat it to death. We've said before, we say again, there is no evidence for its implementation. As a matter of fact on the night of the budget, the Treasurer slipped in that he had brought in the reduction in sales tax because of the request of the United Auto Workers. He didn't correct that until the next day and said, the Ontario Federation of Labour. I'm not sure which of those groups recommended it. I can't believe the auto workers recommended it and I find it difficult to believe the Ontario Federation of Labour recommended it. When I look at the United Auto Workers' brief to the cabinet for the purposes of job creation, what do I find? I find, (1) a request to remove the price differential between Canadian and American cars; (2) a greater subsidy to mass public transit so that the Canadian sector of the automotive industry can be encouraged to build public transit vehicles; (3) housing; (4) services to people; (5) the processing of natural resources in Ontario; (6) keeping farmers on the land so that they don't have to work part-time at Chrysler or Ford, whether it's Windsor or Talbotville and (7) elimination of overtime permits. The one thing I don't find in the recommendations is a suggestion that the sales tax be reduced on machinery and equipment. Do you know why, Mr. Speaker? Because the reduction of the sales tax will not provide a single additional job.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Right on.

Mr. Lewis: There is nothing that offends more in the Legislature of Ontario over the last month than the willingness to give to the corporate sector \$108 million in this fiscal year and \$410 million by 1977.

I want to say something about that, Mr. Speaker. I want to give you a sense of NDP priorities, because we are not going to play the game of generalization and abstracts. I want you to know how we treat these taxes. We want you to recognize the difference in social philosophy and how it would be approached. If we had that kind of money, \$108 million on the one hand or \$410 million on the other, let me tell you some of the uses to which it would be put if we were creating a budget.

I'll go right back to the UAW brief. About public transit—this is really very, very interesting and, again thanks to research colleagues, the figures point a fascinating finger. I am glad the Minister of Transportation and Communications is here. The transit freeze—short-lived—was removed in early March of this year after it was announced in the budget of 1974. Fares have subsequently risen in Metro, Belleville and I think even Sault Ste. Marie. How do you like that, Mr. Speaker? The Minister of Transportation and Communications takes off the freeze, and the fares rise in Sault Ste. Marie.

Is it not enough that the minister's re-election is jeopardized on every front from teachers and workers and transit drivers and middle class and working class and upper class and everyone? Doesn't he feel the walls closing in around him? Is it not enough that his days are numbered? Is it not enough that he runs around Sault Ste. Marie trying desperately to dissociate himself from the Tory party? Is it not enough that he says, "I'm John Rhodes," hoping that they will forget that he is a Tory?

Hon. J. R. Rhodes (Minister of Transportation and Communications): When have I done that?

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Come back to the Liberals.

Mr. Lewis: Is it not enough that with every group he speaks to he isolates himself from the encumbrances around him? Then lo and behold, he lifts the transit freeze. And where does it clobber first? Sault Ste. Marie.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That is local autonomy.

Mr. Lewis: And on whose fate is the seal placed? On none other than the enviable,

amiable John Rhodes. There will be a job for him. We will need sports announcers aplenty when governments change.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Let the member do me a favour. Let him send his sister back again.

Mr. Lewis: Foster Hewitt himself has said to me, "If only I had a John Rhodes as an understudy." Far be it from us to prevent that man having his dreams fulfilled.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: And his dad and his mother. Let him send his family up again.

Mr. Lewis: The fact is that, having risen in Metro, Sault Ste. Marie and Belleville, they are threatening to rise in Cornwall, London, Port Hope, Welland, Hamilton and Ottawa. The effect on ridership is to reduce the percentage increases taking place naturally from 12 per cent down to four per cent. What is really unpalatable about it, Mr. Speaker, what is really unholy about it is the way in which the government could have made it possible to maintain the freeze.

Let me put these figures on the record, because it hasn't been done yet. The 1975-1976 estimate of provincial transit operating subsidies was \$52 million before the freeze was lifted, compared to a current estimate of \$43.9 million—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Those figures are not correct.

Mr. Lewis: —coming from Bernard Jones, I guess, during the budget. Well, the minister will correct them, I am sure. It went from \$52 million down to \$43.9 million for that. If the government was right as often as they are, it wouldn't be courting defeat, so deride them not.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Tell me about the member's majority last time.

Mr. Lewis: My majority last time? My majority last time was 167 before the recount and 170 after it.

Mr. Deans: It got him a seat in the Legislature.

Mr. Lewis: I fully expect it will reach 175 or 180 next time with no difficulty at all. I've learned that any margin is sufficient to gain re-entry into this house of ill-repute—

Mr. Deans: Ask the member for Downsview (Mr. Singer).

Mr. Lewis: —certainly of intellectual ill repute, if nothing more.

For \$8 million the government could have kept the freeze on transit fares. As a matter of fact, for some \$22 million more, it could have provided operating subsidies up to the level of 75 per cent; it could have paid for operating deficits. It chose instead to remove the freeze. It seems to us that if one is dealing with \$108 million and the way it might be apportioned in the life of a government, he does something for public transit; he doesn't give it to the corporations.

I want to make one more point about that. Again, with that delectable insight that they have as Tories, in the raising of the transit freeze, they introduced regressivity into the expenditures on public transit, they re-inforced regressivity into the expenditures on public transit and that, like the sales tax reduction, is what is so wrong about this government.

The minister is looking at me with furrowed brow. Has he seen Statistics Canada, Catalogue 62-537, reproduced as table 5.2 in the supporting documents of Soberman? Well let me tell him what it says, because I have never seen it before and it is, in fact, quite fascinating. "The average expenditures on local public transit by families and unattached individuals." Now listen to this: If you are earning an income of less than \$3,000 a year, you pay \$33 and the percentage of income is 2.2 per cent. If you earn between \$3,000 and \$4,000, you pay \$63 and the percentage of income is 1.8. If you make \$4,000 to \$5,000, you pay \$69 and the percentage of income is 1.5. If you make \$5,000 to \$6,000, you pay \$80 and the percentage of income is 1.45; and if you make \$6,000 to \$8,000, you pay somewhere between \$60 and \$76 on public transit. The percentage of income that that represents is one or 0.9 and the percentage of income that public transit represents lowers significantly as incomes go up. So the raising of the freeze means that the low-income earner pays a greater percentage of his income on transit fares than the middle or high income earner.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It is the same with everything.

Mr. Lewis: No, it's not the same with everything. It becomes the same with everything when, by deliberate government policy, they exaggerate inequality.

Hon. M. Birch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): The member has been reading Illich.

Mr. Lewis: Illich? I don't read Illich. Tories toy with Illich. Others of us read

him 10 years ago. The truth is that these percentages are things they have now re-inforced through their lifting of the freeze. The minister can shake his head until kingdom come—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It's the same on anything one buys. It's the same with food.

Mr. Lewis: Sure it's the same. It is invariably the same that people on lower incomes pay more for necessities—food, transportation, shelter, etc. Okay, we speak the obvious. Then it becomes a matter of government policy to change that imbalance; it becomes a matter of government policy to use the tax system and budgetary measures in order to redistribute income so that people at the lower end of the scale don't pay a disproportionate sum. When they reduce the sales tax from seven to five per cent they reinforce the inequality, and when they raise the freeze on transit fares they reinforce the inequality.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We didn't raise the fares.

Mr. Lewis: Of course this government raised the fares. What does the minister mean, they didn't raise the fares?

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): This government told Paul Godfrey to raise them.

Mr. Lewis: The minister raised the fares as though he himself sat in this Legislature and ordered their increase. In every instance the government raised the fares.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No. We never raised the fares. We removed the freeze. Locally they raised them.

Mr. Lewis: I'm sorry. They removed the freeze—all right.

Mr. Martel: We have got to him. We have got to him.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: They all didn't. Ottawa didn't, for example. Ottawa didn't raise them.

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact—

Mr. Cassidy: Paul Godfrey wanted to raise them and the minister said, "Okay, go ahead."

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Paul Godfrey is one man. We didn't act for him.

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact one would almost wish this government campaigned on that, "We lifted the freeze and they raised the fares." How many angels dance on top of a TTC car? What kind of nonsense is this?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The member has been watching them longer than I have.

Mr. Lewis: What kind of distinctions is he making? This government raised the fares as sure as the minister is sitting there. He said that in community after community in Ontario there will be a rise in transit fares. And then, as sure as he is sitting there, he said it will fall more agravatively on low-income earners than on middle- and high-income earners. And that is the result of the minister's policy.

Well, we would have used the few million dollars extra—\$8 million or \$9 million more—to maintain the freeze. Let me tell the minister, in terms of social priorities that makes a hell of a lot more sense than \$108 million to the corporations. As a matter of fact, it might even provide jobs to those who would wish to build public transit vehicles if there were a greater ridership, which the government has also managed to reduce.

It is like the hand of dross descending on every policy. If there is a flicker of something that is positive, these people will snuff it out. This budget does that systematically on one front after another.

Mr. Martel: Right on.

Mr. Lewis: It is not merely the question of creating jobs or providing other alternatives. Take a look at the plans they could have given in its stead.

The New Democratic Party has done some important work, I think, in terms of costing and evaluating a dental plan in Ontario. We will be dealing with that—as we have dealt with it in the past—but in more and more definitive ways over the next few weeks.

But, I want to add something to what I have put to the House already about the uses of money and about Tory and New Democratic priorities.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We know the difference.

Mr. Lewis: Believe me, the difference comes clearer and clearer every day, which is a pleasure.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We see it in BC.

Mr. Martel: Right on.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Right on, all right.

Mr. Lewis: We see it in BC and Saskatchewan and Manitoba. Yes, I am agreeing. Well, it is rumoured that Saskatchewan may have an election in June. Let's see the

outcome for the NDP there, and watch the fortunes of the Tories here.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): How many Tories are there in Saskatchewan?

Mr. Lewis: Let me tell you something about dental care.

Mr. Roy: As many as there are NDP in Quebec.

Mr. Cassidy: There may not be any here, either.

Mr. Lewis: I don't want to make any invidious comments about the Minister of Transportation and Communications but—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Be nice.

Mr. Lewis: I am; but I think he should listen to this matter of dental care very carefully—very, very carefully. All right? Any who read Hansard can interpret that at will, but I want the minister's ear, as it were.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, sir.

Mr. Lewis: So that he can consider his teeth.

Mr. Martel: The front row is turned around. Perhaps that's the trouble.

Mr. Lewis: If we had used that money in a different fashion, we could have provided in the first year of coverage for dental nurses in clinics throughout the province treating six-year-olds, at the full number of beneficiaries, which is approximately 130,000 in each age category.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Sounds like our policy.

Mr. Martel: The Liberals haven't got a policy.

Mr. Roy: Let the member read the resolution.

Mr. Lewis: Resolution? The Liberals pass resolutions? His colleague, the member for Carleton East doesn't know whether or not they apply in Ontario.

Mr. Roy: Read the resolution.

Mr. Lewis: Maybe they are drafting them for Hyderabad, or wherever it is that they make them for.

Mr. Roy: Tell them about the NDP policy on—

Mr. Martel: The Liberal Party leader will declare his policy on the day the election falls.

Mr. Lewis: We will get to them all. We will get to them all.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Scarborough West has the floor.

Mr. Lewis: He's barracking. The member should keep his self-consciousness to himself.

Mr. Roy: The NDP leader should pull himself together.

Mr. Lewis: I know they have no authenticating of Liberal policy. I know they have never put dollars to it. They shouldn't feel badly about it.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Call me when the member is finished. I will come back.

Mr. Lewis: All right. Sit back there for a moment.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I am sorry; I thought he was going to carry on for a while.

Mr. Lewis: I am going to carry on for a while, but when it comes to the minister's teeth I want him to listen.

A total of \$11,736,000 would cover the costs for full dental care, for all beneficiaries of the age of six in the first year, provided by dental nurses and clinics across the province. In the second year, for ages from five to seven, it would be covered by \$21,461,000. In the third year, for ages three to eight, it would cover everyone at a level of \$31,137,000. In the fourth year, for ages three to 10, it would cover everyone at a cost of \$36,701,000. That's calculated at full utilization, of approximately 130,000 children in each age category. The average cost per beneficiary, incidentally, based on the plan which I believe is now being discussed in the Social Development secretariat, on private plans and on the Saskatchewan plan, would run at between \$35 and \$39 per beneficiary, once the second and third years are included.

For a total of \$101 million over four years, the government could have provided dental care for every child in Ontario between the ages of three and 10. New Democrats would see that as a legitimate use of money. Instead, the Conservatives take almost the same amount, \$108 million, and fritter it away on a reduction in the sales tax on machinery and equipment which will provide absolutely nothing.

Now, let me go on to another matter—

An hon. member: The Liberals enunciated that policy in 1970.

Mr. Roy: We've got it on the order paper.

Mr. Martel: The Liberals just copied it from somebody. They have never introduced a policy of their own at any time.

Mr. Roy: No? Well, read the bill.

Mr. Martel: That's what they call flexibility.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Scarborough West is ready to go ahead.

Mr. Cassidy: There is no bill.

Mr. Roy: We said that in 1970.

Mr. Martel: The member for Ottawa East is five years late. He is one of the new boys around here.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. member for Scarborough West proceed?

Mr. Lewis: What bill is the member referring to?

Mr. Roy: The resolution. Look in Monday's order paper. If the member had been here on Monday, he would have seen the resolution on the order paper. Because we can't put in a bill to spend money, we put in a resolution.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, they put in a resolution? I see.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Where was the member on Monday?

Mr. Lewis: I was here on Monday just before they adjourned the House.

Another area in which the New Democratic Party would have suggested an alternative use for the funds that are being released by way of the special arrangements for the sales tax for corporations is in the whole field of farm stabilization.

Ironically, when the United Autoworkers came before the cabinet they made the point that if the farmers could be kept on the land, if they had some guaranteed income support programme such as that requested by the Ontario Federation of Agriculture or that enacted in the Province of British Columbia, then it would be possible to forgo the part-time jobs, the dependence on industry and to return integrity to the farm community.

So what do the Tories do? They give \$410 million to the corporations over three years and they give \$20 million to the farm community in one year. If they think that's going to mean anything to the Ontario Federation of Agriculture or in terms of rural support, they have another think coming, be-

cause they just don't understand the farm community any longer.

I have never pretended to have the knowledge or the expertise about the farm community that others in this House have, but I fully understand that \$20 million is a drop in the bucket, meaning nothing to the farmers of Ontario.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the \$20 million is designed to add on to the federal farm stabilization bill. But the federal farm stabilization bill—if it ever becomes law, given the nature of the federal Liberal Party—will not mesh very well with provincial programmes, as is demonstrated in British Columbia, where the federal government doesn't wish to participate. As a matter of fact, the federal government bill may never come into circulation. If it does, it's two or three years away at best.

Well then, what does a provincial government do that is serious about the farmers of Ontario? What they do, I think, is what the British Columbia government does. They set a support price, based not on a 90 per cent average over five years but on actual costs and return on investment this year; not on some market values several years ago but on actual costs. They establish the support price in the various commodity area that are designated. In the Province of British Columbia there are already nine commodity areas designated. The government pays to the farm community an amount of money which is equivalent.

The Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) using the British Columbia support programme covering nine essential commodities as a model—this estimate was made in a speech to the Association of Agricultural Societies on Thursday, Feb. 20, 1975—indicated a cost of approximately \$140 million for 1975. The government is providing \$20 million. The hope is that the federal government will come in to pick up the slack. It won't come in to pick up the slack.

What this government has to do for the farmers of Ontario is provide the \$140 million in 1975, the \$148 million in 1976 and, conceivably, the \$157 million in 1977, making a total of \$446 million, in order to give to the farm community absolute agricultural stability for the next three years.

Is it worth it? You're damn right it's worth it, Mr. Speaker. There is no sector of this economy which merits it more. If we ever have to make a choice between \$400 million plus to the machinery and equipment manufacturers, and \$400 million plus to the farm-

ers, the place to give it is to the farmers. At some point the federal government—

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): It's not the manufacturers. It's the ones buying the equipment who are getting the benefit.

Mr. Lewis: The ones buying the equipment are getting the benefit?

Mr. Speaker, what we are putting is an alternative policy for that money. Give it to the farmers not to the corporate manufacturers. This amount of money would provide a farm income stabilization programme sufficient to maintain prices at an adequate support level in all of the important commodities for the next three years. If the federal government joins in first rate; then the Tories can diminish the amount of money correspondingly but at least the farmers will finally have a fair share.

One picked up the paper this morning. I think it's the Globe and Mail; yes, it must be, it's the business section. It's Nicholas Cotter and, to speak to the member for Algoma, the headline reads Machine Tool Orders increase In Some Sectors. The story indicates that the investment intentions in the manufacturing sectors already noted are increasing without any incentive from the government. As a matter of fact—I'm working from memory—the investment intentions in the private sector last year were up 19 per cent; and even in the budget the government projects a 15 per cent increase in 1975-1976.

Why give them another \$410 million? Their investment intentions are already set. They don't need the government money. How come it's going to the corporations? Why not to the farmers? If there was a New Democratic government in this province that inconsistency in fiscal policy would be revealed.

Point No. 6—Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, for a moment—what about the GAINS programme? Or the related social allowance schemes? How many flaws, how many omissions can one budget have? Certainly, the Tories have taken some of the people off tax rolls, we understand that, to correspond to what the federal government has done. And they've raised GAINS a fraction. Should we prostrate ourselves before them for that noblesse oblige?

What about the injustices, transparent, urgent, compelling? Has this budget no time for them? When the government was looking at ways to spend its \$410 million how come it decided to go to the corporations rather than to the farmers? If I can put another

alternative in terms of social programmes—all of which, I hope, will come together when I make the final point I want to make—how is it the Tories couldn't have redistributed that money to a family of four in Ontario now on a social allowance? Why is it that the Provincial Secretary for Social Development doesn't have as much influence in the cabinet as the corporate caretakers?

Dealing directly with the ministries involved, the average monthly income paid to a family of four on family benefits in the Province of Ontario is \$400 a month. It's \$4,800 a year. If we look at the Canadian Council on Social Development, particularly David Ross's book, *The Canadian Fact Book on Poverty*, we find that the poverty line in 1975 for a family of four is \$7,028, which works out to half the average median income of the average family of four. We pay \$4,800 in Ontario and the poverty line is \$7,028.

It obviously doesn't bother Tories that there be such a discrepancy. Let me point out to members by a neat piece of arithmetic that the difference of \$2,228 yearly multiplied by the 48,000 family units works out to \$107 million a year. In other words, one year of the tax rebate on machinery and equipment is equal to bringing 200,000 people in Ontario up to the poverty line.

Now I ask the Tories about their social priorities. I ask them to measure them even in their Tory crucible. Two hundred thousand people could have been brought up to the poverty level in one year by the use of the same money. They are talking about disposable income; they are talking about increasing consumer purchasing power; they are talking about giving a stimulus to the economy. That's a darned sight better way of stimulating the Ontario economy than giving \$108 million to the corporations through a rebate.

Mr. Martel: That goes to their treasure chest.

Mr. Lewis: What about the GAINS programme itself? When I got home last night, I had the following letter waiting for me. It is very short; I want to read it to the Legislature:

Dear Mr. Lewis:

I would like to know when is our present Ontario government going to help people in our position? My husband has been an old age pensioner since 1970 but I had to give up work in 1973 as I am 63 years old in October. Since my unemployment payments stopped last September,

1974, our only income for this year is his combined old age and Canada Pension of \$197 per month. Since we lived through a war and depression and raised three children, we did not save much on a labourer's wages, or my own in a factory. But what little we did manage to save is going very fast. I doubt it will last until I am 65 years old. That's what bothers me. It was supposed to be for when we were both on pension. However I have tried to get a part-time job, without success, age being a big barrier. I presume we are not entitled to supplement as I have filled forms and got nowhere.

Don't you think that it is about time the government did something for people in our position? You are too old for a job and too young for a pension.

Trusting you will have the decency to answer me as Premier Davis did not when I wrote him,

Yours very truly,
Mrs. C.

I am going to make the assumption that the Premier (Mr. Davis) will yet answer.

It's an interesting letter, isn't it? Let nobody in this Legislature tell me they haven't received letters like it. Let Nobody tell me that, because I know we all do. I know the dilemma of what we do with people between the ages of 60 and 64 in this province, who are too old to work or are disabled but not categorized under GAINS and have not yet reached the age of 65; that is an immense problem in Ontario. Letters like this, poignant though they may be, come to members' desks all the time. One spouse is invariably between the ages of 60 and 64 and they have to live on the income of the other spouse who is over 65. Like here, it's \$197 a month with probably a little bit of savings in the bank.

Do members think it's fair? I mean this is a Legislature of honourable people—

Mr. Martel: Empty!

Mr. Lewis: I'm going to come to that.

Presumably, if it were within the capacity of human beings to fashion it, we would like to do away with such situations. Why do people like that who have worked so long have to subject themselves to such humiliation? Why is it all so blessed unfair so much of the time? When the Treasurer introduced his budget this year and he made his comments on the GAINS programme, he ended with the throw-away line, if memory serves me, that we were now at the highest level in

Canada. Fair enough, but what he didn't say is that in the Province of British Columbia those between the ages of 60 and 64 are covered and that makes all the difference in the world.

Now so that those people over there know what we're talking about, those who throw away money so willingly on the corporations, let me show them what the tabulations were and what we, as a government, would have done with that kind of money. They could have phased in, over a four to five-year period, all of those between the ages of 60 and 64 into the GAINS programme for the following costs; I'll just put the table on the record.

In year one, covering the age 64 group at a cost for couples of \$10.9 million and for individuals of \$6.1 million, the total cost this year would have been \$17 million to bring in everybody of the age of 64 into GAINS.

The second year, to bring in those of the age of 63, would cost \$34 million; and then \$51 million; and then \$68 million; and finally \$85 million to include everybody from age 60 to 64. The 1971 census indicated that the number of people in each age category between 60 and 64 is approximately the same so the cost increment is approximately the same in each age category.

Is it arguable from people in this Legislature on the government's side that they made the appropriate choice in giving \$108 million to production machinery sales tax rebates and not \$17 million, then \$34 million, then \$51 million, then \$68 million and then \$85 million to bring everybody from the ages of 60 to 64 into the GAINS programme, so that this kind of letter would never again have to be received by members of the Legislature? Where are their priorities? Why is it that people always count for so little and machinery always counts for so much?

The other thing the Treasurer might have done with the GAINS programme in this budget while he was introducing it—and I'm going over the point briefly—is to have removed the nasty, almost vicious distinction between permanently unemployable and disabled people so that the 3,000 or 4,000 people in Ontario—let us say 3,000 who are left—who are permanently unemployable but not disabled would have been brought within the GAINS programme.

Again, I can't believe that members of this Legislature aren't subject to pressure on that front. I can't believe all members of this Legislature don't get it when my colleague from Sudbury East gives me a letter dated April 12 which was sent to him.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): It says, "Dear Mr. Shulman."

Mr. Lewis: I take it that Mrs. Sobchuk applied and was turned down?

Mr. Martel: She was turned down.

Mr. Lewis: Sorry, I don't have to give addresses. My apologies for mentioning the name and I trust it wouldn't be proceeded with. The letter reads, "There seems to be some confusion regarding Mrs. S's application for a disability pension."

Presumably she is a permanently unemployable woman who applied for GAINS and was turned down because she was not disabled.

Here's a letter from a doctor to my colleague which says:

There seems to be some confusion regarding an application for a disability pension. In order to clarify this matter, the above-mentioned is physically incapable of doing work which would mean that she is totally disabled. I hope that this will enlighten this whole situation.

Your truly,
Dr. de la Riva,
Sudbury.

Some of us know him.

But that medical advisory board in the family benefits branch, boy, they need help. There is something wrong with their mental processes, I want to tell the House. I don't know about diagnostic considerations, but there is something profoundly wrong with those people. Permanently unemployable means disabled. The distinction is preposterous and every case of this kind which is reviewed and turned down is a reflection on the medical advisory board and the Ministry of Community and Social Services, not a reflection on the applicant. The woman whose case I brought to the attention of the members, Mrs. A., in my riding, has hypertension and diabetes and has had a very serious cancer operation and five successive heart attacks, the last two putting her in intensive care for weeks—

Mr. Bounsall: But she's not disabled.

Mr. Lewis: —and she gets a letter from the Medical Advisory Board saying, "We agree to continue to view you as permanently unemployable, but we cannot view you as disabled." Are they mad? I mean what possesses these people?

I have a letter dated April 27, 1973, from the then family doctor for Mrs. A, the last paragraph of which reads: "Mrs. A has a very severe disability because of a coronary artery condition and if she returns to employment it will result in her demise." I am quoting directly.

I speak to her present general practitioner, who cannot believe that anyone would see her as other than disabled. I speak to her heart specialist whose file is read to me over the phone as they chronicle the nature of her disability in hospital. And the Medical Advisory Board turns down women like this, and Mrs. A in my riding, because we have conceived of a distinction which is devilish—permanently unemployable but not disabled.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): How can they sit over there and do nothing about it?

Mr. Lewis: It is absolutely unbelievable.

What does it mean? It means that instead of \$143 a month, these people would get \$240 a month; that's what it means. It means \$97 more a month for them; and if there are 3,000 people at \$97 a month, times 12 months, it works out to \$3,492,000 a year.

Does the government know how much it has just spent on Krauss-Maffei for the next five years—committed—\$6.1 million. It has just returned \$108 million on a rebate to machinery and equipment manufacturers. Is somebody trying to argue in this Legislature that in the range of human and other priorities those things count ahead of matters like this, that are so easy to correct, that are so compelling. How is it that the government values things human in such a minuscule way, and values things material in such an enthusiastic way?

Point No. 7: We still dispute as a party the whole financial base of municipal government, which the members opposite, as a government, have fashioned. Despite all the contributions which have been made, property tax and school tax and every other tax you care to name continue to rise almost unabated.

The Treasurer says in his budget speech, and I quote: "Total provincial payments to local governments and agencies increased from \$1.4 billion in 1970 to \$2.3 billion in 1974." He makes much of the fact that the government is now transferring revenues to the regional governments and local municipalities at a rate which parallels that of the growth in provincial revenue. In fact, had the province been transferring at the rate of growth in provincial revenue over the years 1970 to 1974, the figure would stand at \$2.4

billion rather than \$2.3 billion, so let them stop patting themselves on the back. The difference is almost indistinguishable.

Similarly, while unconditional grants have increased from \$73 million to \$295 million over the period, they still represent less than 12 per cent of financial assistance. Again, Mr. Speaker, the answer lies, for us, in the provision of two points of the income tax to the regional municipalities. We have always thought that the income tax pro-rated in that fashion makes greatest sense and that's how we would wish to do it.

The impact that that would have is as follows—and it's interesting again the way in which figures so neatly coincide in this budget in order to allow us to give the government a range of social and economic priorities which it continues to disavow. If we took two points of the provincial income tax and applied it to local government, in addition to unconditional grants which would remain at this level, in 1975 it would have meant \$124 million, in 1976 it would mean \$145 million and in 1977 it would mean \$170 million, for a total of \$440 million to local governments of an expanding tax revenue. The expanding tax revenue, in other words, is something which would have again equalled the \$140 million, more or less, given the kinds of priorities the government has established.

Obviously, one can only use \$108 million or \$410 million in an alternative way but once. What I have tried to do is to suggest a whole range of social and economic priorities, each and every one of which is better than the choice the government has made, both in terms of job creation and in terms of social priorities. The truth is that if we gave it to the municipalities on this basis not only would it have been possible to prevent any increase in the mill rate whatsoever, it would also have been possible to maintain a much greater degree of employment at the local municipal level.

The income tax, of course, expands now at the rate of about 17 per cent a year and giving municipalities access to a constantly expanding tax is extremely valuable. Do members know what has just happened in the Province of Manitoba? Ontario said it couldn't be done; lo and behold, Manitoba has done it.

Manitoba has given two points on the income tax and one point on the corporation tax to the municipalities, no strings attached. Somehow, Manitoba has been able to negotiate with the federal government, which was supposedly resistant but clearly will support it, an actual line on the income tax form

indicating the municipal points of income tax and corporate tax. It's all there. As one makes out one's form one sees it in front of one. The provincial tax has been lowered correspondingly.

It is possible for taxpayers in Manitoba to know the amount of tax paid to the federal government, the provincial government and the portion of it to the municipal government. What is more, the Premier of Manitoba has said, "If you wish to increase the points which we would transfer to the municipalities, by all means submit it to the provincial government and we will relinquish more of our points and transfer them to the municipalities."

What is important is that everybody in the province understands the transaction, so they are putting it right there on the tax form. The municipalities will feel accountable, just as the provincial government feels accountable, and they will have access to an expanding tax base. It's an extremely intelligent approach and the kind of thing that could have been done with the money which was available here and which we chose to give to the corporations rather than the municipalities—which brings me to point eight.

Point No. 8: As bad as is the use we've made of the money now employed, the revenue sources are still unintelligently exploited and they are also distorted badly as a percentage of revenue. The amount of money we are receiving from corporate income tax and from personal income tax is badly out of whack. The corporate income tax continues to provide a percentage ratio which is much below that of the personal income tax. Again I have misplaced the document, but simply to say it, I think, probably suffices.

We are paying more by way of personal income tax than we are by way of corporate income tax to the total tax revenues of the province. That is unacceptable. The reason I wanted to find that was to show the discrepancy between revenue and expenditure which accompanies it in Ontario; but I can't find it and the world will not end if I don't.

What is most important, however, about the revenue sources for the province, is not so much what we are getting from corporation tax and what we are getting from personal income tax but what we are not getting from the mines' profit tax.

We get from the corporation tax, based on total gross revenue—let me base it on total tax revenue—only 19.2 per cent of revenue this year. We get from personal income tax

31.4 per cent of revenue. We get from the mines' profit tax 2.4 per cent of revenue.

What the NDP is saying is that instead of \$202 million combined — from the mines' profit tax and the corporation tax for 1974-1975—we would have wanted some \$458 million. Based on a 15 per cent tax on total production, now over \$2 billion, and on \$100 million from reserves, and the addition of the corporation income tax, that would give us \$458 million compared to \$202 million and allow us to do for the people of Ontario the things which need to be done. That's a tax, which for whatever reason, the Tories continue to resist applying.

Point No. 9: The budget, in its whole range of social and economic programmes, still neglects one area which is terribly dear to our hearts in this caucus. Again, in the context of alternative priorities, I want to put it to the House, that nowhere in the budget this year, nowhere in all of the tax estimates which emerge in the document, is there any significant additional money for occupational or environmental health. The Ministry of Health in the last fiscal year, spent 0.04 per cent of its budget on occupational and environmental health. The Workmen's Compensation Board spent four per cent of its budget on environmental and occupational health.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): The member is over-stimulating the former Minister of Health (Mr. Potter).

Mr. Lewis: The former Minister of Health has, I may say, snoozed gently in this Legislature on other occasions when I have spoken and when others have spoken. I find it's comforting; it's reassuring.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It has a calming influence.

Mr. Lewis: It has a calming influence. It's time—

Mr. Ferrier: He's deep in meditation.

Mr. Lewis: I told him not to take that Valium. It's stimulants that are required.

I would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that it would be possible to improve the budget of Ontario in a way which would allow for something more than four-tenths of one per cent—four-one-hundredths of one per cent—to go from the Ministry of Health and a total of four per cent from Workmen's Compensation. As usual, the Ministry of Natural Resources will not give us access to the figures used on occupational and environ-

mental health. We simply can't get them from that ministry.

All right, let me put it this way. If the government is going to make a significant commitment to environmental and occupational health in Ontario, it is going to have to provide money for the monitoring of chemicals before they are introduced into the workplace; for standards so tough that management cows when ever somebody from the occupational health branch appears on the scene; and for enforcement procedures, which by way of penalty and law are merciless; and by way of compensation for those who have been diseased or suffered fatality as a result of government neglect are few. When Linda Thomas, whom some members will know, was preparing this little memo for me, she wrote in it—I'll put it in the record in her words—"Ontario's present testing is to allow chemicals to be introduced, wait 20 years and then count the bodies." That's a pretty vivid way of putting the government's position on occupational and environmental health.

The government has silica dust facing it; asbestos facing it; the whole Petrosar development in Sarnia facing it. In economic terms that may be valuable but in chemical terms, it should be subjected to the most intense scrutiny. The government has the rubber workers in Kitchener-Waterloo who are anxious about everything from polyvinyl chloride to chemicals they know not of. We have now emerging trichloroethylene and perchloroethylene both of which are used as cleaning solvents all over, by cleaners throughout Ontario. They are used as solvents in the clothing workers and textile workers trades and are presently under analysis at the National Cancer Institute in the United States for the possible hazards to human health.

We have the lead problem in downtown Toronto and the mercury problem in northwestern Ontario, and the government has given four one-hundredths of one per cent of the budget of the Ministry of Health to deal with occupational and environmental health. And the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Grossman) comes into the Legislature and intones a statement which pretends to good faith. Well, there ain't no good faith unless it is supported by financial figures; and they are not there, they are simply not there.

The great tragedy of this, Mr. Speaker, is the opportunities we are missing. Let me put one on the record. In the Province of Quebec, at the University of McGill, there

are two inspired researchers who are currently doing work in the asbestos hazard consequences to the asbestos workers in Thetford Mines. They are doing lung biopsies. They are doing all kinds of cytology. They are measuring the consequences in the community for wives and children. They are doing it partly with the government of Quebec and partly with the Department of National Health and Welfare.

A leading doctor at Sick Children's Hospital visited the head of the occupational health branch of the Ministry of Health not very long ago and said: "Look at this research. It's original research in Canada. Why don't we combine it with comparable research of the Johns-Manville workers in Scarborough and the Johns-Manville workers at the Reeves Mine in northeastern Ontario?" He was told that the Ministry of Health didn't have the money.

How does the government lose opportunities like that? That's the best use of applied clinical science. That's the best way to deal with occupational and environmental health. You have a defined group of workers, you can compare data from Quebec and Ontario and you have funding from the federal government. Why is it not possible within the Province of Ontario to embrace the same enlightened rationale that is being embraced by the Province of Quebec?

In all of these occupational areas something has to be done to shake the government out of its lethargy or in little plants and in little industries, just as there was at Elliot Lake and just as there has been at Johns-Manville, from time to time there will be a kind of reign of terror where we count the bodies. There is no reason for that in the world, Mr. Speaker. Which brings me to the last point I want to make in this presentation, and in some ways it is pivotal.

Virtually a whole budget paper attached to the budget presentation dealt with energy. I want to say some pretty tough things about that paper, and I want to provide some figures by way of contrast to what the paper provides.

Under the category of energy, the budget statements are bogus, the figures are bogus, the rhetoric is bogus; and one is now wont to ask just what is the Premier up to and whose side is he really on?

Last year, at almost exactly this point in time, the Premier participated in an arrangement which sixth sense alone should have known was wrong. He abandoned Ontario to rapacious oil and natural gas interests, and we have paid a heavy price for it.

Budget paper A deals with the Ontario economic recovery, so-called, and the energy factor. The budget itself is hopelessly ambivalent in dealing with this matter. As a matter of fact, it is almost comic.

The budget describes what Premier Davis entered into in 1974 as losing us \$310 million in gross provincial product, \$420 million in consumption and 22,000 jobs. It chronicles the very serious consequences. It says those consequences, "adversely affected all sectors of the provincial economy . . ." It talks about "this economic shock [that] has not yet been fully absorbed . . ." It talks about direct transfers of more than \$1.1 billion. It talks about the massive shift in funds. Then it goes on to say: "The comparative advantage of \$6.50 per barrel over the past year has provided essential breathing space for the Canadian economy to adjust in a balanced and orderly fashion. "In one sense, it's a shock, massive and adversely affecting the economy. In the next breath, it has comparative advantages and gives breathing space to Ontario.

Now the price we in this province pay for the Premier's errors, Mr. Speaker, is untold. This year we witnessed the return of the vanquished, standing like Canute at that conference while the oil lapped at his feet. It will drown the Tories yet, because the Premier's stand on energy leaves so much that is wanting that anyone who pretends he could fight an election on it hasn't thought it through.

The Premier said in Ottawa that he was digging in his heels, he would allow no increase, he wanted security of supply. And what did he mean? He meant that the oil companies should receive more money from the increase, \$3.80 to \$6.50 a barrel, than they have been receiving.

We in the New Democratic Party say that the figures in the budget are bogus, and that the Premier went to that conference and took a position which he understood in advance allowed for a different interpretation. And let me give you that different interpretation, and I ask the members to bear with me.

What the Premier said in effect was that the company cash flow at the level of \$3.80 a barrel was \$2.18, and the company's cash flow at \$6.50 a barrel was \$2.26. So that the jump in price meant an increase for the companies of eight cents in total; which for the Premier worked out to something like a three per cent increase to the companies.

All right. We have looked very carefully at the figures. If you take into account the

royalties as calculated by Alberta on Dec. 21, 1974, the industry-average federal tax revenues on the \$6.50 oil barrel as outlined in John Turner's June, 1974, speech, the Alberta income tax using the same Dec. 21 figures, and the Canadian Petroleum Association brief to the Minister of Finance, this is what you will find; and I simply want to put it **on the record as carefully as I can.**

For large companies, in March of 1974, the crude oil price was \$3.80 a barrel; in December of 1974 it was \$6.50 a barrel. You then subtract the operating costs. In each case they are 60 cents.

Then there is the federal royalty and tax. In March of 1974 it was 28 cents; in December of 1974 it was 89 cents.

There is the Alberta royalty and tax. In March of 1974 it was 91 cents, in December of 1974 it was \$2.41.

This means that the company cash flow in March of 1974 in the large companies was \$2.01, and after the increase was \$2.60. This means 59 cents more for the companies, or an increase of 22 per cent; not eight cents more and an increase of only three per cent. **That's for the large companies.**

Now for the small companies, here are the comparisons. The crude oil price was \$3.80 in March of 1974 and \$6.50 in December of 1974. The operating costs remained the same in each time, 60 cents. The federal royalty and tax remains the same for the small companies, 28 cents and 89 cents. The Alberta royalty and tax remains the same, 91 cents in March and \$2.41 in December. But there is the Alberta offset of the federal tax on the new price of \$6.50 a barrel, which is 33 cents. So that the company cash flow jumps from \$2.01 to \$2.93, an increase of 92 cents or 34 per cent more.

Now what are we saying? The Premier went to Ottawa and said: "The oil companies are getting only eight cents a barrel more, representing a three per cent increase on the \$2.70 amount." In fact, it ranges from 59 cents to 92 cents more; it ranges from 22 per cent to 34 per cent more. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Premier went to Ottawa not to protect the interests of the consumers, but to lobby for the privilege of the companies. That's what happened in Ottawa earlier this month, and a shabbier display cannot be imagined.

At least about Premier Lougheed there is a certain transparent, hand-maiden attitude. I mean about Peter Lougheed, you know he's a lobby for the oil companies. There's something almost refreshing about it. He stands, and his remarks are prefaced, without

actually being articulated: "I, Peter Lougheed, am here on behalf of Imperial Oil, to get as much for the company as I possibly can by gouging the consumers to whatever extent manageable. Therefore, I ask for the following."

Our Premier is not given to such candour. Lacking leadership and straight talk, the government engages in duplicity. The fact of the matter is that the oil companies in Ontario are doing fabulously under the new arrangements. They have enough for exploration and development, and the only thing the Premier was asking in Ottawa was for more money for the oil companies by asking that they receive an even larger share of the take.

Well, that is, in its own way, quite breathtaking. He's offered no protection to the consumers in the future, it should be pointed out. I mean, that's absolutely clear. No one knows what's going to happen to the consumers of Ontario when, in July or August, Pierre Elliott Trudeau raises the price of oil and natural gas. No indication here of the Ontario Energy Board to review it. No indication here of lowering the gasoline tax to cushion it. No indication here of any response.

But the Premier did go to Ottawa and argue for the oil companies, and he did it so brazenly that it was not possible to divine at the time. But the fact is that his figures were wrong and his argument was wrong, and his rhetoric was wrong.

The place that it all emerges most vividly, of course, and in a sense most ironically, Mr. Speaker, is in the sudden decision on the part of Ontario Hydro to ask for a 29.9 per cent rate increase. Ah, how the oil runs afield, eh? Suddenly Ontario Hydro undercuts the Ontario government's intention to stand firm on one area of energy, while it therefore must capitulate on the other.

If ever there was an apologist it's the hon. Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell), who made the neatest little explanation on behalf of Ontario Hydro that's ever been offered to this House, without one jot of credibility to it. As a matter of fact, you know, Mr. Speaker, the seven per cent plus which the minister talks about is energy consumption, but the actual rate of increase over the last four years has been 6.4 per cent, which is the increase to meet the peak demands. Because Ontario Hydro plans its capitalization on the basis of peak demand, then obviously, Mr. Speaker, that's the figure which has to be discussed.

If I can just remind the House that if—as the Ontario Energy Board requested in August, 1974, but Hydro refused—we lower the reserve capacity to 23 per cent and if we return Hydro just to a seven per cent growth rate, not even a 7.4 per cent growth rate based on the minister's calculations, then we reduce the system by 1,676 megawatts or 12 per cent by 1982, and the savings, in millions, are \$2,737 million.

Let me give the House one other figure. If we assume the rate of growth to be 6.4 per cent, as we have experienced in the last three or four years, and hold our reserve to 23 per cent, then the expansion would be reduced by 3,195 megawatts or 22.7 per cent, for a saving, in millions, of \$5,221 million by 1982.

If the government wants to know about priorities in terms of establishing budgets, why can't it take that \$5.221 billion, and apply it to housing? Why does it have to apply it to Hydro? Why can't it hold the line in Hydro at a 6.4 per cent increase and use the money which it has saved, \$5.221 billion, to build houses in Ontario from 1975 to 1982? That doesn't make sense to members of the Conservative Party? Why is it that the government will go to the market, whether it's New York or the Middle East, for Hydro but won't go to the market for housing?

An hon. member: They don't give a damn.

Mr. Lewis: What is it about the priorities? They don't give a damn? That may be so.

How do those people sit over there with sanguinity and contemplate \$23 billion stacked up by 1982, \$5 billion of which is easily savable and not consider an alternative priority like housing for it?

Can I put it this way, Mr. Speaker, and it speaks to the sense of the budget, do the Tories see what they are doing in Ontario? Do they understand how they are destroying social and economic priorities on every front? Do they see by this budget what they have wrought?

They have \$6.1 million for magnetic levitation in the next five years, and it means nothing to them. They've got \$32,000 for a public relations man for the Minister of Housing (Mr. Irvine) and it means nothing to them. They've got \$250 a day for Judy LaMarsh and they couldn't care a tinker's dam about it. They've got \$5.2 billion for nuclear reactors and it bothers them not at all.

Magnetic levitation, PR people, irrelevant royal commissions, nuclear reactors; how is it that in every way they opt for material benefits at the expense of human realities? What is it about the government that makes it so perverse? How is it that this budget has managed to enshrine in one frail, simple document, offered a few months in advance of an election, all that is most detestable about Ontario's economic system; the inequality within the tax system, the way in which the government asserts its priorities to matters material rather than human and the way in which it has failed to see all of the alternatives which are available to it. The government may run off and run some silly campaign at its heart's content about austerity, of which it knows naught; about cutting the civil service of which it knows naught; and about figures in the budget, each one of which is driven full of holes by an adolescent let alone a member of the Legislature. The government can pretend to some economic expertise, but when it looks at it, it lies in tatters.

It can speak if it will of violence, the newest clarion call of the Tories—the Premier uttering about royal commissions and about baby blue movies; the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman) running off to the Ontario censors and being offended by what everybody is offended about; and the Attorney General (Mr. Clement) making speech after speech about violence, saying it is not as bad as in the United States, mark you, but still pretty bad in terms of crime increase over 15 years ago. Of course that's true!

Then there is the talk about the effects of liquor on the community uttered by the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, at God knows how much length; and the Attorney General as well, not to mention the latest repetition of the refrain by his perfect honour about the Yonge St. strip.

Well who doesn't worry about it? Who isn't concerned about depravity on Yonge St. or liquor as it relates to crime or crime in general, or violence in the movies or the media? Who can't discuss those kinds of things? What hypocrisy contains all of the ministers that they discuss them in the abstract and they do nothing in the particular?

I listened to David Crombie on the radio this morning. If the government wants to clean up Yonge St., if that's its wish—and I don't like my kids being molested by pamphleteers for body-rub houses any more

than people in this Legislature—then why doesn't it pass the legislation which gives the city of Toronto the right to do it? How much hypocrisy can it contain in one moment?

If it wants to do something about the effects of liquor and the relationship to violence, then how come it hasn't done anything about advertising on television or other areas of the media? If it wants to do something about matters of crime and violence, then how is it that police forces in certain areas of the province beg for support to fulfil what many would think are simple elements of law and order?

Does the government want to do something about violence in the media? Then let the Premier single out those areas which he finds personally distasteful, or let him appropriate some of his money to provide alternative programming possibilities for children and adults.

What measure of integrity can be given to all the speeches when they sit on a report for four years which deals with that and related subjects. If they want to fight the campaign on that, by all means. The reality is that there's very little left of substance to the Tory party. The reality is that from their Throne Speech to their budget to their current themes, they can't establish matters of credibility—and there are many who see it.

When I spoke in the Throne Speech I asked of the government: "Where is leadership in all of the major social policy areas?" It was nowhere to be found. We asked for straight talk, and they go to Ottawa with contrived figures. They play hocus-pocus with housing starts; they fiddle with debts. Where is straight talk in this government?

And above all, where is the human priority? Where among the cabinet is the human priority? How is it that social and human conditions are relegated to the bottom of the ash can in every instance, while they slough away their money on machinery tax rebates and other such matters?

There's a very peculiar kind of distortion in Tory priorities now. It's the distortion of the frantic last fling; it's the distortion that creeps into reasonable men and women when they're trying desperately to recapture lost political favour. And so they are doing stupid things rather than rational things. And they are doing things which feed every material instinct and denigrate every human instinct.

It is for that reason that I make this motion, seconded by the member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans).

Mr. Lewis moves that the budget as presented is wanting in the areas of tax redistribution, housing supply, employment incentives, municipal financial support and in every conceivable area of human concern, and that the failure of political leadership thereby revealed forfeits the support of this House.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Hypocrisy; resign; hypocrisy!

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): My God, the Speaker nearly choked on those words.

Mr. Lewis: The Speaker must be changing his seat.

Mr. Speaker: Is there another speaker, or is it orders of the day?

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

MINISTRY OF CULTURE AND RECREATION AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Leluk, on behalf of Hon. Mr. Welch, moves second reading of Bill 38, An Act to amend the Ministry of Culture and Recreation Act, 1974.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): They should amend it.

Mr. N. G. Leluk (Humber): Since the ministry was established on Jan. 14 of this year, we have been pulling together the various components from the other ministries. This bill gives legal effect to the transfers and vests authority for a number of other Acts with the Minister of Culture and Recreation. To this extent, most of the sections of the bill are of an administrative nature to carry forward the principles set forth when the establishment of the ministry was approved. However, I would be happy to answer any questions which the members have about the ministry on this bill.

Since January, when the ministry was established, we have managed to pull together a very diverse group of activities from four existing ministries in the cabinet office and fit them into a structure which, I believe, will let us carry out the very special task that we have been given by the Legislature. I want to take a minute to go over the

specific terms of this assignment with members.

First, we are to preserve and maintain the cultural heritage of residents in Ontario with full recognition of their diverse traditions and backgrounds.

Second, we are to promote access to the benefits of citizenship and active involvement in the cultural and recreational life of the province.

Third, we are to stimulate the development of new forms of cultural expression and promote the concept of individual and community excellence.

For the moment we have the various activities for which we are responsible grouped into five specific areas: heritage conservation; libraries and community information; arts support; sports and fitness, and citizenship and multiculturalism.

Some of these, like arts support and sport and fitness, are well known and require little explanation. Through these programmes we are able to assist local sports and cultural programmes and community centres. In this area we also support such provincial agencies as the Ontario Science Centre, the McMichael collection of Canadian art at Kleinburg, the Royal Ontario Museum in Toronto, and the educational television network.

Through the libraries and community information programme we hope to co-ordinate and strengthen local programmes for the dissemination of information so that we get the best use of public funds spent in this area.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Why is the member speaking from that geographical location?

Mr. Leluk: Mr. Speaker, I did not ask permission of the House. I'd ask it now. I understand that a precedent has been established and I thought it might be better for me to speak from this position. I would ask the permission of the House to do so.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Leluk: The member for Lakeshore is really too much.

Mr. Speaker: When the member's seat is on the opposite side, it has been usual in the past to give the member the privilege of moving over to this side of the House where he is facing the opposition and able to answer questions. Is permission granted for this?

Agreed.

Mr. Lawlor: I can't get at him quite as easily, you know.

Mr. Leluk: We are pretty tough on this side.

Through these programmes we are able to assist local sports and cultural programmes and community centres. In this area we also support such provincial agencies as the Ontario Science Centre, the McMichael collection of Canadian art at Kleinburg, the Royal Ontario Museum in Toronto, and the educational television network.

Mr. Roy: The member has already said that.

Mr. Leluk: Through the libraries and community information programme we hope to co-ordinate and strengthen local programmes for the dissemination of information so that we get the best use of public funds spent in this area.

The membership of the Ontario Heritage Foundation has been expanded and it has been given increased responsibilities in a number of areas including the preservation of archaeological sites. We will work with individuals in communities on the preservation of properties of historic and architectural significance and we will be responsible for the continued development of historic restorations like Old Fort William and St. Marie-among-the-Hurons.

In the area of citizenship and multicultural support we are developing programmes to assist newcomers to settle into Ontario society and aid our native peoples to benefit more fully from provincial services.

At the same time we have a special responsibility to support the government's multicultural policies by assisting various ethnic and multicultural groups. In this way we can all share in the richness of Ontario's cultural mosaic.

We are now in the process of reviewing these programmes to assess their appropriateness in the light of the ministry's new mandate. I expect to be inviting improvements to them in the future for consideration by this Legislature. I will be meeting all the employees of the ministry again this month to review our progress and plans with them because their understanding, co-operation and support are essential to the success of the ministry.

Mr. Speaker, I will have another opportunity to review the ministry programmes with the House when our estimates are considered and I look forward to this.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The parliamentary assistant outlined the purpose of the bill which is essentially the transfer of certain programmes from various ministries of government to the Ministry of Culture and Recreation so it is now MOCAR. I hope the ministry is able to progress substantially so that at least in one field I'm particularly interested in we will see substantial changes in the not too distant future. That is physical fitness, Mr. Speaker. I'll make a few comments concerning it a little later in the discussion of the bill.

I support the principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker. I think it is nice that now we have come along and taken the various aspects from various ministries and put them in one ministry. However, I'm quite concerned as to whether the purpose of the bill is as signified or whether this is really a new propaganda arm of the government under the name of culture and recreation.

Mr. Roy: Sure. Exactly.

Mr. B. Newman: Really, Mr. Speaker, I think that is the purpose of the bill. Were there not an election coming up this year, that bill would not have been introduced into the House in January.

Mr. Roy: That's right.

Mr. B. Newman: There were a lot of other things that should have had by far greater priority in government. Just as the previous speaker from the New Democratic Party made mention of housing and other concerns, I think that possibly we should have spent a little more concern in those areas, rather than in the setting up of the Ministry of Culture and Recreation. Everything that is in there, Mr. Speaker, was in various ministries. The parliamentary assistant and the minister are attempting to rationalize by concentrating the various programmes into one area or one ministry.

Mr. Roy: Creating a pork barrel.

Mr. B. Newman: When I see that being done, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we are now not fragmenting a lot of the programmes that we had in other ministries. I see now that education is going to be in Colleges and Universities and this ministry. The Ministry of Education is going to be in various other branches of the government. Even the Ministry of Treasury is involved. I would like the

parliamentary assistant, when he does reply, to point out to us where Treasury is being involved. It may be the transfer of funds from racehorses into some more fitness programmes—and I hope that is the case. I think we should be paying a little more attention to the fitness of our citizenry and non-residents of Ontario, than we do to the fitness of the various breeds of horses.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that there is the fragmentation of the various educational programmes. Likewise, I am concerned with the development of municipal recreation certification. I hope the parliamentary assistant in his reply makes mention that the community colleges and/or the universities are going to be given that responsibility for the certification of recreation directors or para-recreation directors throughout the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, there is also another concern. In the setting up of the various recreation committees I hope that the ministry does look into the report of the select committee on the use of schools and some of the recommendations that they have made where we want community involvement in the development of these recreation commissions. We don't want them imposed on the community.

We want the grassroots to decide who should be on the committee, the type of programme that that community wants, and the funds really provided to the community so that they can run the programmes in the fashion and the types of programmes that are better for them in their estimation. We don't want big daddy imposing all of this on the various recreation committees throughout the communities and throughout the province.

In one community, Mr. Speaker, you could have a variety of programmes, because the recreation committee for the one given area, like the community school, may want something that is completely different from that of another area in the same community.

In another section of the bill, there is made mention of prescribing a definition of approved maintenance and operating costs. I hope that under that, Mr. Speaker, the minister is going to take away from the boards of education the cost of operating afterschool programmes that are not directly related to education within the schools.

These extraordinary or additional expenditures, rather than being a charge on the property taxes of a local municipality through the board of education, should be a direct responsibility of this ministry, funded by the ministry, and not paid for by the local

property taxpayer. The local property taxpayer has enough to pay now in his municipal property taxes. This burden could be taken away from him if funds were provided to cover the complete operating costs of the programmes that are going to be developed as a result of the recommendations of this ministry. Mr. Speaker, I hope those funds are sufficient to operate the programmes properly.

There is also mention that one of the responsibilities is going to be the development of leadership training camps. I hope the minister looks at the report of the select committee on youth, which recommended the regionalizing of leadership training camps. As it is today, we do have several good training camps, and I'm pleased to see that they are operative. However, one of the training camps accommodates both boys and girls at different periods.

I think there is a need for a substantial increase in the number of leadership training camps—and they should be developed on a **regional basis**. There is no reason why residents of the Toronto area, say, couldn't have a camp associated directly with one of the universities in the area or even given an opportunity to go to a leadership camp farther away from home if that is their wish. As I say, I hope the development of the leadership training camps will be on a regional basis.

I wonder what co-operation there is going to be between this ministry and the federal government in terms of the development of facilities that could be used for provincial programmes and/or federal programmes. I can specifically mention the Essex county agricultural and exhibition complex that is in the planning stages in the county of Essex, in which I understand the federal government involvement will be approximately \$8 million.

We hope that, whenever possible, the provincial government will work in co-operation with the federal government, because in a lot of instances what we are doing here is being done by the federal government. Let's maximize the use of federal and provincial funds so that we can develop the best programmes possible as a result of co-operation between two levels of government.

I'm kind of concerned, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the development of programmes involving physical education or physical fitness. I wonder if the ministry is now going to have the legal authority to attempt to implement or to convince industry that it also has a responsibility as far as physical

fitness is concerned. It is all right to develop programmes in the schools, but when an individual leaves school and gets involved in industry, quite often his approach toward fitness is limited to viewing a hockey game on television or occasionally taking one of his young offsprings to a Little League type of recreation or competition. We hope that the ministry will use some of the approaches that are used by other countries in the development of physical fitness programmes in industry.

Regarding the development of physical fitness programmes in industry, I notice that a study has been prepared by a Donald Bailey of Regina, dealing directly with physical fitness. In it, he mentions that 40 per cent of Canadian men and 47 per cent of Canadian women have fitness levels rated as no better than fair or low. If we are going to substantially reduce our health service costs, we are going to have to pay particular attention to the fitness of our communities. I hope we can find that type of concern on the part of the ministry so that at least we will be a far fitter province than we have been.

I don't think we have to be as concerned about the fitness aspect in developing the best teams in the world. I think we can strive for that. We can hope that we can eventually be among the best, but at least if we have a higher level of fitness among our people then we have performed a very substantial portion of the goal that should be the responsibility of the Ministry of Culture and Recreation.

I hope that there is provision in the Act, Mr. Speaker, so that the ministry can take care of the violence that is involved in sport. It is not only involved in hockey, it goes into other fields of physical endeavour. I hope the ministry can develop, either through rules or regulations in co-operation with the various athletic groups throughout the province and on the national level, a greater concern for sports, for the sake of playing the game and for the sake of the health benefit of the activity rather than solely for the sake of winning, winning at all costs.

We have got to get rid of this idea of the lust for blood in our sports at all levels, both amateur and professional. I know this has probably developed as a result of the old-time wrestlers. Where they wanted to draw a big crowd at the next wrestling competition they involved themselves in as much physical mayhem as one could possibly imagine and then that became appealing and the crowds increased at ensuing wrestling and/or boxing matches.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, the minister also has authority to look into the contracts that deal with the junior A hockey players. I understand that that is illegal, but I think that should be one of the priorities in there. Let's unchain these junior hockey players so that no longer are they tied down and no longer are they slaves of the professional hockey organizations which are really just entertainment and big business.

Likewise, I hope the ministry reviews the various programmes of merit throughout all parts of the province of Ontario and gives financial assistance to those on a regional basis and in a fair manner, so that there can be no criticism that we are not playing the game but providing to those areas in which the government happens to have a representative a greater share of the public purse than we do to those areas which are not represented in the House by members on the side of government.

Mr. Speaker, we support the bill. We hope that the member piloting the bill through can make some replies to some of the comments that I have made, and we certainly hope that the Ministry of Culture and Recreation is able to function in the manner in which we think it should function for the betterment of both the physical and cultural well-being of our residents, both of Canadian birth and those who chose the Province of Ontario and Canada as their place for the future. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have only two or three remarks to make with regard to the bill. It is nice at last to be able to see the sort of fleshing out of the ministry and to see just what sorts of responsibilities it might be going to undertake.

I want to talk about two things. I want to suggest, first of all, that within the ambit of responsibility of the minister there rests the Ontario lottery.

Today I raised in a question what I consider to be one of the inequities of the lottery system. My interest in it was twigged by the member for Nipissing (Mr. R. S. Smith) who started it off a week ago by talking about the amount of money that seems to be flowing back to the coffers of those people who have been charged with the responsibility of distributing and selling the tickets. The more I thought about it, the more I realized that this was wrong and that we had an opportunity, if we used the lottery sensibly, to provide even more money for the very groups

that are supposed to be benefiting from it if we chose another way of distributing and selling the tickets on the lottery.

I want to suggest to the parliamentary assistant that he move immediately to do away with the present private system of distribution and sale of lottery tickets and that he seek out in every municipality the groups most likely to seek benefit from the revenue derived from the sale of the lottery tickets and he make available to them the option, first of all, to distribute and, secondly, to sell those tickets directly to the public. By so doing, all of the commissions from the sales will go directly to the groups which are expected to benefit and intended to benefit—

Mr. Speaker: Will the member for Wentworth come to order for a minute?

Mr. Deans: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: I don't think there is anywhere in this bill where I can see that lotteries are mentioned.

Mr. Deans: It's funny you should raise that because I couldn't find it anywhere either, but I thought it was worth raising. I am quite honest with you and I am not going to quarrel with you about it. When I read the bill I thought, where could I raise it. I thought I could raise it under section 1, subsection 8b(j) "authorizing the payment with the approval of the minister of special grants for programmes of recreation and fixing the amounts thereof." Just listen for a moment. I thought I could point out that we might be able to save the province money and not require as much money out of that particular section, if the minister adopted my suggestion.

Mr. Speaker: I think you got your point across. Now maybe you could move on to the principle of the bill.

Mr. Deans: Thank you very much. I just wanted to make the point in a way that I think that that would be a very suitable way of handling the money and much more suitable than the present method. There might not be the same degree of kickback but there certainly would be a great deal better use of the money. I would like you to consider it—not to consider it—but to do it.

I want to raise one other thing with you, Mr. Speaker, and if you want me to find out where this is in the bill, I will find it for you. There is at the moment a matter that concerns me almost more than any other single thing related to recreation. My colleague here from Windsor-Walkerville was speaking

about violence in minor hockey and all of the problems that flow from it. I agree with him. I think there has to be a much closer watch kept on the violence that erupts from time to time in the arenas of the Province of Ontario.

I want to raise another point that I think is as important. At the moment the Ontario Minor Hockey Association is drafting regulations which will effectively place in bondage any child who is carded under the OMHA who plays hockey in the Province of Ontario from ages nine to 16. This is vital to the future of these youngsters. Mr. Speaker, if a child in the Province of Ontario wants to play carded hockey in this province, starting next year, if the OMHA has its way, the parent of that child will have to sign a contract, guaranteeing that that child will play for that team or in that organization until they are aged 16.

Mr. Haggerty: When they reach the age of 14, they become—

Mr. Deans: I was just going to say that when they get to age 14 or 15, they become the property of some other team higher up, in the World Hockey Association or in the National Hockey League or in some other organization. There is something terribly wrong with that system.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): It sounds like a slave market.

Mr. Deans: There is something terribly wrong when a kid wants to play organized hockey, and wants to be able to play not only in his own community and has the ability to play against teams from other communities, but some group calling itself the Ontario Minor Hockey Association has the right to require of the parent of the child that that child be signed to a contract, tying it for six to eight years to that league and the teams within that league.

I'm saying that if the minister is going to fund, under recreation, any aspect of that organization or groups associated with it, that only be done on the understanding that no such contract is required to be signed. There's no place in this province for tying a nine-year-old to one particular league until he's 16. There's no place in this province for requiring the parents of a child to sign a contract which requires that child to play in a league if they don't want to.

There's something wrong with the Ontario Minor Hockey Association and I'm going to ask the member to do something else. I

would like to know from him who these people are; how they get these positions. Who elects them? How do they get into these jobs? I can't find out. I have read the list of directors but I can't find out if there's any annual meeting held to which coaches or conveners are invited to elect the executive of the Ontario Minor Hockey Association. My child plays in the OMHA. He did, I should say; maybe after this speech he won't but he did. I'm going to tell the members I don't like what they're doing, not one little bit.

For example, if a team wants to go and play in Nova Scotia I don't like it having to send a letter plus \$5 to the OMHA to get a letter of permission to play in an exhibition game there.

An hon. member: Yes, that's in all amateur sport.

Mr. Deans: I ask the members why should—

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): They need a passport as well.

Mr. Deans: They need a passport as well, do they? I mean, what is it? Why should they have to pay \$5 to get a letter from the Ontario Minor Hockey Association to take a trip to Nova Scotia?

Mr. B. Newman: That's a travel permit.

Mr. Deans: A travel permit? I'm going to tell the members that's a lot of unadulterated nonsense.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): It is totalitarian.

Mr. Deans: When I look around and I see all these kids who want to play hockey, who have the ability to play at one level or another, and I think of this sort of super-body which sits and makes these kinds of decisions both about the future and the freedom of these children, I've got to question it seriously. Also, by the way, I don't know how that group got there and I've got to question seriously how the best interests of the children of this province are to be served.

I don't agree with what's going on at the moment. I don't think there's nearly sufficient overseeing of the operations. I want to know who in the province makes sure that the contracts drafted are fair, that the civil liberties of these children are protected and that the legal requirements placed on their parents are not so onerous as to require them to sign these kinds of contracts.

What parent who has a child with any ability at all would deny the child the opportunity to play in that kind of competitive hockey? Yet in order to allow the child to play he's got to sign a six-year contract for a nine-year-old. There's something wrong, something terribly wrong with it. I'm asking the member if he will take a serious look at it because it needs looking into. I think it's about time we came to grips with it. Maybe then hockey could be played in the arena rather than in the back rooms. Maybe then people would be able to make their choices reasonably and sensibly.

I understand, of course, that if children sign for a team, if we're going to have any kind of a team sport, we can't have them switching back and forth every five or 10 minutes. That goes without saying. But signing them year in and year out or on and on for all of these years certainly doesn't make any sense to me.

I know an awful lot of parents in the Province of Ontario who are very worried about this. They are very concerned about the legal implications of having to sign such a document and whether or not there would be any requirement on them to fulfil the obligation they've signed. I know a lot of parents in the Province of Ontario who are really concerned about the fact that many children in the province will not have an opportunity to play, simply because their parents won't bind them to that kind of usury. Now I want to suggest to the minister that that should be looked into and looked into quick under his ministry. As far as the rest is concerned, good luck.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to speak for a minute? The hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Yes, I just have a few comments to make.

Most of the things that are contained in this bill are things that are being moved from the Ministry of Community and Social Services over into this new ministry. Of course, they involve the setting up of recreation committees, etc., across the province and I presume, from my reading of the Act that the main principle of the Act to move that responsibility into this ministry.

I never thought it should be in Community and Social Services, where we are dealing with an altogether different type of programme, and for that reason I certainly am glad to see it moved out of there. Whether we need a Ministry of Culture and Recreation to put it into or not is another question

and I suppose we dealt with that on second reading of the bill to set up the ministry.

I want to make reference to some of the things that the previous speaker made reference to. There is no question that the programmes that we are talking about within this bill are going to be financed by the Ontario lottery. Although the Ontario lottery is not mentioned in this bill, this bill is not workable without the money the government is going to get from the Ontario lottery.

All of the programmes in this bill are going to be developed to a great extent because of a \$40 million or \$60 million projection in profit from the Ontario lottery. That could easily be upped by another 10 per cent if a new method of distribution of the tickets were undertaken because, as I understand it, the costs of administration of the Ontario lottery is going to run to at least 20 per cent and perhaps 25 per cent. Beyond that the winner's share of the lottery will bring it up to somewhere around 40 per cent, and then the province will keep 60—am I correct in that, or is it the other way around? It's 60-40 one way or the other.

But, really, I would just like to advise the people of Ontario if they are going to bet—if that's the reason they are buying a lottery ticket, to bet—that they are better off at the racetrack because there they get 83 cents on the dollar back and here they don't get nearly that much.

Mr. Burr: The races may be fixed, though.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Well the lottery may be fixed too. And there is one other thing that bothers me—

Mr. Speaker: Will the member curtail his remarks to the principle of the bill as—

Mr. R. S. Smith: Well, I am.

Mr. Speaker: —there is no place to discuss lotteries in this particular bill?

Mr. R. S. Smith: I am talking about the funding of the programmes that are in this bill, and the funding of the programmes that are in this bill is going to come from the lotteries. Now, if there is anything more direct than that, I don't know what it could be.

Mr. Speaker: Go ahead and proceed, but just don't discuss the lottery that's all.

Mr. R. S. Smith: The lottery represents a considerable amount of the income, you know, and we can see how directly that applies to what we are talking about.

Mr. Speaker: Proceed.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Anyway—now you have got me off the point. I can't remember what I was going to say.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I think the point I would really make is the fact that the costs of administration of the Ontario Lottery Corp. are far too high. They are far higher than those that are being experienced in the Manitoba lotteries where it's around 12 or 13 per cent. Obviously political patronage is being used in the lotteries insofar as the distribution of the tickets is concerned, through the appointed people.

Mr. Lawlor: It very easily could be a scandal. We will investigate it.

Mr. R. S. Smith: It really could be. It almost is.

Mr. L. Maack (Parry Sound): I am glad the member worries about that.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I think the member for Parry Sound should not comment too freely on this because his area was one of the areas that I had to go to bat for, because they weren't getting their share of the tickets.

Mr. Maack: The member doesn't have to go to bat for my area. It is looked after a lot better than Nipissing any day of the week.

Mr. R. S. Smith: There was bad distribution in that area; very bad distribution.

Mr. Maack: It's all looked after.

Mr. R. S. Smith: The member shakes his head and agrees with me, regardless of what he might say. The fact is that that's the part of—

Mr. Lawlor: Ripoff.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Yes, that's right. That's the part of this ministry that has to be looked at very closely.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): There is a new organization to be formed.

Mr. R. S. Smith: The other matter that I would like to bring up, insofar as the development of programmes under this Act goes, are those programmes that will be developed through the recreation committees that now come under this ministry.

In northern Ontario we have the problem of unorganized municipalities. According to this Act, as it was in the previous Act, for a recreational council or a committee to be established, it must be established under the aegis of the local school board. In many cases the local school boards are regional boards and are very uninterested in what happens in the unorganized territories. First of all, because the amount of money they gather through taxation in those unorganized territories is very small. Secondly, they are usually administered and operated by representatives from the larger municipalities in the area, so that the unorganized municipalities have no say whatsoever in the operations of the school board. Therefore, generally speaking, the school boards do not have very much interest in whether the unorganized territories have recreational committees established or not.

I know some areas have made appeals to the school boards to set up recreational committees so that those areas could become eligible for provincial assistance in the provision of the services and the capital grants

that are available to ordinary municipalities. They have been denied this right by the school boards. So I believe some other method should be evolved that is not included in this Act whereby those unorganized territories could form recreational committees and apply directly to the provincial government without having the aegis of the local district school board. In many instances the district school boards have no interest and do not feel that it is a part of their responsibility.

Obviously, since the areas are unorganized the responsibility in northern Ontario, lies directly with this government. It doesn't lie with the other organized municipalities that may be close by, nor does it lie with the school board which may cover the area. All those things municipal in nature, including recreation committees, in unorganized territories of this province are the direct responsibility of this government. I believe this government should accept that direct responsibility.

It being 6 o'clock p.m., the House took recess.

APPENDIX

(See page 1363)

The answer to a question was tabled:

8. *Mr. Haggerty*—Inquiry of the Ministry:

1. What is the total amount of hydro electricity in kilowatts by contract that was exported to the United States (ex New York State) from Ontario Hydro generating stations for the years—1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974?
2. How many kilowatts of energy were exported on emergency basis for the last 10 years?
3. What is the revenue generated by Ontario Hydro through the exporting of energy?
4. What is Ontario Hydro's rate structure per kilowatt hour for export purposes?
5. The present agreement for long-term contracts between Ontario Hydro and its United States counterparts—what is the life term of this contract?
6. Does the Ontario Hydro Commission plan on increasing the export of electricity and to what degree, if any?

Answer by the Ministry of Energy:

1. The information as requested is shown in Table I, omitting 1964 data which is not readily available in this format.
2. This question cannot be answered directly since there is no common definition of "emergency" and interconnection transactions are not classified as emergency or non-emergency. The quantities given in Table II are for sales to meet a capacity requirement when the buyer is short of generating capacity to meet his load and system reserve requirements.
3. The total revenue from export sales is shown in Table I.
4. The rate structures as of Jan. 1, 1975, for the more common types of purchases and sales with the United States are as follows:

Type of Power	Rate Structure
Short term power (weekly sales to meet a capacity requirement)	Demand: \$450 per MW per week Energy: Fixed rate negotiated from time to time, or, if greater, 110 percent of the supplier's incremental cost.
Capacity power (day-to-day sales to meet a capacity requirement)	Demand: \$90 per MW per day Energy: Same as above
Economy energy (displacement of higher cost generation)	The supplier's incremental cost plus and equal share of the savings.

5. The interconnection agreements provide for interchange or surplus interruptible power and energy and do not have a definite termination date. The interconnection agreement with Niagara Mohawk continues year to year and can be terminated by either party by at least 12 months' prior notice in writing.

The agreement with PASNY continues year to year providing for termination by either party in writing of not less than five years' prior notice for certain paragraphs and not less than one years' prior notice for other paragraphs.

The agreement with Michigan may be terminated at any time by mutual agreement or upon seven years' written notice given by either of the parties to the other party.

There are no long-term contracts with United States utilities for the sale or purchase of specific quantities of power.

6. Ontario Hydro intends to continue to take maximum advantage of suitable opportunities to export or import surplus interruptible energy whenever this will result in greater reliability

and/or reduced costs in Ontario. As power systems grow, the potential for export and import transfers will increase. However, interruptible sales are arranged on a relatively short-term basis, usually only a few hours to a few weeks in advance. Consequently, there are no "plans to export (or import) any particular quantities. Actual exports in future years will depend on many factors, primarily the availability of fuels, generation, and transmission in Ontario and market requirements in the United States. The situation could range from relatively large imports, if Ontario has internal problems with fuel, generation or transmission, to large exports if surplus fuel, particularly United States coal, continue to be available.

TABLE 1
Scheduled Export Sales—000s kwh

(1) Interconnection agreements

Year	25 Hz Firm (2) Contract	(3) Mohawk	(4) PASNY	(5) Michigan	Total	Total Revenue \$000
1974	0	2,968,229	0	2,944,859	5,913,088	101,135
1973	0	2,412,852	0	2,948,689	5,361,541	61,149
1972	0	1,092,164	0	2,662,328	3,754,492	36,265
1971	0	742,539	0	1,033,827	1,776,366	21,949
1970	0	910,020	0	651,541	1,561,561	17,616
1969	0	440,901	0	362,383	803,284	6,231
1968	0	181,803	0	35,207	217,010	1,210
1967	0	200,672	0	80,646	281,322	1,499
1966	0	150,672	23,134	19,993	193,799	787
1965	68,040	28,263	309,668	1,426	407,399	1,831

Notes:

- (1) The interconnection agreements provide for the interchange of power and energy from time to time as opportunities and circumstances make such transfers advantageous. They do not involve contractual commitments to export or import any particular quantities.
- (2) Contract sales of 25 hertz firm power and energy. These terminated on March 31, 1965.
- (3) Mohawk: The Niagara Mohawk Power Co. in New York State.
- (4) PASNY: The Power Authority of the State of New York.
- (5) Michigan: The Detroit Edison Co. and the Consumers Power Co. acting jointly.

TABLE II

Year	Capacity assistance to United States of America —000s kwh
1974	5,865,149
1973	5,014,791
1972	3,409,002
1971	1,714,060
1970	1,383,045
1969	518,183
1968	85,985
1967	104,005
1966	51,177
1965	10,541

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 29, 1975

Mercury pollution at Indian reserves, statement by Mr. Grossman	1287
Employment on Indian reserves, statement by Mr. Bernier	1288
Grand River flood inquiry, statement by Mr. Bernier	1288
Mercury pollution, questions of Mr. Grossman, Mr. Bernier: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Reid	1289
Protection of treaty rights, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Roy, Mr. Singer, Mr. Lewis	1292
Grand River flood inquiry, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Gaunt	1293
Government advertising programmes, questions of Mr. Winkler: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis	1294
Compensation to Indian fishermen, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lewis	1295
Third world grants, questions of Mr. Welch, Mrs. Birch: Mr. Lewis, Mr. R. F. Nixon	1295
Equal pay for women, questions of Mr. MacBeth; Mr. Lewis	1296
Daycare report, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Lewis	1296
Hydro rates, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Bullbrook	1296
Community health programmes, questions of Mrs. Birch: Mr. Dukszta	1297
Use of French in courts, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Roy	1297
Operations at Reeves Mine, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Ferrier	1298
Environmental assessment, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Good	1298
Closing of Burwash Correctional Centre, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Martel	1299
New Kitchener courthouse, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Breithaupt	1299
Ontario lottery, questions of Mr. Welch: Mr. Deans, Mr. R. S. Smith	1299
Huron Steel Products Co. Ltd., questions of Mr. Bennett: Mr. B. Newman	1301
Tainted fish in St. Clair River, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Burr	1301
Government bookstore stocks, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Paterson	1301
Special-occasion permits, question of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Stokes	1301
Report, Royal Commission inquiry into Grand River flood, 1974, Mr. Bernier	1302
Report, standing administration of justice committee, Mr. Ewen	1302
Report, standing procedural affairs committee, Mr. Morrow	1302
Referral of ministry estimates to standing committees, Mr. Winkler	1302

Training Schools Amendment Act, Mr. Potter, first reading	1302
Public Utilities Amendment Act, Mr. B. Newman, first reading	1303
Tabling answer to question 8 on order paper, Mr. Winkler	1303
Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. J. A. Taylor, Mr. Lewis	1303
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	1325
Ministry of Culture and Recreation Amendment Act, Mr. Welch, on second reading	1325
Recess	1332
Appendix: Answer to question 8 on order paper	1333



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, April 29, 1975
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975



CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 1975

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Hon. M. Birch: (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): May I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Legislature, 20 Girl Guides from West Hill, which is in my riding, along with their leader, Mrs. Jane Robertson. Would members please join with me in greeting them? They are in the west gallery.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, at the same time, I would like to introduce Cub Pack 312 from Agincourt. Would members join me in welcoming them?

MINISTRY OF CULTURE AND RECREATION AMENDMENT ACT (concluded)

Mr. Speaker: When we rose at 6 o'clock, I believe we were debating second reading of Bill 38. The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to range briefly from the ridiculous to the sublime this evening, constantly never quite reaching the sublime but only remaining ridiculous.

I would ask the minister right off to look at page 5 of his bill, section 3. If he can answer the question it may save the trouble of going to committee. Is he right with respect to the designation of clause (d) of section 4, as that which he wishes to amend? In looking at the statute, it appears to me, based on the 1970 statutes of the province to be clause (b) not (d). I could be wrong. I haven't been through the statutory citator in order to see whether they brought it down to date, but that would appear superficially to be the case. I do this with hesitation because when I've brought these kinds of niggling points up before I've always been wrong.

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): Let the member not spoil his average.

Mr. Lawlor: No, I just may hit the jackpot tonight. The people who look after our statutes in the province are extremely perti-

nacious and extremely accurate with respect to matters of this kind.

What I want to say basically has to do with the transference of a number of sections of portfolios into this ministry, some coming from Colleges and Universities—this section in question that I just mentioned—other ones having to do with Community and Social Services and other ones having to do with Education.

Then there is kind of a preamble written into this legislation at the very beginning. It's very sonorous and it rolls off the tongue. To what purpose I'm not quite sure. It says:

The minister shall on his own initiative and through co-operation with the ministers—

If you translate it into French, it would have a certain quality about it. In this particular body it lacks mellifluousness.

—in co-operation with the ministers having charge with the ministries of the public service of Ontario, with the ministers having charge with departments of the public service of Canada, with municipal councils, with school boards and boards of education, with other organizations and otherwise, in the cause of human betterment, advance and encourage the concept and ideal of full and equal citizenship—

Blarney or baloney, take your choice, Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: Amen.

Mr. Lawlor: It goes on:

—among the residents of Ontario in order that they may exercise effectively the rights, powers—

I've never seen such rodomontade written into a statute. If we had full and equal citizenship in this province we wouldn't have the economic system we have. The whole system is denial of equality. People are not in the same status at all. The minister's department is in no way designed to bring any alteration into that picture. He doesn't know what equality is. With this particular concept in mind, it is just window-dressing,

fabric-making, embroidering the edges of the garment.

If the minister wants to parade and primp and pretend in this particular way—

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Lawyers have the edge in this country, don't they?

Mr. Turner: Not really.

Mr. Lawlor: Is the god speaking? Did I hear Jupiter?

Mr. W. Hodgson: I just said lawyers have the edge here.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, we will bring some equality there too.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): They might have the edge here, but not up there.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, I often wonder, in this business about culture, how different it is if we compare the city of Toronto, which I suppose is the metropolis here in this jurisdiction, with some lost little town in other portions of the world; or some city like Milan, comparable in size; or a city like Frankfurt, which is about a third of the size. Out of those cities, out of Vienna, comes something that may remotely be called culture.

Why the tremendous difference? Why does one city breed, because of the relationship of men with man in that city, composers of genius, writers of superb skill, poets galore, men of science making new inventions? This is true today. It's not true here; it's just not true.

What curious quality goes into those cities that doesn't seem to apply to this particular city or to the cities that we have here? Is it something induced by government? Is it something to which subsidy is paid? I think not.

I tell you what it is, over against what we know; it's something to do with the quality of life. And that's what one means by the quality of life; a city rich in artistic works, a city rich with intelligence; where people sit down and have a cup of schnapps, if you will, or even coffee on occasion—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lawlor: —stay away from the coffee, it will kill you—and trade notes and talk over matters; where a large number of the citizenry is aware of what is going on in sculpture, what's going on in affairs of government, what new constitutions are being engendered and what the hell is going on in the world.

An hon. member: He is swearing.

Mr. Lawlor: We don't do it; we don't. This is the fallacy in this ministry. That's why it becomes a piece of tokenism; a totem for propaganda, that's all we have there.

Where is the engendering spirit? Where is the vitality? The parliamentary assistant is not going to bring it in, Lord knows that; neither him nor the minister.

An hon. member: And neither is the member.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Where would you rather be?

Mr. Lawlor: I would rather be down at the open air cafe on Bay St. with the member drinking at this moment. I really would.

Mr. N. G. Leluk (Humber): That's cultural.

Mr. Lawlor: But here I am, and being paid for it, so we'll pass the time of day. Okay. You know, the member for York North and I got on better in London when we were there together than we do here. Does he realize that? That's because there was a little bit of civilization present.

Mr. W. Hodgson: We are getting along good enough now.

Mr. Lawlor: We are, in this continent basically—we'll leave out Mexico—and in this country and province, under something called the regime of quantity. Everything is quantitative; the nature of quality is missing. It's a product of modern scientific development. Science knows nothing of quality. All science knows is quantity. Science can measure quantity and can conjure with quantity. It can experiment with it, place it in a test tube, place it in various comparative techniques, etc. It all has to do with technology. It all has to do with dead matter mostly.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): There's a lot of that around here.

Mr. Lawlor: That's the continuity of this ministry. That is what it represents. That's what it continues, so that when they talk about these other matters they are somehow out there. They are external to the ministry. The ministry people visit them. They are not inside. They are like museums.

Know what the word museum means? It means a house for the dead; a place where one keeps dead things. One can't make them live. They are from past civilizations. They

were the things that were the common household objects of earlier men and other men.

Have we such household objects ourselves? Will the works of Ontario at this time in history inhabit museums into the future? I sincerely doubt it. It will be like Carthage. The vaunting of Carthage is not a stone was left upon a stone. They produced nothing, absolutely nothing of any worth. They were great warriors and great commercial men and they plied the Mediterranean Sea. They worked with the Phoenicians—after all, they were a Phoenician colony—all over the coast of Ionia. This is the work they did and this is all they were capable of. There is more to say even of the Romans and that isn't very much either, if one looks at their total development.

Let me put it this way, and I'm not going to speak very long on this because it's kind of a lofty thing, the Legislature doesn't really go for these things very much.

Mr. Deans: Oh, we do.

Mr. Lawlor: The Germans, and people who have worked in this field, make a distinction which I think is a very good one between civilization on one hand and culture on the other. They are completely different things. In English, we don't make nor do we think of that distinction. We use the words interchangeably with great ease but it ought not to be so.

I think of Oswald Spengler's writing in this particular field on the decline of the west. In 1922 the man told us what our future was and what the fruits of late capitalism were likely to be and they are coming to pass, everyone of them.

He was the first man to talk about the megalopolis in really penetrating terms. He almost invented the term. The great world cities are coming into being with their deadness, their drifting leaves and the hollow men who inhabit them. He condemned civilization. He said it was the fruit of the winter in our lives and he felt everything turned around, that civilizations were born and died just as the seasons changed. I don't agree with the biological theory of history behind it, but there is certainly a good deal of truth to it.

A civilization is something concerned with organization, with institutions. Institutions are invariably of the past, they are generated in that way. They are traditional things and to a very great extent they're husks. They're the dead fabrics and leavings of a dynamic

people; and only if they are entirely revamped constantly and all the time, with a deep sense of change operating in things, do they have any vitality at all. They're usually clouds upon human freedom and upon our development by and large; and government is one of those institutions along with others. Particular governments entrenched in a certain mentality are double clouds upon either the senses of freedom or of development or what you will. This is what we face in the province at this time.

To some extent civilizations produce great organization men who produce machines and know how to work with high efficiency in terms of techniques. This is what governments have sought to become in the western world. My leader spoke today at some considerable length about the distinction between the Tory approach to government in terms of technology and in terms of efficiency, and the human element which ought to predominate and ought to be the driving force behind government.

Governments and laws are not ends in themselves, they are all means to something else. When we come to the justice estimates in a few more months, I'll tell members what I think that something else is. In any event, at the moment they are distinctly means. They are devices to achieve a particular possibility. If that device is taken as a technical thing, as an organizational thing, as something which can be imposed, as something people get ground up in the gears of or get meshed into, as I see the government is doing with this cultural ministry all the way through, then look out.

Really, it's not going to be a Ministry of Culture for the various reasons I've already stated tonight. It's going to be basically a recreational facility. It's going to give a certain amount of money for athletic purposes and I suppose that's all to the good; but to pretend it's anything beyond that, beyond a form of largess for various groups in the community . . .

The minister has had this portfolio before. When I was a fledgling member of this House eight years ago, he occupied a ministry called the Provincial Secretary. Since that time, the disease has got worse, we now have three of them and his was abandoned. But the functions he performed in those days are, by and large, precisely the functions of this ministry. The whole earlier ministry was abolished about three years after I came in here because it was thought to be ineffective, sloppy, and as for the old minister of soft soap, the soap had gone down the drain by

that time; I am talking about this minister's ministry—and with that in mind it was abolished. He went off to more arid fields perhaps, to various justice things and things of that kind, where he is just as little effective as he is in this particular role.

But in those days what we talked about were ethnic problems; translation problems; problems of meeting groups in the community; the problems of immigration; the whole bit of languages, etc. This is what he is back into. In that area he had a special list that he produced year by year in the estimates. Namely, about 150 to 200 various organizations under his hospitality fund. He was an exceedingly hospitable fellow. It wasn't his money of course; the hospitality comes easy in certain circumstances. Now he is back to hospitality again.

I suppose hospitality is a high part of culture. If you take a look at Homer and see the way that a stranger is treated there, as some kind of visitor from the heavens, over and against how strangers are normally treated among us who are little better than barbarians in this regard, then you may have a field in which to work. The welcoming of strangers, we might call it, taking some recognition and being aware of the plight of people who come to this province, not speaking the language well, and being introduced to a new, for them, more poverty-stricken culture.

Those are the basic remarks I want to make. I am going to reserve the balance of what I have to say on this particular head, because I think that somewhere in here with a ministry by this name, that there should be a fairly good analysis, a fairly scappling one, of what it should be doing, of really what it is after if it is a Ministry of Culture at all; what is embodied in the phrase; what it means.

I mean it doesn't mean it's something high-falutin or esoteric or anything like that; or elitest or way up there. Culture is what men do in their everyday lives. It's the clothes they wear, the way they spit, the way they walk up and down streets—and the streets they walk up and down and the condition of those streets. It means every commonplace thing around us. The way we live, that's what it is about.

When you look at this culture, Mr. Speaker, it is no longer so. It is pretty damn close to civilization and that's to be regretted.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor West.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Thank

you, Mr. Speaker. In rising to speak to this bill I am aware it is probably the first of many bills of this type which the minister or his assistant will bring through the House in which he adds to himself and to the ministry various bits and pieces and programmes and chunks of other ministries. We have in this bill the bits and pieces transferred from the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, and the Ministry of Community and Social Services.

When I read the original bill forming the ministry last fall, I realized it was a bill that gave the minister the power to form deputy ministries and gather unto the ministry the seal and various housekeeping chores of this type, but it did not mention any transfers from other ministries. Here we have the first of what should be a series of bills, as time goes on, transferring bits and pieces of ministries to this particular ministry.

I look forward to the inclusion of one of the omissions from this bill: That is, the transfer of the cemeteries branch from the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations. I think this fits very ideally into the Ministry of Culture and Recreation. It may not have quite the vitality the member for Lakeshore was speaking about—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): It's dealing more with leisure time, you know, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Bounsall: —but it certainly has every other aspect—the museum quality that was referred to by the member for Lakeshore previously and, under culture certainly, the historical and heritage significance that one can find in cemeteries makes an ideal sector for the minister to gather under his wing, to mention nothing of the leisure time considerations which occur under recreation. There is plenty of leisure time for the persons with whom the Cemeteries Act must deal.

I would suspect that this is just the first of many as this ministry continues to build, and empire build in that sense. I will look forward to the minister taking the cemeteries branch under its wing rather soon.

Speaking of transfers from the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, I gather this Act provides the force to take in some of the items which I see outlined in the estimates. I was kind of wondering just what would be included in the estimates and from the estimates be able to see clearly what was being transferred from other ministries into this particular ministry. This is the one which

involves the area of historical sites and the Ontario Heritage Foundation, heretofore under Colleges and Universities.

Just quite briefly on that, I am rather glad to see that has come under this ministry and that they will be administering the historical sites, apart from cemeteries; although I believe that many of those could well be considered historical in order to be given rather more prominence than they were under the former Ministry of Colleges and Universities. The problem with that branch being under Colleges and Universities is I don't think it really got its fair share of money or fair share of consideration. I would hope that under the leadership of this particular minister and his parliamentary assistant, a lot of time and attention is paid to that branch of the ministry; preserving the culture we do have in the Province of Ontario, and preserving the many historical buildings and sites we have in the Province of Ontario.

To mention only one, there is a very old historical church in Windsor, Assumption Church. It is on the list of historical sites to be preserved, but there is a continued need for operating funds to keep the church in repair. I suppose you do need some capital funds to restore it to good condition, but the continuing problem is one of operating funds to ensure that true historical sites do not further deteriorate or get to the point where they cannot be restored.

Therefore, to this minister and to his assistant, I would hope that more funds are reserved now that they have the authority in this bill to maintain our historical sites, to designate, around the province, a somewhat wider range of buildings—like Assumption Church—which the ministry will immediately start funding and helping to maintain so that these buildings are preserved in the condition in which they deserve to be preserved. The present occupants of many of these buildings are having a tough time maintaining them in the state of repair that these buildings deserve and which the community deserves.

I will talk further in estimates on this, I am sure, about the various other sites which interest me. But I say to the minister and his assistant that I am glad to see this move because of the additional funds and the additional importance within the ministry that I hope the minister will give to this area. This is an area, which, under the former Ministry of Colleges and Universities, I thought was sadly neglected. I bring this to the minister's attention and hope that he and his staff will pay particular attention to the funding of this

type of endeavour and encourage the people involved at the present time in maintenance; and that there will be funds coming, if not in the near future, at least some time in the not too distant future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Do any other hon. members wish to speak to this bill? The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Yes, I want to take this opportunity to say a few words about this Act. I welcome the indication that funding will be made available for communities and groups within communities for recreational and sports purposes. This is a breakthrough for us in the north who feel we have been neglected far too long because of budgetary constraints imposed on the former sports and recreation branch when it was under the Ministry of Community and Social Services. Now with the possibility of a good deal more funding hopefully we will be able to come into our own, so to speak, with regard to the Community Centres Act and its regulations.

The parliamentary assistant was north last Friday and had a preview of the kind of expectations held by people in the north, by virtue of the fact that he attended the annual convention of the Northwestern Ontario Municipal Association. I think he knows we expect a great deal from this ministry by way of additional funding to sporting groups and small communities which don't have the wherewithal to provide a well-rounded sports and recreation programme.

My primary reason for getting up to speak tonight on the bill is I would like to spend a little bit of time, Mr. Speaker, referring to a particular section of the bill which transfers responsibility for the Indian community secretariat from the former Ministry of Community and Social Services to this new ministry. It means that a ministry whose primary function is to deal with cultural and recreational pursuits on behalf of the people of the Province of Ontario has taken unto itself almost total responsibility for the delivery of programmes to native people.

As I see its responsibility within the Indian community secretariat, it is to co-ordinate all the programmes available to the native people in the province and to perform a co-ordinating function for those delivery systems among all of the various ministries of this government and, hopefully, to provide some kind of liaison, some kind of rapport, between the government of the Province of Ontario and the federal government.

When the minister is hiving off what I consider to be one of the most important branches of this government into a ministry that calls itself Culture and Recreation, I wonder how serious he is about coming to grips with the social, economic, cultural and linguistic needs of our first citizens. When we consider that the federal government recently announced a new method of funding for all native groups in the Province of Ontario, whether they be resident on Indian reserves or classified as Indian settlements on Crown land without reserve status, if the minister is going to convince the native people of this province that he is even remotely interested in, concerned with and sensitive to their needs, I question whether it should have been placed in this ministry.

I would have hoped that with the reorganization and the transfer, maybe the government would have considered putting the Indian community secretariat in the charge of an entirely new ministry or in charge of a Minister without Portfolio whose sole responsibility would be to co-ordinate the government's efforts on behalf of native people in the province and to effect some kind of liaison and co-operative effort with the federal government in the delivery of a total programme of assistance to Indian people.

While I would be the first to remind the parliamentary assistant that the primary responsibility for treaty Indians or status Indians falls within the purview of the federal government, either by design or by accident the provincial government has, to some extent, become more aware, more concerned with needs of treaty Indians, whether they live on or off the reserves, and for the non-treaty or non-status Indians and Métis. When one considers that, notwithstanding the primary responsibility for these services rests with the federal government, there are many areas as outlined by the Indian Welfare Services Act, as referred to in this bill, where the minister, with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, may make agreements with the Crown in right of Canada or an agency thereof to provide compensation to any Children's Aid Society that extends its facilities and services to Indians, to provide compensation to any authority operating a home for the aged that provides accommodation and care for Indians, respecting the payment of the cost of providing general welfare assistance to Indians, respecting the payment of the cost of providing rehabilitation services for Indians and respecting the provision and payment of such other services as will promote the well-being of Indians.

The provincial government has taken over that responsibility and I am wondering just how serious it is about meeting that obligation as defined in the Indian Welfare Services Act.

In addition to that, this government does enter into arrangements for road construction with Indian bands; it is responsible for policing on reserves; it is responsible for many forms of social assistance; hopefully it will be getting involved in work opportunity for native people; hopefully it will become involved in firefighting in certain circumstances; homes for the aged, as I mentioned earlier; day care centres and education in non-federal schools. It has a legal aid programme that supposedly makes services available to Indian people living within the province. It will be called upon to co-ordinate land registry on behalf of native people, land surveys, federal-provincial agreements with respect to land, federal-provincial agreements with respect to resource development, and treaties and annuities, and will have responsibility for the managing of fish and wildlife having regard for the treaty and aboriginal rights of our first citizens, and child welfare.

I am just wondering—and I see the Provincial Secretary for Social Development is listening—I am just wondering if this ministry, this new Ministry of Culture and Recreation, fully appreciates the magnitude of the responsibility it has taken on when it is going to be responsible for the delivery of those services to native people in the Province of Ontario.

I have suggested that perhaps it should have been given to a person with ministerial status, whose sole responsibility would have been co-ordinating among the various provincial government ministries and liaising with their federal counterparts to co-ordinate a meaningful social and economic programme on behalf of our first citizens. I've even mentioned the possibility of a Minister without Portfolio whose sole responsibility would be this liaising and co-ordinating effort.

I think the very least the ministry could do, if it's bound and bent on keeping it under this ministry, is to appoint a person with deputy minister status whose sole responsibility will be to provide the co-ordinating effort, both intergovernmental and interministerial, in order to make it meaningful and effective and to assure our native people that the government is really serious about coming to grips with some of their social and economic problems.

I don't want to go into any great detail

as to the kind of direction I think the government should be taking in this regard. I'm on the record as having taken advantage of every opportunity during the estimates of the Ministry of Community and Social Services when it had the responsibility for the delivery of social and economic assistance to our first citizens, so I don't want to go into any particular detail. But I think that if this ministry is going to tag the Indian community's secretariat onto a ministry whose primary functions are culture and recreation, I don't know how the government will convince our first citizens that it's really serious about coming to grips with a good many of their social and economic problems.

I don't know what kind of budget it's going to be. It's always been very meagre in the past. It may be in the estimates book that just came out this afternoon, I don't know. I haven't had the opportunity to look at it yet but I suggest that whatever form it takes and whatever the status of the person who is going to co-ordinate these various programmes, I suggest he be given sufficient funds so that the programmes can be much more effective than they have been in the past.

I can remember very vividly, Mr. Speaker, when I entered this House a little over seven years ago, the Indian community development branch had a budget of \$1.4 million. When the then minister was called upon to give an account of his stewardship for the previous year, over \$1 million of that \$1.4 million went unexpended. It was just returned to the general revenue or the Treasury of the Province of Ontario because the government couldn't find any place to spend it.

Things have changed in the last seven or eight years and I really feel the Indian community's secretariat, which has had its troubles along the way, is finally coming to grips with some of the problems that are facing our first citizens.

But if the ministry is not about to destroy what has already been started, and if it doesn't want to create the impression among the native people that it's prepared to forget about them and really treat them as second-class citizens and put them on the tag end of a brand new ministry like this—where a good many of the people in the ministry who are setting the priorities and allocating the funds, I'm convinced, know very little about the problems of our first citizens; granted the people who transferred from the Ministry of Community and Social Services do—I implore the minister, don't destroy what they have started:

Give them the power to go out and implement programmes they know will work; programmes they have been working on for a good number of years. Allow them the opportunity and give them the financial resources to build on what they have already started, and for heaven's sake, don't leave it in the hands of a director. Give them ministerial status. Give them, at least, deputy minister status so they can sit around the money table and get the kind of resources they are going to need to carry on a meaningful social and recreational programme.

Sure, culture and sports are a part of it but only a part and, I suggest to members, not the most important part if in any realistic way we are going to solve the very complex and very long-standing needs of our first citizens.

I hope the parliamentary assistant and the Provincial Secretary for Social Development will heed my words and really reflect on where they are going with regard to co-ordinating all the efforts of this government on behalf of our first citizens. More important than that, they must effectively liaise with the federal government so we can complement what it is doing. Hopefully, in the process we will bring our first citizens into the 20th century, socially and economically, while preserving their cultural and linguistic heritage. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Do any other members wish to speak to this bill?

The member for Prince Edward-Lennox.

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention the very historic area I represent in this Legislature. We've heard so much about Canada's first citizens; I really don't know who Canada's first citizens were. I presume the member for Thunder Bay was referring to the Indian population. If he was I would let him know that there are Indians in southern Ontario as well as Indians in northern Ontario.

Mr. Stokes: I said Indians. I didn't say in the north.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: We hear day in and day out about the plight of the north.

Mr. Lawlor: Come off it.

Mr. Stokes: I never mentioned the north.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: One would think there was no other part of Ontario but the north. The member had better start looking around in the southern part of Ontario.

Mr. Stokes: I never mentioned the north, not once.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: If he wants to see heritage and wants to see culture and if he wants to see Indians, let him come to parts of eastern Ontario and southern Ontario.

Mr. Lawlor: This member's got a chip on his shoulder these days.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That's what I'm here for and that's what I'm doing. Before we cordon off Ontario and make special pleas for special people—

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): I'm glad to see him start to do something.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That would be more than that member is doing anyway. He's developed a very mean streak and I'm very surprised at the attitude he has taken in this House.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: In any event, Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to get involved in personality clashes with the Liberal member. At the same time we must—

Mr. Stokes: I think what's wrong with the member is one of our first citizens took off after him and just missed.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member has some remarks to make.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Yes, I have indeed.

Mr. Lawlor: Very provocative, too.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, we should be looking at some of the early architecture of this province. I would remind the parliamentary assistant to the minister of the United Empire Loyalists who settled part of eastern Ontario. They were people who developed what was once the capital of Canada and, of course, many were original citizens of Ontario.

Mr. Lawlor: Who are our first citizens?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I have made submissions and—

Mr. Lawlor: He is almost the last of the Loyalists.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: I have made submissions and have been trying to get funds from the existing ministry in connection with architectural sites, churches which have been men-

tioned, museums and so on. I think before we get the whole matter distorted we should be concentrating on the southeastern part of Ontario where so much of Canada's history developed.

I would ask the parliamentary assistant to review those matters I have requested and to see when all that money rolls in from the lottery that we get our fair share in eastern Ontario.

Mr. Deans: Thank goodness he has finished.

Mr. Speaker: Do any other members wish to speak to this bill? If not, the parliamentary assistant.

Mr. Leluk: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I welcome the remarks of the members opposite in the Liberal and New Democratic parties. I just want to reiterate that there is nothing new in the bill, that this is of a housekeeping nature which effects the transfer of several programmes in other ministries to the new Ministry of Culture and Recreation. To be more specific, in reply to some of the members who spoke on the bill, the member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. B. Newman) stated that this is a propaganda ministry. I have to say that his statement has no basis in fact. I take exception to that statement.

These programmes have been in existence in other ministries for some time. What we are doing is bringing them under one roof. In other words, we are streamlining the operation of all these programmes. We are bringing them under the one ministry. There are other jurisdictions in Canada which have similar ministries—to name a few, Alberta, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Quebec. So really this is nothing new.

The member stated also that we were fragmenting programmes of the other ministries from which we transferred these programmes. I must say that really what we are doing here is co-ordinating these programmes by putting them under one roof so that people in this province don't have to run around to five or so different ministries. They only have to go to one.

I believe also that the member for Windsor-Walkerville asked about why it was necessary to amend section 3(1) of the Act. I would just like to say to that that it is up to the minister who is responsible for the administration of the public libraries to approve the purchase of debentures from the public libraries by the Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corp. This amendment will give the

Minister of Culture and Recreation that authority.

He also spoke of the involvement of municipalities or local participation in recreational programmes. I must say that, I am sure, he is aware that we have municipal recreational committees which have a maximum of 12 members, two of which must be council members, while 10 people are picked at random from among citizens at large. The municipalities run these programmes and we provide the operating grants for these programmes. So we do have involvement of our citizenry. I want the member to know that we are running a very open ministry here. In order for our programmes and our efforts to be successful, we must involve people and people must be involved in our programmes. We welcome suggestions and good ideas from all sources.

With respect to the member's interest in fitness programmes, I would just like to say that our ministry is now investigating the promotion of fitness programmes throughout the province.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): I've heard that now since 1959.

Mr. Leluk: This ministry is just three months old and I would like to remind the member of that.

Mr. R. S. Smith: This government is 32 years old.

Mr. Leluk: It is a new ball game now. I can just say to him again that we are investigating the promotion of fitness programmes throughout the province.

Mr. B. Newman: I have heard that comment since 1959.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Leluk: Well, he is hearing it again.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): There were two fights down there in the first period tonight.

Mr. Leluk: With respect to violence in hockey, the results of the **McMurtry** report commissioned by the Premier of this province (Mr. Davis) are being currently studied. There has been a noted improvement in the general operation of minor hockey in Ontario to discourage violence.

The member for Wentworth also mentioned his concern with violence in hockey. Again, I just want to reiterate that the **McMurtry** report is currently being studied by the On-

tario Hockey Council which was established in November of last year.

The member also asked who the members of the executive of the Ontario Minor Hockey Association were. I understand these people on the executive are elected from the ranks of their own members, that is, the various hockey associations of the municipalities. There is no direct funding by the province to the Ontario Minor Hockey Association. We do provide moneys, however, to the Ontario Hockey Association to assist in the development of coaches and officials.

Mr. Deans: Would the member answer one other question? It was much more important than who was running. I want to know what about this tying kids into seven-year contracts. Is the government going to sit by and allow that to happen?

Mr. Leluk: Well, I've taken note of the member's comments and we will consider those with the minister.

Mr. Deans: It's really vital. It has got to be done now, because their process has begun.

Mr. Leluk: I've taken note of those comments and they will be looked into.

Mr. Lawlor: The Attorney General (Mr. Clement) should pay attention. It is the juvenile contracts he is talking about.

Mr. Leluk: The member for Nipissing made some comments about financing of programmes from the receipts of the lottery. As I stated in my opening remarks, this will be discussed during the estimates.

He also spoke of unorganized territories or municipalities having to go through the local school boards in order to obtain their moneys. The member should be aware that under the Community Recreation Centres Act, 1974, capital grants can be paid to private charitable corporations and this legislation was specifically amended to assist in organized communities in this regard.

Mr. R. S. Smith: That doesn't have anything to do with this.

Mr. Leluk: The member for Lakeshore made some remarks about the ministry, and I can only say to him that I'm pleased that the people of this province are somewhat more enthusiastic and positive about our ministry than he is.

Mr. Lawlor: That's where he is mistaken.

Mr. Leluk: Well, I beg to differ with the member on that point.

Mr. Ferrier: Great member.

Mr. Leluk: The member for Windsor West spoke of funding for the Assumption Church, I believe; and I would just like the member to know that I'll bring this to the attention of the Ontario Heritage Foundation.

With respect to the member for Thunder Bay, I just want him to know that the transferring of the Indian community secretariat to the Ministry of Culture and Recreation in no way is going to diminish the quality of the programmes which currently exist in this regard.

We were asked what moneys were in the budget, and I might say that the amount of money is approximately double that in the budget last year. This means that there should be more support moneys for some of these programmes in culture and recreation.

I've taken note of several of the other comments that were made and certainly they are appreciated and will be considered.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

Mr. Lawlor: What about that point of subsection (b)—is that wrong?

Mr. Leluk: Pardon? No, it is not wrong.

Mr. Lawlor: Better send it into committee and amend it.

Mr. Leluk: I'll speak to the member about that after.

THIRD READING

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill 38, An Act to amend the Ministry of Culture and Recreation Act, 1974.

EXPROPRIATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Clement moves second reading of Bill 43, An Act to amend the Expropriations Act.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I want to make a very brief comment with respect to this particular bill. I welcome this

bill—I support it wholeheartedly. I think it must be obvious to the minister, in view of the conversations we've had over the last number of months with regard to the problem which confronted a number of people in my riding.

The Expropriations Act, as it is drawn, didn't take into account the fact that landowners couldn't exercise an option which differed from the original expropriation and make themselves available to the Land Compensation Board in the event of a dispute over land prices.

In the particular instance with which I was associated, Ontario Hydro had come out with a new land policy, making a number of options available to landowners other than the fee simple option, which was always available to them. There were a number of people who negotiated with Ontario Hydro and who were prepared to exercise their option in one form or another in regard to dealing with Ontario Hydro. But in so doing, under the Expropriations Act these people were precluded from going to the Land Compensation Board in the event of a dispute over the land prices.

I mentioned this to the minister and I know he has had consultations with a number of people. I think he also had the Robinson report to fall back on. He has come in with this bill which corrects the problem; I certainly support it and welcome it, and I know a good many people who are currently negotiating with Ontario Hydro welcome the change as well.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I do not have much to say about this bill, Mr. Speaker, except to simply state that it is a broadening of the powers already contained in the Expropriations Act for a hearing before the Land Compensation Board. When land is acquired by public authorities and the acquisition of that land, whether by expropriation or not, is brought about, then the board may determine compensation.

One of the questions that arise out of it—and I'll ask it here, rather than send it in to committee—relates to the fact that for many years the board has been under some degree of fire, if that is the word, or maybe it is drenching. The tendency of the legal profession is to scout the board.

I would like to know, therefore, if the minister has statistics as to the number of compensation cases taken directly to the Supreme Court of Ontario for adjudication and compensation over against the number

of cases that are taken to the board itself independently of that process.

While one may go to the Land Compensation Board and can appeal up to the level of the courts, etc., the legal profession by and large has circumvented the board. Their attitude is: "What is the point of going to the board? If we are going to have to go to the courts anyhow, let's go to the courts immediately and get the job done." There seems to be very little gained.

On the other hand, it may be that the Land Compensation Board has acquired a certain expertise, that it has come into better odour with the profession, and therefore the number of its cases in the past year or so have increased substantially. I don't know if I can say that—I would trust that it would be so, because after all the board does exist and it should perform some kind of function. What role is it performing? What is its volume of cases at the present? Does the minister really feel, therefore, that this is an efficacious and effective instrument to do anything with this minor amendment to the legislation? Why does he bother with it at all?

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to speak to this bill?

The hon. minister.

Hon. J. T. Clement (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the hon. members know, the Expropriations Act was studied by Mr. R. B. Robinson, QC, and certain recommendations were brought forward quite recently.

One of the recommendations which he brought forth is contained on page 28 dealing with hearings on consent. He very properly points out in that recommendation that at the present time the board, by the drafting of the existing statute, lacks jurisdiction to hear a matter on the consent of all parties.

It would appear that the board, which has now been in existence some 6½ years, I believe, has in fact attracted a great deal of confidence from the public insofar as the amounts of compensation or the amounts awarded for the taking of lands by public authority are concerned. It became somewhat more apparent fairly recently—it was referred to by the member for Huron-Bruce; it was certainly referred to earlier this year in the House in a question directed to me—that there were instances in his area—and members on this side from the same general area have mentioned the same thing—whereby the owner has recognized that a strip of land

would be taken, whether it's in fee simple or an easement really doesn't matter. But the owner wanted to be reassured that the value paid for the fee or for the easement was in fact a fair one, and wanted that determination made by an authority or by someone who was neutral to the whole situation—and the owner felt that the board was the proper authority to make that decision.

But the Act as presently drafted does not allow the matter to go on before the board on consent, because the board only assumes jurisdiction when certain procedures under the Expropriations Act have in fact been made. I would draw the hon. member's attention to section 30 of the Act, I believe it is, which says that upon certain things having occurred, the board may determine compensation. So here we have two parties, namely, the expropriating authority and the owner, really wanting a third party to make the determination and yet the third party lacks jurisdiction. Of course, the whole thrust of the amendment which is before the House now, Mr. Speaker, is to in effect give jurisdiction. On the consent of both the owner and the expropriating party, either side can apply to the board to make the determination.

I will have to refer back to the member for Lakeshore at a later date the approximate number of those matters which have proceeded to the Supreme Court as raised in his comments with reference to the bill. I attempted to call the deputy minister just now; he is chairing a function this evening and could not be reached, but I will get back to the member in connection with his inquiry as to the number of cases which have proceeded to the Supreme Court. Subject to getting the figures on it, it is my impression there have been relatively very few, and as I recollect it in general discussion with my law officers, they invariably have gone, mainly on points of law, to the Supreme Court of Ontario.

Just in passing, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to add this comment. Many of the recommendations put forward by Mr. Robinson are being very seriously considered by our ministry right now. I hope to come forward with a bill later on in the year to reflect many of the recommendations contained in the Robinson report. There was some urgency in this particular matter drawn to my attention by members of the House and for those owners who want the compensation board to make that determination, I felt that in order to give the board that jurisdiction, I would have to come forward at this time. Hence, my introduction some two weeks ago of the bill

which is now before the members of the House on second reading, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THIRD READING

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill 43, An Act to amend the Expropriations Act.

FORESTRY AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Bernier moves second reading of Bill 59, An Act to amend the Forestry Act.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could give a brief outline of the bill before the hon. member debates the issue. I have just a short statement here that may clarify a number of points.

Mr. Speaker, the Forestry Amendment Act of 1975 provides for the managed forest tax rebate programme. You will recall when I introduced the bill on April 18, I said at that time it is the aim of the government to provide an incentive for private woodlot owners to manage their forests so as to obtain the greatest possible yield of wood and wood products from their lands. It is also expected that proper management of private woodlots under this programme would also provide those other benefits of a managed forest—a healthy wildlife habitat, conservation of water, recreational benefits and a pleasing landscape.

You will be interested to know, Mr. Speaker, that we estimate that up to 20,000 forest landowners could qualify and benefit through these rebates. It is further estimated that up to 90,000 forest owners could benefit from this programme, if their lands were placed under proper forest management.

I know there will be questions concerning the cost of the programme. The Ministry of Revenue estimates that a 50 per cent rebate on managed forest lands would average about \$100 per owner at current tax rates or \$2 million for 20,000 owners. I would point out to you, sir, that there are approximately seven million acres of small forest land holdings in those designated under the Woodlands Improvement Act and, of course, this does not

include the railway land holdings, such as the ACR, of which I'm sure the members opposite are very much aware. We estimate that the current yield from these seven million acres is approximately 100 million cu ft of wood annually. And, of course, under a proper management programme we strongly feel that this could be increased to well over 200 million cu ft per year.

The question will come up as to who qualifies for this rebate programme. Any resident of Ontario owning forest land not assessed as part of a farm will qualify. Standards for the programme will be established through an order in council. We expect that the following standards will be sought:

A forest means that it will be not less than 400 trees of any size per acre; 300 trees per acre measuring over 2 in. dbh—that's the diameter breast high, or taken about 4.5 ft above the ground—200 trees per acre over 5 in. dbh; or 100 trees per acre over 8 in. dbh.

A managed forest means that a forest that is subject to an agreement under the Woodlands Improvement Act or subject to an agreement under the Forestry Act or subject to an agreement planned and certified by a registered professional forester, in which, of course, livestock does not pasture or roam. That means it is not less than an aggregate total of 25 acres on a separately assessed parcel of land, and in which trees are cut in conformity with a bylaw passed under section 4 of the Trees Act or in conformity with good forestry practice. Taxes mean taxes for municipal and school purposes imposed by a mill rate.

Trees mean any of the following species with any of the following genera: Pine, spruce, hemlock, tamarack, cedar, balsam, birch, oak, ash, elm, hickory, basswood, tulip, black cherry, walnut, butternut, chestnut, maple, sycamore, beech, locust, blackgum and poplar.

The administration will be with the Ministry of Natural Resources. We will set the forest management criteria and do the field audit of the programme. The Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs will administer the tax rebates, as it does the farm tax reduction programme in co-operation with the Ministry of Agriculture and Food.

Mr. Speaker, applications will be mailed out to about 70,000 forest landowners as identified by the Ministry of Revenue from the present tax rolls. I might say that we have the information here. It's a very simple appli-

cation. Along with that application goes a full explanation, provided that this is approved tonight, for a managed tax-reduction programme.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Thank you. I welcome that explanation from the minister.

The kind of thing that I think that he is trying to do here is something that I have been advocating that he should do for a number of years. He can recall the rather heated debate and the rather heated exchange that we had when he was setting up the Algonquin Forestry Authority. It was our contention over here on this side of the House that had the government embarked on this programme a number of years ago that it may not have been necessary to violate what a lot of people in southern Ontario refer to as the wilderness or primeval forest contained in Algonquin Park.

Hopefully, as a result of the initiatives that he is taking or the incentives that he is providing to holders of private forests, either under the Woodlands Improvement Act or the Forestry Act, he will revive the interest of those owners in planting, husbanding and harvesting a forestry crop on their lands, particularly in southern Ontario where a lot of it has been allowed to grow into scrub.

When one considers the need in the future for fibre, it's quite obvious that if we are going to maintain our position as one of the leaders in forestry—having regard for what we consider to be a tremendous need for fibre, whether it be for newsprint, fine paper or for pulp linerboard—we are going to have to make use of all available lands in order to get maximum production, at least to the extent of which we are capable. If there is this kind of programme, it will make maximum use of private forests.

A good many of those lands are far from No. 1 and No. 2 agricultural land, but they are ideally suited for the growing of tree crops. I hope that as a result of this programme the millions of acres that are not being used at all or are under-utilized will be regenerated—particularly in the southern part of the province and even in some areas of the north; acres that have been brought to the attention of the ministry, a good many of them having once been held either under a licence or under a volume agreement by the prime licence-holders or the prime users of wood, but having been allowed to grow up in weed species until they have become weed fields rather than productive forest

areas. If this Act and this incentive will give that needed stimulus to the regeneration of forestry in those areas, I am all for it.

The minister has mentioned that the government intends to provide a 50 per cent rebate which will cost the taxpayers, in total, an estimated \$2 million. He mentions that is exclusive of land held by the ACR. The ACR holds, I think, something like two million acres. They are private lands. I can think of two other companies with major land holdings. Abitibi is one in our area which holds several townships. Ontario Paper hold a fairly substantial amount of land themselves. And, no doubt, there are several others. Does this mean that this programme will also be available to those large companies who, for their own reasons, have been sitting on these lands? They have done absolutely nothing with them by way of reforestation, regeneration or silviculture.

If that is the case, I don't think they are deserving of this kind of assistance. One must realize that until a very short time ago we were only using between 40 and 45 per cent of the allowable cut in the prime species and maybe 10 to 15 per cent of what was once referred to by this ministry as the weed species. That is no longer the case. The allowable cut in many, many areas of the province is now reaching very close to the maximum we can tolerate on a sustained yield basis. It seems to me that we're going to need this additional fibre, but I don't think that we should bail out these people who have been sitting on huge tracts of land for decades and, all of a sudden, say: "Let's give them a helping hand." I hope that, in fact, is not the case.

One other thing that I find a little bit objectionable is section 2, subsection 4 of the bill: "A programme may be made effective retroactively to a date not earlier than Jan. 1, 1973."

I find that a little bit hard to swallow, where we're bringing in legislation and saying: "You can get relief retroactively under this amendment to the Forestry Act." Granted, in most instances, it will be a fairly insignificant amount. From the ineffectiveness of the programme in the past, the limited amount of work that was done by private landholders on their own land, either through the Woodlands Improvement Act or the Forestry Act—from what little bit I know about it—was minimal, to say the least.

In fact, the minister's colleague, the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) was decrying the fact that of the 70,000 people who own small woodlots, or small

areas that might be suitable for tree farming, very few of them took advantage of it. I don't see why the minister should make a thing like this retroactive. I think that if they are serious about making their lands productive I don't know of any reason why we should make it retroactive for a two-year period.

I would like an elaboration by the minister on those few points that I have raised with him. I find the retroactivity a little too hard to swallow.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I have a few comments to make on this bill, Mr. Speaker, particularly in regard to what the bill doesn't do, as well as what it does do.

The first section of the bill is quite plain, simple and obvious. But in the second section, which establishes a programme for the encouragement of forestry, it is really something new within our province insofar as private forests are concerned. In effect it provides assistance to the private forests that will be established, or have been established, mostly in the southern part of the province. I'm not opposed to this, of course, insofar as the establishment of these forests is concerned. But, on the other hand, we must be selective in the areas where we provide the support.

For example, I don't think it would be of any use at all to provide support for the provision of forests in the southern part of the province that would only duplicate that which is in abundance in the north.

On the other hand, it would be a decisive programme to establish assistance for the provision of hardwood forests in the southern part of the province to offset that which we may lose in the area of Algonquin Park when the government finally decides that that likely will be phased out over a period of time. Of course, the minister may or may not agree with me on that, but I think the day will eventually come when that is done.

I'm not saying it's within the next five, 10 or 15 years—it may be 20 or 25 years—but on the other hand I believe that we should be establishing programmes, such as the one that can be envisaged within this legislation, that would provide assistance to the specific needs of our industry and not provide assistance to those forests which may be developed, which may not provide any requirement that the province now has for specific types of production.

The other thing that bothers me, of course, is the retroactivity of the programme. We

always hear from the government that they can't make things retroactive, but obviously when it suits their purposes they do make them retroactive, and in this case it's going back to Jan. 1, 1973. I find that kind of difficult to understand, unless there are some people in the business now to whom these assistances are going to go regardless of the fact that the bill hasn't been brought in.

I'd just like to make some general remarks in regard to the woods industry. I would say that this bill does not go far enough and it should deal at this time with the whole question of Crown dues and the question of stumpage. It has been my position, and I would think I've expressed this on a number of occasions in the Legislature, that as the economy of the woods industry goes up and down the stumpage charges should do likewise.

In Ontario, if one watches what's happened not only in the sawmills but in the pulp mills, as well as in the veneer plants and right across the whole gamut of the woods industry in northern Ontario, it's just like a roller coaster. It is up and down. There are periods of very high unemployment and there are periods of very high employment, and because of the nature of our industry in this province we have developed an industry that seems to bottom out on occasion. Those occasions have been becoming more regular, if one looks at a chart of the past 10 years.

It appears that what is happening is, when the world markets are good, business in the woods industry in Ontario is good; when the world markets are bad, then we are the first to suffer. That is because of our production costs and because of the fact that we have large costs in transportation to world markets. In order to offset those costs, I believe any legislation that's brought forward in regard to the woods industry should include within it a form of stumpage charge that will float inversely with the industry, so that when the industry is in trouble the government is not collecting as much in stumpage charges, and when the industry is viable and is producing big profits, then we are stepping in with a higher stumpage charge.

This hasn't been done, and because of the lack of initiative on the part of the ministry to do this we have created in the north that type of employment situation which I've just described, which goes up and down like a roller coaster. That's what the woods industry is in northern Ontario and that is how it is going to remain until this government can find some way of stabilizing that industry.

The other thing I would like to point out

is to look at the export market. The export market is all-important in this area, particularly in pulp and paper; it is the mainstay of the pulp and paper market. If we look at that and look at the charts drawn up in a study by Peat Marwick and Partners we'll see there are obviously decisions made in the boardrooms of the big companies in this country as to who will export where.

In Ontario, woods producers, insofar as pulp and paper are concerned, have obviously been the big losers. The markets assigned to us by agreement between the big companies—and by the big companies I mean CIP, Abitibi, the whole works—are those markets now being served by the southern United States where the competition is the toughest. We in Ontario are the ones who are suffering the most.

The ones in Quebec and the ones in the west are not suffering to the same extent as we are because the cartel which operates the sale on foreign markets of pulp and paper from this province has designated those markets which are the most competitive to Ontario. We have become the losers.

All one has to do is look at the Peat Marwick studies which were done for the select committee on economic and cultural nationalism and one will see graphs of where our product goes.

Our product goes to certain areas of the United States and not one drop of it goes to any other area of the United States. Our product does not go to the European market which is a good market at the present time but from which we are cut off because of the agreements made in the boardrooms of the large corporate woods producers in this province and elsewhere across Canada.

I believe this ministry has to take into consideration that it must step into that situation and decide that products made in Ontario are going to be shipped everywhere in the world, wherever a market is available, regardless of what type of contractual or non-contractual arrangement has been made between the big producers in this country. It becomes obvious to me as a northerner that we are suffering because of this and have suffered greatly over the past 20 years.

There are three things then. There is the stumpage charge which I believe should be geared to the market as it exists, geared to the profits of the industry as they go up and down like a roller coaster, and geared to the question of employment, which goes up and down the same way. The third thing is that the big companies have formed a cartel and have decided where the foreign markets are

going to be for each of the different producers in this country. Through that, we have been the big loser.

This bill today, although it does not deal with those things, could well deal with those things and should well deal with them. What it does deal with is a very small segment of the overall woods industry in this province and it provides assistance to that segment.

I don't oppose that in any way except it should be specific in that it provides assistance to that segment of the woods industry where we need production. I don't think the fibre for pulp and paper should have any type of subsidization provided if it is produced in southern Ontario because there is plenty of that in northern Ontario in specific areas. Right now, most of those producers in that area are having some difficulty in finding markets. I think it is foolhardy to provide assistance to them.

Certainly, for hardwood production in southern Ontario we should provide assistance because there are no other hardwood forests in the province that are really productive, other than those that are in Algonquin Park. If we're ever going to have a truly recreational area there, then we have to develop hardwood forests outside that area in order to provide the raw materials for the secondary industries that are so dependent on them.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister to reply to the numerous questions I've put on second reading.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Speaker, this is a relatively short bill in terms of words but there is quite a bit in it. I might say that this bill is welcome at this time; I think that had we had it a number of years ago, the dilemma we recently found ourselves in with regard to Algonquin Park might not have occurred.

One of the concerns of the Algonquin Wildlands League was that there never has been much of an effort to get the Ministry of Natural Resources to manage the lands outside the park or to encourage the people living there to engage in an adequate silvicultural programme to provide hardwood in that vicinity. I hope the minister will move with dispatch in this area and encourage a managed programme so that it will be much more possible to get logging stopped in the park in a shorter time. I know this isn't the government's objective, but I think this is a policy that any government in this province should be undertaking.

One thing about this Act that I think is very worthwhile is that it does encourage more woodlots and more people in southern Ontario to buy some farms where the land is of rather poor quality as far as agriculture is concerned but which will provide very useful soil and conditions for forestry.

There are more and more people who are willing to invest in this kind of land to buy themselves a country home, so to speak, and who are willing to put it into forests but who have felt very strongly that it's not fair that they should be paying full taxes, because those trees will not grow up for 50, 60 or 70 years and there won't be any economic return to them. In fact, they will probably be dead before there is any economic return to their heirs. In a sense, they are providing a useful service to the people of the province, but they do not feel that they should have to pay full taxes. I think it was the professional foresters' association that presented a brief to the minister, and I think that probably had a significant impact on bringing forth this legislation.

I happen to be one of the members of the drainage committee, and I know my friend from Essex South (Mr. Paterson) probably will be speaking on this subject following my remarks. But one thing we noted was that in areas where there was fairly good agricultural land, the farmers were not too happy about having woodlots in their area. Sometimes a person who did have one of these woodlots wasn't too anxious to have drains built across his land. Farmers in many instances wanted to clear off all the land and use it for agricultural purposes.

I think this bill will be beneficial in some rural parts of southern Ontario for those people who wish to provide wildlife habitats, some water management and even flood control in some instances. If this encourages more people to invest in woodlots and tree farms in the southern part of the province, I think that it will have a very significant and worthwhile impact in a lot of the rural areas of this province.

I note that the minister said this announcement is going out to 70,000 people. It seems to me that a lot of this is through either order in council or regulation. It's not in the Act. Why that should be, I don't know.

Sometimes one would like to see more things in the legislation and not so much left to the regulations and order in council—

Mr. Lawlor: This is one of the minister's easy bills.

Mr. Ferrier: —where things can't be debated. They should be, in fact, spelled out.

I don't know that this is going to be very beneficial for us in the north. I think it is more for the hardwood industry here in the south and for the other things that I have said in terms of conservation, and in providing in the south an alternate source of hardwood to the only one that is now there in Algonquin Park. We may not necessarily reap the benefits of it in our generation, but if this programme is carried out with some determination and some real resolve by the ministry, then it can provide significant benefits in the future for our people.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It is a progressive programme.

Mr. Ferrier: I think I have to admit to that. I don't always agree—

Mr. Gilbertson: It is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Stokes: We have been urging the government to do it for eight years.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Progressive legislation by a progressive government.

Mr. Ferrier: I remember, Mr. Speaker, what one of my professors at Victoria College, John Irvine, used to say about Mackenzie King.

Mr. Lawlor: Give the minister an inch and he will take a mile.

Mr. Ferrier: He said he would wait, wait and wait until people all over the place were urging him to act and then he would go ahead and do something and say, "Look how progressive we are."

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Those fellows opposite get a good idea every now and then.

Mr. Ferrier: Well, all kinds of people have been urging the minister—the member for Thunder Bay, this party, the Forestry Association. The whole province has been saying: "For gosh sakes, get on with the job and do it." Finally, the government has done it and we can't do anything but commend the minister for finally seeing the light. But it has taken a long time for the light to dawn. The light had a lot of barriers to break through before it finally got through and they perceived it.

Mr. Stokes: We finally brought them kicking and screaming into the 20th century.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): It's called leading from behind.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Essex South.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, the member for Cochrane South has sort of enticed me into this particular debate. As he knows, my colleague, the member for Essex-Kent (Mr. Ruston) and I do represent that part of the Province of Ontario that has the least cover by trees in the province; that is, the Essex and Kent county areas.

I think there is nothing that disturbs me more on my travels about the county and on our way to Toronto than to see the bulldozers working knocking down trees in woodlots along Highway 401 and the other highways.

But this is somewhat of an economic problem, Mr. Speaker, these days when the land is worth several thousands of dollars and the returns per acre can mount into the hundreds of dollars to the individual farmers. It certainly has been trying to them to maintain lands and woodlots that aren't in active production.

Many of them, I know, have taken advantage of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food's grants to put the bulldozers in to knock the trees and the brush down, and the hedgerows, and clean up their farms for more economic production. This is further financing by a government that is destroying the very thing that this Act hopefully is going to combat and bring back the tree growth in our particular part of the province.

I think the minister's explanatory remarks were certainly helpful, and I want to study them in more detail as they are of specific interest to me. As you may be aware, Mr. Speaker, I represent an area that is rather unique in Canada. It is the Carolina forest region. It is the only area in Canada that has certain species of trees. I was pleased the minister mentioned there would be some assistance toward encouraging the sycamore and the blackgum, and possibly the Kentucky coffee tree, those species that are very unique in Canada, and I would ask of him if his ministry is planning to expand the operations of the nursery at St. Williams to add species. I believe they do produce approximately 15 species at the present time. I think their latest new one was the Norway spruce, but I don't believe they are going into more of what we call the exotic trees native to the Carolina region for planting on private woodlots. Pos-

sibly they do produce some of these for the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, but I don't believe that these are available to the public at large.

In the minister's comments, I believe he said something about wildlife management and indicated that the propagation of certain nut trees and berry trees was going to be encouraged. I wonder if the ministry is going to encourage those who are planting the trees to get a little better mix; rather than planting a block of 50 acres of conifers, which in fact do not support wildlife, put in a mix of both deciduous and conifers, and even get into the business of supplying types of shrubbery or bushes on which wildlife can feed and winter.

I know, as my colleague the member for Cochrane South has stated, on the select committee on drainage, and prior to that the select committee on conservation, that those of us who served on that became very aware of the necessity for the encouragement of planting, both along the ditches and the wet areas, various species of bushes and trees, both for wintering purposes and feeding purposes for the various wildlife in our province. But to this date I don't believe anything has been done in that regard unless it has been carried forth by individual conservation authorities. So I would hope the minister would give that point some consideration and have his ministry propagate these particular native bushes and trees that can be used in a real managed forest wildlife programme.

The only other question I would ask is in relation to conservation authority woodlots. I don't think it was spelled out in the minister's remarks as to whether these tax grants or incentives were going to be made specifically for conservation authorities as opposed to individual woodlot owners, and I would appreciate a clarification of that particular point.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to speak briefly. I suppose in some respects the member for Essex South has covered mostly what I had in my mind. It's probably a little difficult to realize that in farming in the area where we come from we are, on one hand, forced to clear our bushlands in order to make use of additional land and at the same time we are probably defeating certain ecological improvements that might be had by keeping the bushland. We know that it certainly does hold a great deal of moisture. The runoff from rains is of course much less in the woodland areas.

We had a resolution come to the county council recently which some of the conservation authorities had been pressing, that no farmer be allowed to destroy his woodlots without the approval of the conservation authority, and this was voted down in county council. I suppose one of the reasons, too, is that the cost of purchasing land in Essex county now has gone up to, I suppose, a minimum of \$1,000 an acre and, depending on the quality of the land, it goes up higher than that of course. But for what we classify as Brookston clay soil it is around \$1,000 an acre. So if one has 15 or 20 acres of bushland, by hiring bulldozers and clearing it and then having it tiled, one does get close to that sum by the time we figure the cost of tiling it, I suppose two rods apart, which is the proper drainage for it, and clearing it out. It's always a job for the first two or three years farming as well, because there are always new roots come around it. But that can be done for a little less than buying new land, so naturally if it's adjoining one's farm he is going to clear out the bush if he wants to expand his operations. That's one of the things. How does one conserve forest land when farmers are in a situation where they have to farm all the land they have in order to make a living?

I think myself we need this. It's something that we are definitely going to have to look at from a long-range view; probably the province itself will have to do this. I don't think we can expect individuals to keep woodlots or bushland because it's to the benefit of all the people. It isn't just the individual farmer who benefits; it certainly benefits all the people in the area. If one notices, in the last few years, in flat country like we're in, as the trees are cut and the bushlands cleared out, the wind makes an awful difference to some of the crops. With some of the lighter soils, we're finding we have a little problem with the drifting and blowing of the topsoil. That's something I think we're all going to have to contend with.

I had thought a few years ago, when I saw the amount of trees and bushland being cleared out, that perhaps the government—and I say all levels of government—may have eventually to look at planting rows of trees, probably 200 ft wide, down every second or third concession. This would be a great asset as a future habitat for our wildlife, and it also would be an asset as wind breaks. It's not a serious thing yet, but I think it's a problem that could increase over the years as the bushland continues to be taken out.

I think that's something we're certainly going to have to look at very seriously.

Even in large areas where we farm with large machinery we have to have large fields. The day of keeping a few trees stuck around the end of the field or out in centre for shade is no longer feasible. Mr. Speaker, if you've ever farmed and worked around a large elm tree that takes all the moisture for about two acres around it, you certainly want to get it out so that you can get your crop in. Woodlots are definitely the only way to go. It is going to take support from the province and all the people in Ontario to do this.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to speak to this bill? The member for Renfrew South.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to rise and comment briefly on the bill before the House tonight, the Act to amend the Forestry Act. I would want to go on record as congratulating the minister and his staff for putting together and bringing this legislation before the House.

I cannot recall any single programme in recent years that will do as much toward creating healthy forests in both southern and northern Ontario as this amendment to the Forestry Act will do. We all know that great tracts of southern Ontario and the north-eastern section, and for that matter many sections, are really not agricultural land and are best suited for the growing of trees.

Many years ago, a century ago, our forefathers came to those parts and the way of life was to eke out an existence from a clearing. They cleared great areas of this province which really did not belong in the area of agriculture. Later on, as times and things changed, and our way and mode of life changed, this became very apparent and right across southern Ontario we see abandoned farm after abandoned farm. None of these holdings really had soil which could sustain one in the industry of farming. Many of them were left and very little or nothing was done with them. They grew up on their own in a sort of haphazard manner and really are not too valuable in their present state.

I am sure their present owners will certainly welcome this legislation because it's a real incentive for them to put these areas back to doing what I would like to say I feel the Lord intended them to do in the first place, and that was to produce trees.

I understand that any holdings of 25 acres or less will require a management agreement. I wonder, and I hope that perhaps in the distance the day will come when every holding which qualifies will be required to be under a management agreement.

I have seen in recent months and recent years that some private holdings have been harvested in a manner which I don't think is very complimentary to the forest industry. This is why I would hope that at some time in the future the ministry would see fit to have all the properties or holdings which qualify under this legislation under management agreements.

I think it is perhaps going to be somewhat difficult in the early stages of this programme to determine what properties are eligible. I am told by some of the ministry staff that this doesn't appear to be a difficult matter but I wonder if there will be areas with insufficient trees on them to qualify and I am afraid there will be many so-called borderline cases.

At any rate, this is great legislation. It will be welcomed, I feel, by some 20,000 or more property holders in Ontario and will certainly go a long way to stimulate the woodlot industry and make our people, especially those people who hold title to those areas, more aware of the great need we have to put these lands back into forest production.

Mr. Stokes: Doesn't the member wish it had happened 10 years ago?

Mr. Yakabuski: Yes, I think it is always great to look back, but a lot of things didn't happen. We didn't have the farm rebate tax until some two or three years ago and I think this follows closely on the heels of that.

It's going to be welcome and I want to commend the minister and his staff for preparing this legislation and bringing it before the House at this time. Certainly, I would want to be on record as highly in favour of it. Thank you.

Mr. Stokes: It's nice that we have one Tory member participating in this debate.

Mr. Speaker: The minister.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, after hearing all the support and the praise we have had for this particular legislation, I couldn't help thinking as I was sitting here of that great poem which went something like this—I am sure all members will remember it, "I think that I shall never see a poem lovely as a tree. A tree that looks at God all day and lifts its leafy arms to pray."

Mr. Stokes: Boy, is he reaching.

Mr. Lawlor: More like a little babbling brook.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Look who is opposing that. That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. Lawlor: He couldn't get to that nest of robins.

Mr. Stokes: In her hair?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I certainly think that this is a really historic night, because I'm sure relatives of those members who have supported this particular legislation, as history will record it 50 or 60 years from now, will look back and say, "Those were the type of men who supported really progressive-type legislation."

Mr. Stokes: They may even say that they advocated it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Some of my relatives might even sit under the tree.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: This type of legislation is difficult to bring in, because in these times of high cost and inflation, to ask people to put their lands into a productive position where they will see no real benefits for 50 or 60 years, it takes a certain amount of forethought, a certain amount of planning and a certain amount of faith in the future—and, of course, that is what the 90,000 or so people in this province affected by the Woodlands Improvement Act will have as they come under this particular tax reduction programme.

Mr. Ferrier: There are a lot of genuinely conservation-minded people in the province today who will welcome this.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, I'm sure there are. Right.

Mr. Deans: Why didn't the minister say so, then?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I certainly want, at the outset, to express my appreciation to all members who have so strongly supported this progressive legislation, which we have indicated to the members will take effect as of Jan. 1, 1973. I know there has been some question as to the retroactivity of this particular legislation but I would point out there is a certain reason for that. Section 4, subsection 4, provides that this programme will be retroactive to Jan. 1, 1973. It recognizes the government's programme of farm tax reduction.

The members will recall that when that particular programme came into force on Jan. 1, 1973, we had several woodlot owners who made application for a tax reduction

thinking that that applied to them. We examined it very carefully and accepted the philosophy that a tree is a crop and it should be treated exactly the same as agricultural land. This was one of the prime moves and the reason for bringing this type of legislation forward, so the lands are being treated identically to agricultural lands. It makes good sense, of course, to go back to Jan. 1, 1973, and bring both programmes in step. That is the particular reason for that section.

The member for Thunder Bay asked about the lands which would qualify. I would point out to him, as I did in my opening remarks, that the ACR, the railroad lands, the conservation authority lands, and blocks 7, 8 and 10 in northern Ontario will definitely not apply.

Mr. Stokes: Very good.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: This is very, very clear. It will just be those lands, of course, that are under the management programme of the Woodlands Improvement Act.

The member for Nipissing questioned the success of the woodlands improvement programme. I would point out to him that we've got about seven million acres of land under cultivation now in that particular programme. It's yielding about 100 million cu ft of wood annually and with this new incentive we hope to double that. So I think that while we have a good programme in place now it makes good sense to give an added incentive to increase and to double the output on those same acres of land.

I'm sure other people will join the programme, because there will be a tremendous amount of non-agricultural land—maybe class 3 or class 4 land—that's not properly suited for agricultural purposes, as the member for Renfrew South correctly pointed out in his particular area. These areas have been cut over. They're not lending themselves to the type of agriculture that we have in other parts of the province, and they would now have the opportunity to be given some incentive if those areas were put under cultivation for trees.

There was mention of the export of our finished products; I think the member for Nipissing was referring to our pulp and paper products. I think it's fair to point to him that we have one of the strongest and one of the best customers in the world right at our doorstep. There are 200 million people just across the border—

Mr. R. S. Smith: We only have one strip of it.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: In terms of our free-enterprise system, I find it difficult to agree with his argument that it's a cartel, because I know some of those people and they are very competitive and of course they will sell where they can get the greatest return, having due consideration of course for their costs, the tariffs and the high transportation costs involved.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Any study will show they have the market split up between them.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: If the hon. member fully informed himself about the production capacity of the Scandinavian countries, he would see that they do present tremendous competition to Canada in the pulp and paper industry. They do look after the European market, although I'm not saying we don't get in there, because we do supply a tremendous amount of newsprint and pulp to Britain. It is to be hoped, of course, that we'll be in the European common market in the not too distant future, but that's another problem.

The member for Cochrane South also made reference to the Woodlands Improvement Act, saying that perhaps it is not as productive as it should be. Again I would point out to him, as I did a moment ago, that we have about seven million acres under cultivation and producing 100 million cu ft annually.

He mentioned something about the species we have listed in the regulations and how they will qualify. There are no exotic species per se; I think we want to promote the trees that are natural and will lend themselves to production and growth in this particular province.

We are not interested in promoting shrubbery simply for habitat areas, as the member for Essex South suggested. I think it is fair to say that any well-managed forest lends itself for this purpose and does provide an improved wildlife habitat. This is something a well-managed forest will do, of course.

Of course, any land under this particular legislation would have to be a managed forest under the Woodlands Improvement Act or under a programme by a registered forester. I was a little disappointed that none of the members picked up that particular point. This is a new thrust to encourage the private forester to become involved on his own and to provide his services to these woodlot operators.

We think this is a good step in the right direction. It is something that the foresters have been asking for for some considerable time, and of course we are only too pleased to go along with that request. I think this is the first time they have actually been recognized in this particular way.

Mr. Stokes: They made that proposal more than two years ago.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, it has taken us a little while to pull the legislation together. I might say that when we were pulling the legislation together, we looked at other jurisdictions, and I was amazed to find there is no jurisdiction on the North American continent that has this type of progressive legislation dealing with trees. In fact, many people I contacted personally have said to me, "You've got to be out of your mind in the Province of Ontario. When I fly from Toronto to Kenora, all I see is trees; and you fellows are giving a tax rebate to grow more trees. Surely you must have enough trees now to keep you in perpetuity."

That's the thinking of some people who are looking at Ontario from a distance. But when you get on the ground and consider the demands of future generations and our capacity to grow wood fibre, then I think it's imperative that this generation take on the responsibility of putting those non-agricultural lands into woodland production.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I again want to express my appreciation to all members of all political parties for their outstanding support and for their comments. I will certainly review their suggestions in detail as I go through Hansard, because of course we are most anxious to come up with the best management programme anywhere on the North American continent. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is for second reading of Bill 59. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

THIRD READING

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill 59, An Act to amend the Forestry Act.

Clerk of the House: The 13th order, House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, PROVINCIAL SECRETARIAT FOR JUSTICE

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. minister have a statement?

Hon. J. T. Clement (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Yes, Mr. Chairman, and it's not going to be about a tree.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): It doesn't mean there aren't going to be robins in your hair.

Hon. Mr. Clement: You will be barking before we are done, I am sure.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Try us.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): We'll be barking up the right tree, though.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Chairman and members, I have a rather lengthy statement, but I think it is most appropriate that I do open these estimates with the reading of this statement because it will touch on a number of matters which are of common interest to all members of the House and perhaps will explain certain matters to some of us and perhaps, hopefully, prepare a decent foundation on which to discuss the estimates of the Provincial Secretariat for Justice.

Mr. Lawlor: Also to give some rationalization and justification to a dead ministry.

Hon. Mr. Clement: As a newcomer to this particular portfolio, Mr. Chairman, I thought it would be appropriate if I refreshed my memory of past debates on the estimates of the Provincial Secretary for Justice. While I found the exercise interesting and revealing, what particularly caught my attention was the extent to which the concept behind the establishment of a co-ordinating body of this nature was generally accepted on the one hand, while on the other hand there was a total lack of agreement on the manner in which that concept should be applied. The difference of opinions expressed were not, be it noted, differences between the two sides of the House but differences among individual members of each of the opposition parties.

It is my belief that there is, in fact, little disagreement on the necessity in these rapidly changing times for a body to co-ordinate the various segments of the justice system, to establish priorities in the field and to provide leadership in the development of policies aimed at achieving that essential but delicate balance between the protection of society and the freedom of the individual. Where differ-

ences of opinion have arisen, they have sprung from a variation in individual perspectives as to how the secretariat should carry out its mandate.

We are long past that point where the areas of consumer protection, law enforcement, the administration of the courts and the custody and rehabilitation of offenders can work or can be viewed as totally independent segments of the criminal justice scene. The aims, objectives, successes and failures of each have an effect upon the others.

As a very simple example, to respond to public demand for more police in order to control crime more effectively would be unwise unless additional staff were provided both to the courts and to the prisons to deal with the additional caseloads which would result. Again, a change in the law, such as raising the age of criminal responsibility from 16 to 18, would have tremendous repercussions on all three segments. It is, therefore, essential that we look at the field as a whole and be ever cognizant of the fact that no matter how advantageous it may appear to one ministry to take certain actions or propose certain changes those actions or proposals will indeed have an effect upon other segments of the system.

The function of the committee and its secretariat needs no justification for this purpose alone, but clearly there are other and equally important roles which it must play. One of these is the establishment of priorities in our efforts—jointly and severally—to protect society by limiting criminal activity without unduly trespassing upon the individual's freedom. In establishing those priorities we must ask ourselves, Mr. Chairman, many questions. Do we wish to continue to pour people into the system or should we devise ways and means of diverting some of them from that system and handling in less formal fashion those whose offences may be petty but whose apprehension, prosecution and conviction costs the province considerable sums?

Mr. Lawlor: The answer is yes.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Thanks, I'll note that. Are there alternative sanctions to those we have relied upon for many years? Should there be greater resort to arbitration and settlement and less to the adversary trial? If so, how is this to be achieved without impinging upon the rights of the individual?

Mr. Lawlor: You're a great bunch of question askers over there.

Hon. Mr. Clement: I'm providing the questions for the member for Lakeshore, so he'll look pretty sharp in Hansard. To what extent do our values, ideas and attitudes affect the numbers brought to the attention of the system?

Mr. Lawlor: There is another question.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Is the answer to some of our problems to be found solely in terms of more and more financial and personnel resources, or will we find, as our neighbour south of the border has found, that pouring billions of dollars into bolstering the existing system is not enough?

Mr. Lawlor: That's the 64th one.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Do we have the essential data which informs us how well the present system does work and which influences the eventual choice of decisions which must be made?

Mr. Lawlor: Question 65.

Hon. Mr. Clement: What steps must be taken to ensure that native people are given the support and assistance which would enable them to look after their own offenders who presently are totally bewildered by and totally unaffected by our own system?

To what extent should the government intervene in the regulation of economic and market activities in order to achieve a sound financial and market environment?

Clearly, Mr. Chairman, this is only a sampling of the many questions which have to be answered, but I need not elaborate further. Perhaps the manner in which the questions have been formulated will indicate to you my doubts that the answer to what has come to be known as the crime problem lies in simply providing more people to do the same thing. More police? Yes, but to work in the field of crime prevention. More court staff? Yes, but to ensure that those who can be are screened out of the system, thus helping to restore to the courts that dignity and to the offender that sense of fair treatment which tends to evaporate under the weight of ever-increasing dockets.

The experience of other countries leads me to believe that the answers are not to be found easily, but we must continue to search for them. An essential step in our exploration is to have a firm data base, to know how many people are arrested, how many are convicted, how many serve prison terms and how many repeat the experience, to what advantage our manpower resources are being used

to the best advantage, to estimate future personnel and service needs and above all, to enable us to evaluate the worth of each individual programme within the system. Research and evaluation assume greater importance in a time of rapidly changing values and tighter budgets, but little research or evaluation is even possible without a modern computerized information system.

I have done no more than sketch some of the issues which I think our field must concern ourselves with. If I am open to criticism for having merely posed questions rather than offer solutions—

Mr. Lawlor: You sure are.

Hon. Mr. Clements: —I would make two points. The first is that I believe the initial steps to making progress in this or any other field consist in asking the right questions, not in rushing into simple-minded solutions—with the greatest deference, of course.

Mr. Lawlor: Of course not. Let's have no simple-minded questions either.

Hon. Mr. Clement: The second is that there are few simple solutions in a field as complex and as bound by traditional procedures as this one.

Mr. Lawlor: What was your ministry supposed to be doing for the past 50 years? Holy cow!

Hon. Mr. Clement: Having drawn your attention to some of these issues, let me now indicate to you the major items which will be occupying our attention in the coming year.

Firstly, I shall of course continue to meet at least weekly with my colleagues to discuss with them their policy submissions and their proposed legislation. These will be subject to analysis by the secretariat staff with respect to their priority and their impact upon other ministries within the field, and, indeed, upon the other policy fields.

Mr. Lawlor: You're telling me.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Among the proposals which will receive our consideration are those concerning family law reform, a unified family court—subject to Ottawa paving the way by amending the Divorce Act—limitation periods for bringing actions involving negligence, a pilot project in court administration, a pilot project in delinquency prevention—

Mr. Lawlor: You must save an awful lot of cups of teas, you fellows.

Hon. Mr. Clement: —changes to the Training Schools Act, the Land Titles Act, and the Certification of Titles Act. Let me emphasize that this is only a sampling and by no means an exhaustive list.

Mr. Roy: You should be embarrassed.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Because we feel that each member ministry in the field must develop its programmes with a view to their impact upon the other segments of the system, we consider it important that staff, and particularly senior staff, should be encouraged to develop their knowledge and awareness of each other's role.

Last year, for example, an interchange at the senior level of personnel in the OPP and Correctional Services was undertaken, and this has proved to be extremely valuable in broadening the perspectives of those involved. While that programme will continue, in itself it is not sufficient. This year will see the establishment of residential senior management development courses for those working in this policy field.

Next, Mr. Chairman, I would remind you of my earlier comments in regard to developing means for collecting and disseminating hard data in regard to the offender and to the process. There is presently an inter-ministry committee on justice information and statistics. This is a very vital component of our system, for while each ministry understandably will collect the data which it considers to be important to pursuing its own aims, it is important that we understand the effects of the system on people and receive the greatest benefits from the costs involved. Wherever possible, therefore, each ministry should collect its material in a manner which is compatible with the other components of the total system.

Moreover, our own material should be gathered in such a fashion that it can be coordinated with the information system being developed by the government of Canada in order that, jointly, we may increase the total awareness of emerging trends and our capacity to cope with their effects. For many years, those working in this field have been frustrated by their inability, through the use of manual record-keeping and of separate and different approaches, to evaluate the failure or success of their programmes and to identify the causes of bottlenecks within the process.

The management information systems, which are presently well advanced in their development, will go a great distance in

helping to provide answers which have so far eluded us. The secretariat carries the responsibility for co-ordinating the inter-ministry developments and the federal-provincial developments in this important task.

To turn to another very important area, Mr. Chairman, the secretariat this month assumed the responsibility for co-ordinating the services of the ministries in this field to native people. Those of you who have been able to attend the debates of the ministries will be aware of some of the significant changes which are occurring, particularly in northern Ontario. I will only mention as examples the recruiting and training of band constables; the native court worker programme; and the development of community residences for native offenders as alternatives to prison.

Again, since each of the many programmes which have been or are being developed to meet the specific needs of native people have impact upon each other, it is essential that the responsibility be assigned to one group, not only to co-ordinate these programmes but to maintain a close liaison with the participants in them and the recipients of them.

Mr. Stokes: Yes, get on with it.

Hon. Mr. Clement: A standing committee representing the various native associations in the province has agreed to meet regularly with the secretariat so I shall have full knowledge of the extent to which our endeavours do, in fact, accord with the wishes of that committee and its committees.

This brings me to the whole question of input to the process from that overwhelming majority who are not directly engaged in the system on the one hand or the other but who feel, quite rightly, that they have a stake in ensuring that public safety and protection, public order and equality before the law are maintained. Some take that responsibility very seriously and offer their services voluntarily in many ways. In one ministry alone it is estimated that there are well over 2,000 volunteers. Others are not yet willing or perhaps do not yet recognize the need to assume such a responsibility.

As I see it, we have a duty to perform in ensuring that the public is made fully aware of the many roles which citizens can play and, on the other hand, in ensuring also that those of us who are responsible for developing policy are aware of the specific concerns of individual communities. The secretariat will therefore be engaged in organizing meetings across the province with a view to

studying the questions of how the general public can be more directly informed of, involved in and consulted on the whole process of justice.

It is also our intention at such meetings to do all in our power to increase the awareness of the public of the true nature of crime which is not always the same thing as the impression some may have from viewing films or television shows which emanate largely from another country and portray, accurately or inaccurately, a totally different society. Different or not, there is always a very real danger that given constant exposure, people confuse the image with reality. While it is true that surveys of the public's attitude to crime indicate that people do not consider it to be one of the major problems facing society, those same surveys indicate that while there is no general alarm there is concern that what has happened south of us could happen here. And there is a determination that it must not happen here.

The cause for concern, in my opinion, is understandable. It could take very little to turn that concern into real apprehension if one looks only at an isolated statistic—for example, the fact that in the past six months the total number of people held in the Toronto jail increased by nearly 40 per cent. I do not intend to be an alarmist but neither do I wish to leave the impression that there is a simple explanation for that fact or that the answer to such a problem can be found within this policy field alone.

Crime, its degree and its nature, is a reflection of the character of society in which it is bred, and to that extent every one among us has a duty to preserve the quality of life we enjoy by playing our part in crime prevention. As you are aware, Mr. Chairman, this is a very complex field, since it impinges upon such areas as the strength and unity of the family, the social environment, the reduction of individual stress and many others.

To take the business environment as one example: This should be such that it is conducive to law-abiding behaviour in the world of commerce. For many years we have recognized that regulatory procedures must be established for certain components of our economic system where public trust is involved, such as the insurance industry, the securities industry, the real estate business and so on.

In this sector we have to be careful not to develop regulatory systems which are so onerous or oppressive as to discourage the establishment and development of responsible job-creating enterprises. At the same time we

have to act in such a way as to ensure that individual rights are respected and protected in the potentially conflicting consumer and commercial relationships between individual groups and corporations.

Again, I touched on the need to re-examine our traditional approach to the criminal justice system—apprehension, prosecution, conviction—to assess if alternate means might not be equally, if not more, effective, more humane and less costly. I wish to emphasize here that I consider it timely that we devote our energies to crime prevention in all its dimensions—strengthening and supporting community agencies to deal with problems, supporting the increased use of referrals by police, encouraging pretrial mediation and community-based dispositions. Through these measures we may be able to stem the return of an offender to the criminal justice system while building up the communities' abilities to take responsibility for their members.

I hope I have said enough, Mr. Chairman, to make it very clear that we see crime prevention as being much more than a police function, or a function of a family or social agency or indeed of any one body. It is your business and mine, and it will be the secretariat's business to promote and encourage initiatives in this area and play a role in co-ordinating them.

In this regard, I am pleased to report that we have already made a start. Jointly with the Ministry of Correctional Services we have been able to develop a plan for a unique pilot project in the area of delinquency prevention. We are supporting, with co-operation from the federal government, the applications of two private-agency groups to undertake parallel but quite different approaches in that same area.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me turn to a most important event which will be taking place very shortly in the province and on which members of my staff have been busily engaged. I refer to the fact that from Sept. 1 to Sept. 13 of this year, Toronto will host the fifth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of the Offender. I would like to express my appreciation to the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Grossman) who, through his eloquent pleading at the fourth congress, was primarily instrumental in Toronto being chosen as the site for this year's meeting.

The congress is held every five years and has met previously in London, Geneva, Stockholm and Tokyo. The fifth meeting will be

held on this continent for the first time. It is expected we shall have over 100 nations represented by delegations of various sizes, and that over 2,000 people will be in attendance. The five issues being addressed at the congress are those which concern all who work in the field of justice. They are:

1. Changes in forms and dimensions of criminality—transnational and national;
2. The role of criminal legislation, judicial procedures and social controls in the prevention of crime;
3. The emerging roles of the police and other law enforcement agencies, with special reference to changing expectations and minimum standards of performance;
4. The treatment of offenders in custody or in the community, with special reference to the implementation of the standard minimum rules adopted by the United Nations for the treatment of prisoners;
5. Economic and social consequences of crime—new challenges for research and planning.

While Canada is the host country, I need not elaborate upon the fact that the province has played a major role in the preparation of the programme, and in the arrangements for accommodation, visiting and so on. We have also contributed financially, of course, and by lending or seconding staff, particularly in those final stages of the preparation.

I have been personally honoured by being appointed one of the two deputy heads of the Canadian delegation. Accompanying me as Ontario government delegates within the Canadian delegation will be Chief Judge Fred Hayes of the provincial courts and the deputy provincial secretary. My deputy has also been involved, together with the Deputy Solicitor General of Canada, the Assistant Secretary for Social Defence at the United Nations, the Canadian co-ordinator of the congress, and a representative from External Affairs as a member of the senior policy committee of the congress. My colleagues, the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Potter) and the member for Halton West (Mr. Kerr), and some of the staff from the constituent ministries have been involved in meetings with the United Nations committee of experts, or in regional meetings.

Those of you, Mr. Chairman, who have been involved in international conferences can grasp the scope of the sheer volume of work which is involved. I wish here to pay tribute to those of our staff who have assisted in making these arrangements.

I will close by repeating what I said initi-

ally, namely that no ministry can operate in isolation or take unilateral decisions without society, and the public purse, suffering as a result. Whatever name you give it, whatever form it takes, there has to be a co-ordinated approach taken to the development of policies in this field or any other.

Man is inventing his future now, Mr. Chairman. He's producing his own brands of crime and he's developing or impeding his capacity and ability to deal with them. We intend to develop those policies which will provide us with that capacity.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mrs. Birch moves the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. M. Birch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday we will proceed with Bill 3 and Bill 22,

and the estimates of the Provincial Secretary for Justice, not necessarily in that order.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question? Does the minister think there's even the remotest possibility that what she has just told us might, in fact, come to pass on Thursday?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I indicated—

Mr. Deans: It means that every night we get told what's going to come up the next day, and the next day it never happens.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, these are all on the order paper.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): She's only acting House leader. It's not fair to ask her that question.

Mr. Deans: I understand that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mrs. Birch moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 29, 1975

Ministry of Culture and Recreation Amendment Act, Mr. Welch, second reading	1339
Third reading	1348
Expropriations Amendment Act, Mr. Clement, second reading	1348
Third reading	1350
Forestry Amendment Act, Mr. Bernier, second reading	1350
Third reading	1359
Estimates, Provincial Secretariat for Justice, Mr. Clement	1359
Motion to adjourn, Mrs. Birch, agreed to	1364



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, May 1, 1975
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 1, 1975

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. J. H. Jessiman (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity, through you, to introduce to the House 80 students from Whitefish Valley Public School, of Thunder Bay city and the adjoining municipality. They are with their teachers and their guides, and Mayor Walter Assef and Ald. Teras Kozyra, who are accompanying them and who are sitting in the Speaker's gallery.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to welcome to the chamber this afternoon a group of 32 grade 8 students from Ecole Champlain in Chelmsford accompanied by their principal, Mr. Charbonneau. I hope you will join me, Mr. Speaker, in welcoming them to the chamber this afternoon.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I think members of the Legislature will agree with me when I say the students from the Kenora riding are the most travelled in this province because of the government's Young Travellers' programme. Today we are most pleased to welcome 35 grade 8 students from the Evergreen Public School in Kenora.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): We welcome them even though they get the run-around from their own members.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Peterborough.

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity of introducing to you, and through you to the members of the Legislature, the members of Peterborough County Council who are accompanied by their wives and led by Warden Wilfred Ellis. Thank you.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to your attention and to the members of the House that the member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer) is celebrating his birthday today. The

member, as you are aware, is the dean of the House. We are aware of the contributions he has made as a member for the past 38 years and his ability as a cribbage player. I would hope you would wish him well today, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): How was he ever born on May Day?

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Workers of the world unite.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Kind of makes May Day a travesty, doesn't it?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my congratulations to the member, but I should also like to point out to him that he is not necessarily the sole champion of cribbage in our caucus. I make that as an aside.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier had better win at something these days.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'll tell the Leader of the NDP one thing we're going to win at—

An hon. member: Let me guess.

Hon. Mr. Davis: However, I don't want to be provocative this early in the question period.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): No, we couldn't get hold of the Premier later.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I haven't seen some of the members opposite here that often in the last few days either.

Mr. Roy: That's right.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

ENERGY PRICES

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to the attention of the hon. members a matter of serious concern relating to the pricing of energy.

An arbitration board in Alberta on Tuesday decided that the field price of natural gas supplied by Gulf Oil Canada Ltd. to

TransCanada PipeLines Ltd. should be raised to \$1.15 per thousand cu ft. Substantially all of the other producers of natural gas, selling gas to TransCanada PipeLines, had agreed to be bound by the results of this arbitration decision. Unless set aside, this higher price will become effective on Nov. 1 of this year.

This award will be opposed by the government of Ontario with all the vigour we can command.

The proposed increase would worsen inflation and increase unemployment. The adverse impacts will ripple through the national economy. It is our view that it is in direct opposition to the current economic and social interests of this nation. It must not be permitted.

The government of Canada, with Bill C-32, the Petroleum Administration Act, enacted, is capable of setting aside the price determined by the arbitrators. Natural gas field prices must be held to current levels, which average 45 cents per thousand cu ft. The responsibility of the government of Canada is absolutely clear.

It would be impossible for hon. members to underestimate the far-reaching negative impact of this arbitration board award. The matter at issue is not simply a sale of natural gas by one producing company to TransCanada PipeLines, not at all. This case was, in essence, a test. Substantially all of the producing companies, which have natural gas under contract with TransCanada PipeLines, had agreed to be bound by the results of this arbitration award. Consequently, this award means that the field price of natural gas, now 45 cents per thousand cu ft, would jump to \$1.15 as of Nov. 1 of this year, and that will apply to virtually all the gas purchased by TransCanada PipeLines for sale in Ontario.

The arbitrators followed the rules laid down in the Arbitration Act of Alberta. This Act requires that arbitrators, considering a new field price, take into account the price of alternative energy sources in markets in which the natural gas is sold. The result is that the prices of competitive energy sources can be marched upwards in a grim, lock-step position.

This inflationary spiral is confirmed in this award. The proposed increase in the field price of natural gas would result in natural gas not just achieving parity with crude oil at the citygate in southern Ontario, but in fact substantially exceeding it.

It's really a case of racing escalators. It's a "heads I win, tails you lose" game. It isn't a game we choose to play.

The redetermined price of natural gas awarded by the arbitration board would increase the average citygate price in southern Ontario by more than 80 cents per thousand cu ft. The current citygate price is 82 cents. The citygate price in southern Ontario will have been doubled.

An Ontario family that uses 144 thousand cu ft of natural gas for cooking and heating—an indicative consumption per family—would see their costs increased by \$120 a year or an average of \$10 a month.

The total additional cost to our industry, commerce and homeowners would total over \$550 million a year.

This is obviously unacceptable; nor is it consistent with the national interest; nor is it consistent with the conclusions reached at the first ministers' conference.

At the conference Mr. Speaker, I stated:

The government of Ontario opposes any increase in the price of crude oil or natural gas at this time. We do not believe the people of Ontario would support an increase. They recognize, as I recognize, that rising costs, fueling inflation, eroding job opportunities—all inherent in permitting energy prices to rise—is not the priority of today. This is not the task to which governments in Canada should be devoting their attention.

Mr. Speaker, nothing has altered that could be construed as a justification for this unilateral and damaging action.

On Dec. 19 of last year, the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough)—then the Minister of Energy—called for the speedy enactment of Bill C-32. He said, and I quote from the minister's statement:

Unless Bill C-32 is enacted quickly, the process of the redetermination of field prices will begin and move swiftly to conclusion by the spring. The field values mentioned could well become field prices effective on Nov. 1, 1975, as a result of the Arbitration Act of Alberta.

Certainly field price levels equivalent to the field value suggested by the Alberta board could damage the economic prospects—the economic fabric—of this nation.

Mr. Roy: Why did the Tories in Ottawa vote for it?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Fortunately, this legislation for protecting the national interest, defined as urgent in this Legislature last December, is finally in position. It is critically im-

portant that Bill C-32 be promptly proclaimed and that the government of Canada assume authority over the price of natural gas moving in interprovincial trade.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Did the Premier tell that to his friend, Mr. Stanfield?

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): What about Mr. Lougheed?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I pointed this out very vigorously at the first ministers' conference. I flatly rejected the comment of the federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources that "if there is not some agreement reached here, the price of natural gas will automatically escalate."

I responded then, Mr. Speaker, and I respond now, that Bill C-32 should be proclaimed, and the federal government should recognize its responsibility to protect the national interest in the matter of the price of crude oil and natural gas at this time of economic stress within our country.

The Prime Minister has stated publicly that he desired a consensus; that bilateral meetings must be held between federal and provincial ministers; that meetings must be held between officials. Out of these discussions a consensus would be sought. It was understood that there would be no movement of natural gas prices in the interval.

Instead of discussions by national leaders there has been substituted an abrupt award by a three-man tribunal.

Mr. Speaker, the government of Canada must set aside the proposed increase in the price of natural gas.

The onus is on the government of Canada, and I have today dispatched to Prime Minister Trudeau a Telex outlining the concerns of Ontario and urging that Bill C-32 be proclaimed without delay—

Mr. Lewis: They said they won't set aside the price increase.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and that it be used to protect the interests of the people of Canada, through holding the line on prices.

Mr. Roy: Does that apply to Ontario Hydro too?

Mr. Deans: Did the Premier send the Telex to Jamaica?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Minister of Transportation and Communications.

NORONTAIR SERVICE

Hon. J. R. Rhodes (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House of the progress that has been made in the expansion of norOntair into northwestern Ontario.

Last Friday, the Canadian Transport Commission granted approval for the operation of norOntair service between Kenora, Fort Frances, Dryden and Thunder Bay, a service operated for the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission by On-Air Ltd. The inaugural run was made this past Sunday.

In addition to the daily connections from Fort Frances and Kenora to the Transair jet service through Dryden, there is an east-bound flight from Fort Frances to Thunder Bay on Saturday and a westbound return flight Sunday. These flights tie in with the service to Kenora and Dryden.

Service on the Fort Frances-Thunder Bay route will be upgraded this fall when Atikokan will be added to the route. The starting date for this new service will be dependent on the completion of the new airport at Atikokan.

If Transair receives approval from the CTC for a proposed second daily jet flight from Winnipeg through Dryden and Thunder Bay to Toronto and return, norOntair will establish a second flight to connect with Transair in Dryden.

The tentative date for this additional service between Kenora, Fort Frances and Dryden, subject to the approval by the CTC, will be June 1.

On July 17, phase two of the northwestern Ontario plan is expected to go into operation. It will provide daily norOntair flights between Sault Ste. Marie, Wawa, Thunder Bay and Pickle Lake.

The start of this service is, of course, subject to approval by the Canadian Transport Commission and the Ministry of Transport.

To provide these new services, the Ontario government has purchased two Twin Otters, bringing our total to five. A sixth aircraft will be required this fall to provide expanded service to these communities in northwestern Ontario.

Finally, I should like to point out that by the end of 1975, the Ontario government will be providing norOntair service to a total of 16 communities in northern Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

ENERGY PRICES

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to put a question to the Premier following his statement having to do with the results of the arbitration in Alberta.

Since the government of Canada has already indicated that it intends to use the powers of the Petroleum Administration Act, which I understand had third reading yesterday after many months of delay, and while I am sure the federal government is anxiously awaiting the receipt of the Telex from the Premier of Ontario, has the Premier, his Treasurer or his Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell) contacted their opposite numbers in the government of Alberta so that these dislocating and unnatural pressures do not necessarily have to be imposed from the producing province? Has he communicated with the government, indicating clearly the effects these pressures will have on this province, which is essentially the consuming province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, these concerns were registered with the Premiers of the producing provinces at the first ministers' conference. I don't think there was any doubt in their minds as to the views of the Province of Ontario and I shall be sending the same material to the Premier of Alberta. It is quite consistent with those things that were communicated two or three weeks ago.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Since we appear to be heading for a 30 per cent increase in the costs of hydro-electric energy as well as this proposal of 40 per cent in gas—which we hope is going to be turned back to zero, although we don't know about that—is there any particular policy of the government, through the Treasury or through any other ministry, to somehow cushion the effects at least of the increase in Hydro if, in fact, it goes forward in the next few weeks and months? Does the Premier, who must surely be as, let's say sensitive, to the important impact on our own industry and our own individuals as anybody is, have a programme to cushion the effects of the Hydro increase, as well as the possibility of these other increases on our own consumers?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Especially senior citizens.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I recognize what the Leader of the Opposition is saying and I won't try to separate them as to two distinct issues, although with respect I be-

lieve they are. With respect to natural gas, we have taken the position and will continue to take the position—and I hope that is clearly understood from my statement—that the onus is on the government of Canada not to roll back but to maintain the existing price of natural gas during this period of some economic stress.

As it relates to the question of the proposed increase, or the application for increase, the Minister of Energy has dealt with this as it relates to Ontario Hydro. It is being referred, of course, to the Ontario Energy Board.

I would only state, Mr. Speaker, that the onus is there. It is on the federal government; it is what the federal government is all about. While I am not looking for any sort of confrontation as between the federal government and any of our sister provinces, I believe the economic situation is so serious that they must use that power that is given to them under that Act and discharge their national responsibilities in this instance.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They said they would do it, even without the Premier's advice.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West with a supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: All of the pre-election rhetoric aside, since Donald S. Macdonald has already indicated that he would agree to 70 or 80 cents—in one case a 55 per cent increase over the present price and in the next case a 77 per cent increase over the present price so we know that the prices are going up—what is the government prepared to do to intervene on behalf of the consumers of Ontario after its fashionable anti-federal rhetoric is done?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the leader of the New Democratic Party—who is probably the greatest expert on rhetoric in this House, and I say that in a somewhat complimentary fashion—

Mr. Lewis: I wouldn't have taken it otherwise. I wouldn't have taken it otherwise.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —can call it pre-election rhetoric if he wants. The fact remains, this government is going to oppose any increase in the price of natural gas and we intend to continue.

Mr. Lewis: That's stuff and nonsense. What is the Premier going to do when it happens?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

An hon. member: He had better tell Hydro that.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member for Ottawa East with a supplementary.

Mr. Roy: Seeing the Premier is talking about the onus on the federal government on the question of the increase for natural gas and oil, would he not agree first of all that the onus is on him on the question of Hydro; and how about hearing a statement from him on policy, accepting his onus and saying that he is against the increase in Hydro? That's where the onus is, here.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I know the member for Ottawa East loves to make speeches. If he is asking me a question with respect to Hydro, the Minister of Energy has already dealt with it—

Mr. Roy: Right. Accept the onus here.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and I don't want to get into a lengthy dissertation as to the differences between an increase in the price of natural gas, where there has been no increase in the cost of production, and this also applies to some aspects of oil, as against operators of a utility here that has no profit, is a public utility, with increasing costs entirely within that organization. I say, with respect, there is a distinction.

I know the member for Ottawa East would love to try and couple them together. I can only say we will discharge our responsibilities. We are in the process; it's being referred to the Ontario Energy Board. But for heaven's sakes, when are the Liberals going to stop defending their colleagues at the federal level and get around to making some decisions of their own?

Mr. Breithaupt: Tell the federal Tories to clean up their act.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: I guess he is right. It is not pre-election rhetoric. I guess I misinterpreted it. It's election rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order. Is this a supplementary?

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: We will allow one more.

Mr. Deacon: Does the Premier not agree that one of the major problems is providing

for a supply in the future, and that that is one of the things that has to be taken into consideration in Hydro and natural gas?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I find this a most revealing question. The hon. member is saying that, I guess, he supports an increase in the price of natural gas to provide for further exploration.

Mr. Deacon: I support what is necessary to assure supplies.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, we're concerned about security of supply. That was the understanding a year ago. The royalty situation in both producing provinces, including the NDP administration in Saskatchewan, the federal government tax and the fact that those two jurisdictions couldn't agree, have led to no further exploration as a result of the price increase of a year ago—maybe five cents a barrel.

Mr. Deacon: Why are Hydro costs going up?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am saying here, and I say it very simply, that while we're interested in security of supply and while we're interested in further exploration, we cannot accept this proposed price increase as the method of achieving that. If the hon. member is taking that position, that's fine.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Ontario's position last year led right into it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Why don't the Liberals make it their policy? Why don't they get up and say so?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We'll allow one more supplementary. The member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary of the Premier: If the Premier is so concerned about stopping the unwanted increase in the price of natural gas, over which Ontario has no direct control, can he explain why Ontario's government is taking no action to stop unwarranted increases in rents, over which the province does have control?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): The member should look at socialist BC and socialist Britain.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Has the Speaker ruled that question out of order?

Mr. Cassidy: Well, it's a telling point. The government should have tried. It doesn't do anything except where it can grandstand; and it grandstands like crazy.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Leader of the Opposition with further questions.

TEACHER-SCHOOL BOARD BARGAINING LEGISLATION

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to put a question to the Minister of Education. In view of the 50 per cent to 73 per cent demands for salary increases from the high school teachers in Metropolitan Toronto, can he now tell us when he intends to introduce the legislation, which has been pending for a year and a half and which is supposed to bring some order and justice into the relationships between the school boards and the teachers' professional organizations?

Mr. Roy: And he promised that legislation.

An hon. member: What's the Leader of the Opposition's position?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Leader of the Opposition is trying to get off a sticky wicket now, isn't he?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): I'm not sure there's a direct correlation between the two, because certainly the introduction of this legislation will not by itself rule out unreasonable demands, as are these demands that are presently reported in the Star. We're hoping to bring the legislation in within the next few weeks.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker: If we are going to be presented with the irrationality of a 73 per cent demand, would the minister not feel it is imperative, before the confrontation between the teachers and the Toronto board leads perhaps to the closing of the schools, that we have the sort of legislation which the minister has been working on for 18 months, and which is supposed to bring rationality into the dealings between the two areas? While we're in a period of some peace between the teachers and the board, that's the time for us to act. Why doesn't the minister act?

Mr. Roy: He promised it a month ago; including control over certification.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I'm surprised, of course, that my friend shows practically no regard for collective bargaining negotiations or how they go on.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is not true; I have some regard.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It is true, because I haven't seen one sensible statement in the last two years come out of the Liberal caucus.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What kind of an answer is that? The minister is on his way out.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Let the Leader of the Opposition not worry about it. He's on his way out.

Hon. Mr. Wells: They've gone all the way from wanting us to take over the school boards a couple of years ago—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister has made such a mess of education that he will not survive the election.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Reid: Where's the legislation?

Hon. Mr. Wells: They've gone all the way from wanting us to take over the school boards a couple of years ago to asking for legislation—

Mr. Reid: Where's the legislation?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister is irrational; and unrealistic too.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Just calm down.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have called for order on various occasions. Will it be heeded?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh, was that a threat?

Mr. Speaker: It might be. Has the minister finished his answer?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The Leader of the Opposition's two friends and colleagues sitting behind him wanted legislation brought into this Legislature—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, are you going to permit the minister to answer in this particular way? If he is going to deliver some sort of a political diatribe he should hire his own hall.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A question was asked and the answer, I understand, is being given. The minister gives the answer as he sees fit.

Mr. Lewis: If he had started this comeback six months ago, he might have made it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I know it embarrasses my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, that two of his members asked for legislation to end the Ottawa strike. He opposed them and we still don't know where the Liberal Party stood—

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): We never will.

Mr. Turner: Let the Leader of the Opposition tell us where they stand.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —and we never will. The party that preaches local autonomy wanted us to take over this school board in the York county situation.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Even the Premier is trying—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Breithaupt: The minister doesn't have to take sides; just bring in the guidelines.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the question was asked about the timing of bringing in legislation. I think we are straying quite a distance afield. Will the minister please answer the question?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I have answered the question, Mr. Speaker. What is needed in teacher-school board negotiations is good-faith bargaining on both sides.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A new minister of education.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): He must give them the guidelines to do that.

Hon. Mr. Wells: There have not been any real meetings between the Metro school board and their teachers at this point in time. I hope and I pray, and I request, that each of them gets down and starts bargaining in good faith. Let's cut the rhetoric out. Sure, we all know that 73 per cent is an unreasonable request but let's have them get down and bargain with the board in good faith. I tell my friend it doesn't need our legislation to have them sit down and bargain in good faith at this point in time.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? The member for Scarborough West with a supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: Since good-faith bargaining is clearly not met either by the kinds of offers which boards are making or, I happily concede, the 50 per cent to 73 per cent demand which is not good-faith bargaining, why doesn't the minister give a definition of good faith, as he has been requested, with the opportunity to enforce it either before the Ontario Labour Relations Board or some aspect of his ministry so that negotiations in this case don't disintegrate the way they disintegrated in Ottawa?

Mr. Breithaupt: He's afraid to bring it in.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think my friend makes a very valid point. The only thing I would point out to him is that it's very difficult sometimes to define good-faith bargaining.

Mr. Lewis: Nobody has tried in this province.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I don't think he and I disagree with what he has just defined as good-faith bargaining but I know there are other people who would disagree.

Mr. Lewis: I will draft it with the minister. We have a majority here.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lewis: We have a majority in the House. I'll draft it with him.

Hon. Mr. Wells: At least he and I understand a little about good-faith bargaining, which is something the Leader of the Opposition doesn't know anything about.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? A supplementary, the member for Ottawa East first.

Mr. Roy: I would like to ask the minister if, when my leader talks about bringing in the legislation, the minister is not aware that in Ottawa one of the difficult issues was quality of education; and that can be settled by his bill on the criteria or guidelines for bargaining. Why doesn't he bring his bill in—he promised it?

Mr. Reid: Eighteen months ago.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The bill will be brought in here in a very short time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister promised it the first week of the session. We don't believe him any more.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Everyone understands where we stand as far as bargaining on terms and conditions of employment is concerned.

Mr. Speaker: The final supplementary, the member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, can the minister inform the House if in the draft legislation he is about to bring in there is a good-faith bargaining clause? Is he developing within his ministry the expertise for the enforcement of a good-faith bargaining clause?

Mr. Lewis: The minister doesn't have that in his legislation anywhere.

Hon. Mr. Wells: My friend, of course, is saying we don't have it in there; I would have to assume he has seen the legislation.

Mr. Lewis: I have my contacts.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I'm sure he hasn't. I can tell my friend there will be something concerning good-faith bargaining in the legislation, because I believe, as a lot of other people believe, that is one of the key cornerstones on which we have to build legislation for bargaining in the public service. It will be there, along with a few other things.

Mr. Lewis: Then get it out here, define it.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Are there any further questions?

EFFECTS OF HYDRO BORROWING

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes I would like to ask the Premier, in the absence of the Treasurer, if he has examined the reported effects of the Hydro loan of \$100 million on the financial community and interest rates in Canada? The Hydro loan of \$100 million is reported to have forced rates up by a clear one percentage point. Is he prepared to report on the effect this has had on housing costs, for example?

How is he prepared to find the \$675 million additional borrowing the Treasurer reports we will need this year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: This question should be properly directed to the Treasurer. I haven't personally investigated. I am sure the Treasurer is quite aware of it and if he comes in time this afternoon I am sure he will be delighted to answer that question.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? The member for Scarborough West with his questions.

Mr. Lewis: Perhaps, in a sense, I have an extension to that question; because the Minister of Energy is back and I wanted to ask about it anyway.

When is the minister going to exercise some control over Ontario Hydro? It is now clear that the floating of the bond issue was literally thrown onto the market, without for instance putting it up to tender amongst the various institutions, with disastrous consequences for interest rates, particularly in terms of housing. Has he no control over Hydro at all?

Hon. D. R. Timbrell (Minister of Energy): Mr. Speaker, I really think the question of the leader of the NDP is based on a few inaccuracies in some of the figures which were quoted in the paper yesterday.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, really?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I saw one report that quoted the interest rate of about 10.75 per cent, where it is actually 10.25 per cent. In sending out any bond issue—

Mr. Renwick: It was not. The interest rate was 10.75 per cent and the yield was 10.31 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: If the member for Riverdale isn't interested than he can at least be quiet and let me finish.

Mr. Renwick: Well, don't confuse us.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): How would the member know what a bond rate is?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: In any bond issue there is close consultation between Hydro and the Treasury and the advisers in the private sector as to timing and place of allocation. From the reports which I received this morning the issue is being well received.

Mr. Lewis: Is the minister sure?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: It is not likely to go to a premium, and it is not likely to be sold out quickly.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary: What about the consequences for the increase in the interest rates which are now being registered, and predicted to be applied to the housing market? The money is now drying up throughout the province partly as a result of this folly of Ontario Hydro.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I don't accept it as folly, and not being an expert on the total bond situation—

Mr. Roy: The minister is not an expert on anything. His suit isn't bad though.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: No, I bow to the member for Ottawa East who is an expert on nothing. Trivia and nonsense are his areas of expertise and he is very good at it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The point is, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about moneys needed for 1975 to cover the operating and capital budgets of Ontario Hydro to meet their commitments in this year. It is not an excessive bond issue. It is being well received—

Mr. Renwick: Of course, because the interest rate is out of line.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —and it is very well co-ordinated with the Treasury and other elements of the private sector.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary. The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Can the minister make it clear whether the decisions as to the timing and the allocation, if these market decisions are made in Ontario Hydro, in which case the minister would be involved to some extent; or by the provincial Treasury, in which case also the minister would be involved to some extent, in view of the fact that the Globe and Mail Report on Business says in headlines: "Ontario Hydro Issue Causes Bond Market Havoc"? It goes on to describe the consequences.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I really think, Mr. Speaker, from whatever little bit I understand about journalism, somebody writes a report and somebody else sitting at a city desk writes a headline. I think that was really badly exaggerated.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Who was responsible for it?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The borrowing for Hydro is very much co-ordinated between Hydro, the ministry and the Treasury.

An hon. member: They were all wrong.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions? The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question: Will the minister report to the House where the decision was made to float that bond issue at the interest coupons and the yields which were reported in the press as being so substantially above

what the market was prepared to take? The bond issue, as I understand it, is going very well because of the depression of all of the other bond prices and the automatic increase in interest rates. Will the minister inquire and report to the House about the decision-making process?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I have just answered twice; I will answer for a third time. I will confirm it again with my staff, and if for any reason there is any deviance from normal procedure we will report, but this is co-ordinated with Hydro, the Treasury and the ministry.

Mr. Speaker: One final supplementary? The member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Who are the ministry's advisers and Hydro's advisers; and in what way are they co-ordinating their opinions with others in the bond market? It's obvious that other bond issues had not been digested and this one caused absolutely chaotic conditions.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, once one gets into the overall question of the credit of the province and borrowing on the credit of the province, that question should be more properly directed to the Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions? The member for Scarborough West.

ENERGY PRICES

Mr. Lewis: I have a question of the Premier. At any point in this process of energy costs is he going to indicate publicly what Ontario will do to protect the consumer when the price increases occur? Why is the Premier's rhetoric so substantial and his solution so negligible?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, of course the Leader of the New Democratic Party gives up very easily. We have not given up with respect to the price of natural gas, or with respect to the proposed rates for Hydro, which are being referred to the Ontario Energy Board. We will determine what we do when there are facts there for us to deal with. At this moment we are saying "no" to an increase in the price of natural gas.

Mr. Speaker: Further questions.

Mr. Renwick: By way of a supplementary!

Hon. Mr. Davis: The leader of the NDP would have us say that if it does, then we are going to—

Mr. Lewis: That's right; that is what I'd have the Premier say.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Of course he would.

Mr. Renwick: Why can the Premier, on the one hand blame the federal government for procrastination in passing Bill C-32, and at the same time not introduce into this Legislature enabling legislation which will give the government authority to cushion and protect the consumer if and when—and I think when rather than if—the price increase occurs?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Of course Mr. Speaker, with great respect, I say to the member for Riverdale in regard to introducing legislation that would "protect the consumer"—protect the consumer against what? In terms of what a provincial government can do, if the hon. member is going to argue that we should have some way of rolling back a price determined in another province, by way of either royalty or tax at the federal level, I say with respect that it can't be done.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, the Premier can cushion it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Cushion it.

Mr. Renwick: No.

Mr. Lewis: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: Further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Order please, a final supplementary; the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is it not true that by the imposition of a new royalty structure in this province the Treasury is going to extract from the profits of the oil companies here an additional \$60 million this year, after criticising the other provinces for doing something similar? Why could that \$60 million not be used in a programme, through the fuel tax or through a tax credit or some other procedure, to cushion the blow of energy increases? Apparently there is the prospect of gaining an additional \$60 million through this province's own royalty changes. Why should that not be used for our own consumers rather than for general revenue?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I'm surprised—well I'm not surprised, I really thought the Leader of the Opposition probably would give up the fight sooner than the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

I am not assuming there is going to be a price increase in natural gas or oil. I'm not making that assumption.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: There will be in Hydro. The Premier can examine it all summer, but he will have an increase in Hydro right after the election.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Liberal leader can make that assumption if he wants.

Mr. Roy: The Premier will be whistling in the dark.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Scarborough West with further questions.

Mr. Lewis: One of the premises of the budget, if the Premier will recall—and I'm coming to an interrogative—indicated stable energy prices. This government is about to permit Hydro to raise its rates, natural gas is clearly going up, and oil is clearly going up. Is this government ever going to provide Ontario with an energy tax credit which will cushion the blow; or has it some way of responding as a government?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't really want to observe, but this same question was asked about four or five minutes ago. The answer here is very simple: In terms of Ontario Hydro, the Minister of Energy has made it very clear their application has been referred to the Ontario Energy Board. In terms of natural gas, the Leader of the New Democratic Party is saying it is inevitable, it is going to go up, it is going to go up in the next very few months, or weeks. If the price of crude oil, as in his view, is going to go up—

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —the government here is saying, and saying as clearly as possible, that we will not support that increase and we will oppose it in every way we can.

Mr. Lewis: We will oppose it with the Premier, but what will he do?

Hon. Mr. Davis: And the members opposite aren't helping one darn bit.

Mr. Lewis: That's not leadership, that's abdication of leadership.

Mr. Speaker: Order please, the member has further questions.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The leader of the NDP almost talks as if he wants the price to go up.

Mr. Lewis: The price is going to go up. The Premier is pretending it won't.

Mr. Roy: The Premier knows that is what is going to happen.

Mr. Lewis: He is just posturing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, this is the question period.

Mr. Lewis: I have a question of the Minister of Housing, one last question.

Interjection by an hon. member.

LAND SEVERANCES IN BROCKVILLE AREA

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Housing: Is it true that after a speech to the Brockville Chamber of Commerce a couple of months ago he indicated that his ministry was going to establish an investigation into the question of land severances undertaken by the land committee in the areas around Brockville? Has he made such an investigation, and if so will the document be tabled?

Hon. D. R. Irvine (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, the statement is true. As my staff has informed me, we are halfway through the investigation. I don't know exactly when it will be finalized.

I want to determine, first of all, whether there have been any improper severances given. I will discuss the matter directly with the land division committee and with the municipalities before I do anything with regard to releasing whatever the results may be.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: Is the minister looking at the possibilities of conflicts of interest involved in there being people sitting on the planning board and sitting on the land committee whose land was engaged in the process of severing? Is that part of the inquiry?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. George.

HYDRO BLOCK

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the Minister of Housing. Is he at this time in a position to table in this House the

government proposals for the development of the Hydro block in the city of Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not at this particular time. My staff and myself are preparing a proposal and I expect it to be finalized within the next 10 days or so.

Mrs. Campbell: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Could I at least ask this? Is the minister prepared to tell this House whether there is to be a write-down of land costs in that block, and if so what the write-down is?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I am not prepared to say yes or no at this time, Mr. Speaker; or until I have had a full opportunity to discuss the merits of the proposal to say how we may proceed. Whether the cost of the land should be written down will come into consideration at that time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

MERCURY POLLUTION

Mr. Stokes: Thank you. I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. Is the minister aware that the chief of the Islington band at Whitedog has repudiated the statements made in the House by the provincial secretary and the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier), in the statement about the plans that the government has to assist them by providing freezers and this sort of thing, and that he attributes both of the statements to gimmickry and electioneering? Is the provincial secretary prepared to react to that sort of statement and do something positive on behalf of those people, who are suffering from excessive amounts of mercury in the fish?

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to repudiate a statement I haven't heard about. I'd like to see the statement—at least the statement which the chief is alleged to have made. I can't understand what the hon. member is referring to. Is he making a suggestion that the chief doesn't agree with the proposals which we have brought back—

Mr. Lewis: Yes. He says, "election gimmick and window dressing."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, that may very well be what he said. I would be surprised if he had. We had a very amicable meeting.

What I reported back here was what they were happy with; and as a matter of fact—

Mr. Lewis: It is amazing how difficult the provincial secretary can make it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —they were going to get a resolution of the band council along those lines. If this is what the chief has written, all I can say is that it's mischievous.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, mischievous.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What's the matter? Well, at least mischievous.

Mr. Renwick: I thought they were glad to see the minister.

Mr. Lewis: Didn't the minister say how pleased they were to see him?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, and that's exactly what happened. If they weren't pleased, they never gave any evidence of that.

Mr. Renwick: If they were pleased to see the minister, they were pleased to see anybody.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What we have come back here with as recommendations, as was pointed out by myself and my colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources, was as a result of their agreement to a programme which they said they would be happy if we carried through. They said they would provide us with a resolution from their band along these lines.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Misrepresentation. The provincial secretary should resign.

Mr. Stokes: Supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary.

Mr. Stokes: How does this hold with the minister's words, when they have said in the last paragraph:

Allan Grossman and Leo Bernier of the Ontario provincial cabinet prepared and made the statement without my approval. This can only be construed by my band members as an election gimmick and window dressing on the part of the Ontario government. Would you please make this correction on the national and regional news, particularly to the Kenora area? [Signed] Sincerely, Chief Roy MacDonald.

Mr. Martel: The provincial secretary should resign.

Mr. Lewis: The minister can attack him now and call him mischievous. Go ahead, attack the man.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I will admit this to the hon. member, that our first inclination was to await the official resolution from the band.

Mr. Deans: That was the right one.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, that's perhaps what I should have done, in retrospect, now that this has been raised. But it was obvious that they agreed; they agreed verbally, the chief did and those of the council who were there—

Mr. Lewis: The minister has been pretty obvious—

Mr. Renwick: The minister mistook politeness for agreement.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If, in fact, we made any error here, it was to make sure that this House was advised as soon as possible of what our plans were—

Mr. Roy: It was done for political gain.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If we hadn't done that, the members of the Opposition would have claimed we had misled them when I had said we would make a statement immediately on our return.

Mr. Renwick: No, we wouldn't if the minister had made that explanation.

Mr. Lewis: Boy oh boy, is he inept.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa East.

DESERTED WIVES' AND CHILDREN'S MAINTENANCE LEGISLATION

Mr. Roy: I have a question of the Attorney General regarding legislation called the Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act. Doesn't the minister think it's time that legislation perhaps should be amended to bring it into the 20th century, at least to 1975, and make the legislation applicable not only to deserted wives but to deserted husbands as well?

Hon. J. T. Clement (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Yes, I do think it should be brought into the 20th century, Mr. Speaker,

and we have moved very positively in that direction. As the hon. member probably does not know, the Ontario Law Reform Commission did a study on the supportive role of the parent. That study was returned from the printer last Friday, and I was given a copy which I have partially read. I will be tabling it in this House in the very next few days. It deals with a very integral part of the family law in this province, or what would hopefully be amendments to the family law programmes.

Secondly, as the hon. member probably knows, we have made representations to the federal government to have the Divorce Act amended to extend the jurisdiction into the family courts of this province insofar as divorce is concerned. So one cannot take an isolated piece of the whole complexion of this problem and move forward with it until one knows what the overall effect is going to be, as to whether the Divorce Act will in fact be amended, as I believe it will and should be.

Eventually we want to introduce legislation reflecting, certainly, a number of the observations made by the Ontario Law Reform Commission on the supportive role of the province; and we will be going forward this session, of course, with the former Bill 117 dealing with the assets of the family or family property.

Taking all of these components together, we hope to move on in a very positive direction, recognizing the obligations we have to husbands, to wives and primarily to children in this province.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There is considerable background noise in the chamber. It is very difficult to hear the answers, and the questions as well. One supplementary.

Mr. Roy: Is the minister saying that it is his intention to amend that type of legislation, which applies only to wives, but that he is going to wait until changes are made in the divorce legislation? Are we going to wait for that?

Hon. Mr. Clement: That is not what I said.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park.

OMA FEE SCHEDULE

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development, Mr. Speaker. Is it not the policy of her ministry to advise those physicians and others who might be interested of

what the government has agreed with the OMA to pay for various fees, beginning today? Inasmuch as neither her secretariat nor the Ministry of Health has notified any physicians, is the minister aware that the OMA is charging \$15.75 for this little pamphlet, whereby you can learn from them how much the new fees are?

Hon. M. Birch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that, and I think that is a question that more properly should be directed to the minister responsible for that.

Mr. Shulman: Is this not a policy matter?

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): What are they paying her for?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Rainy River.

LAND SEVERANCE REGULATIONS

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Housing, if I can have his attention. The minister indicated at the Northwestern Ontario Municipal Association meeting in Marathon last week that he was pushing forward with changes in the severance regulations in regard to land, particularly in northwestern Ontario but across the province, to reduce the requirement of 25-acre lots. Can he indicate when this might come about and what size lots will be required by Ontario Housing?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, this may come about as soon as I can receive the agreement of my colleagues, which I'm not sure I'll get at this time. I'm proposing that this severance acreage be changed; I think it should be—

Mr. Stokes: Is the minister flying a kite?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I am not sure whether or not this will be approved, but I hope it will be approved very shortly.

Mr. Reid: One supplementary, if I may: Does the minister think he can impress upon his colleagues that, in northern Ontario at least, reducing the requirement of the 25 acres will go some long way toward reducing the housing crisis in that part of the province?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I can assure the hon. member I'll do my very best to make that point very clear to everyone.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor West.

JUDGES ON POLICE COMMISSIONS

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): I have a question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker. Inasmuch as he is now replacing judges on police commissions, with which I agree, and thus removing them from a somewhat anomalous situation, why is he compounding the problem by not consulting the elected municipal officials about their replacements, rather than making what can only be considered or viewed as patronage appointments? Why is consultation not being made with the municipalities about the replacements of those judges on the police commissions?

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, I don't understand the question on whether the hon. member is referring to provincial court judges or county court judges.

Mr. Bounsall: I am referring to those judges who were on police commissions and whom the Attorney General is now replacing and making appointments of other people in the community.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, there are two types of judges on police commissions. In some instances there are provincial court judges and there are also county court judges.

Speaking, firstly, of the provincial court judges, Hon. J. C. McRuer, in his studies of police commissions some years ago recommended that judges not, in fact, have a role on police commissions in this province. This policy has been followed. It was announced by one or two of my predecessors three times removed that this was going to be the policy and it has been implemented over the past two or three years. I believe, at the present time, there are only two or three provincial court judges still sitting on police commissions within the province.

With reference, Mr. Speaker, to county court judges, the federal government, as I understand it, has before the House or a standing committee of the House, at the present time, legislation which, in effect, says that if a county court judge sits on a police commission following April 1, 1975, he is not entitled to accept any remuneration for so sitting. Whether that becomes effective as of April 1, 1975, or when it gets back into the House in Ottawa, if the date is changed to say April 1, 1976, I do not know. The Police Act—I think section 10—says that a judge must sit on a police commission.

When we find out when that bill in Ottawa goes through referring to county court judges,

I would presume that a number of those who are serving will decline to serve any further. Our Police Act will then have to be amended on the floor of this House to add some other class of person or persons for a county court judge to replace the county court judges.

Mr. Roy: That's the phoniest answer.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary.

Mr. Singer: It's the first one. Why can't the Attorney General exercise a little initiative of his own and do what Mr. McRuer recommended some years ago and what two or three of the minister's predecessors three times removed have also nibbled at, namely, remove the county court judges from police commissions by our own legislation and not wait for this weird process that he has been describing? Remove such people as Judge Scott from the Niagara Police Commission immediately.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Mr. Speaker, that sounds as if the hon. member does not think that these county court judges make any positive contribution. I take umbrage at this.

Mr. Singer: McRuer didn't want them on. The police didn't want them on and the Attorney General doesn't want them on.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Clement: I would not identify myself with that statement. In many instances, the guidance and experience of county court judges on police commissions are without parallel in this province, Mr. Speaker. I do not share the same views as the hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: That's not the issue.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Clement: We will see what the federal legislation is going to do and what the effective date will be. Then we will develop alternative legislation.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Welland South.

PROPERTY OWNERSHIP

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Natural Resources. Is the minister aware of the problem that has existed for a

number of years as it relates to the ownership of land and title to—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There is too much background noise in the chamber. We cannot hear the question. Will the member repeat his question?

Mr. Haggerty: Is the minister ready now, or shall we go behind here and talk about it? Thank you.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have asked that the noise be cut down in the chamber. The member for Welland South, please.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Natural Resources.

Is the minister aware of the problem that has existed for a number of years as it relates to the ownership of land and title, in particular to lot 142, plan 77, broken front, Lake Erie and part of lot 24, Bertie township which now is in the town of Fort Erie? It has now come to light for some 300 property owners who are alarmed that they cannot transfer any property, and don't have true title to their property?

Will the minister now bring in a bill to expedite the Crown letters patent to this particular property in question? I brought this to the attention of the minister some five years ago, I believe, hoping it would be corrected then.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the member I will have a complete review made of the entire situation and bring myself up to date on it.

Mr. Roy: Is five years sufficient notice for the minister?

Mr. Lewis: A complete review?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

INTER-CHURCH APPEAL

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier concerning the Jan. 22 appeal from the leading churches of Ontario for aid to foreign nations in self-development plans: How many letters has the Premier's office received on this subject and how many has he answered?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have the feeling the numbers are now probably in the

low thousands—perhaps 3,000 or 4,000—I haven't looked at the most recent list. We are endeavouring to reply individually to each one of those who have written. If a letter comes in with, say, half a dozen names attached thereto, we endeavour to write to the person who sent in the list of names. We are corresponding with all of them and really it's a very good opportunity to acknowledge the interest they are taking in this proposal. I will get the exact number but I think I am right that it is perhaps 3,000 or 4,000 letters.

Mr. Roy: All handwritten?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, a lot of them are handwritten. The member is quite right.

Mr. Burr: A supplementary: How close to a decision is the Premier?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I really thought that would have been the first part of the question, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, I joined the group personally about a week ago and certain discussions are going on now. I agreed to meet with them, I think, or have some further communication with them three weeks, I believe it was, or a month after the meeting we had which was roughly a week ago.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Nipissing.

MINISTRY OF HOUSING FIELD OFFICES

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Housing in regard to the decision of the ministry about 1½ years ago to decentralize and give the regional office in Sudbury the power to make decisions in regard to severances and subdivisions. Apparently now the order has gone out that this decentralization will be discontinued and that henceforth, a month or two from now, the decision-making power will be brought back to the Toronto offices. Could the minister explain the reasons for this?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe this decision has been made as the member has apparently thought it might have been. We are at all times reviewing the activities and the operations of our field offices. If they are not satisfactory, we want to improve upon them. It may be that some staff have been removed from Sudbury and put in another field office or our head office but I would say the office in Sudbury will still be continuing.

Mr. R. S. Smith: A supplementary: Would the minister assure me that the right of making decisions will remain within that office as it is now?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, the right of making the decisions will be left there as long as we have decisions made and we had better have decisions made as quickly as possible.

MERCURY POLLUTION

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, point of order.

Mr. Lewis: Here it comes—the reinterpretation of Chief MacDonald.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Damn right. Mr. Speaker, in asking a question earlier during the question period, the member of the opposition who asked me a question in respect of the visit to Whitedog and Grassy Narrows misled this House by misreading from a document, sir. I think it's very—

Mr. Deans: That's very serious.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the minister should not make that direct charge.

Mr. Renwick: Well, let's read the piece.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I didn't say he deliberately misinformed the House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Read it. The minister said he misread it indirectly.

Mr. Speaker: I think it's not necessary to use such words.

Mr. Stokes: I read from the document.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the Speaker will give me other words to use in their place, I would be very pleased to do so.

An hon. member: He may have misled.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The point is that in reading portions of the so-called statement by Chief Roy MacDonald—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Signed by him.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —he at least gave the wrong impression to this House. If I may, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Stokes: No, I quoted directly.

Mr. Breithaupt: Put the whole thing on the record.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He never quoted me directly at all.

Mr. Stokes: I quoted MacDonald directly.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member should have taken time to read this thoroughly.

Mr. Lewis: No, the minister should stay in St. Andrew-St. Patrick.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, this is dated April 29—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, that was the day.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —which is on the Monday—which is on a Tuesday, as a matter of fact. I made the statement in the House here on Tuesday.

Mr. Singer: Sometimes it comes on Wednesdays.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Except in Leap Year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is a letter purportedly signed by Chief Roy MacDonald to the Canadian Press, referring to two days previously:

Dear Sirs:

Last evening, April 28, 1975, on the regional news emanating from the Winnipeg CBC television news, you reported I made the following statement: [In other words, Chief MacDonald is quoting what he says the CBC television had stated on April 28. And here is the quote:]

"The chief of the Whitedog Indian reserve near Kenora says there has been a moderate improvement in the social conditions for Indians in northwestern Ontario recently, but more jobs are still needed on reserves.

"Roy MacDonald says he has asked the Minister of Natural Resources, Leo Bernier, for better timber areas so that native people can create their own employment opportunities. He says residents of the Whitedog reserve are completing construction of a grocery store which will sell high-protein foods. Chief MacDonald says he hopes this will lessen dependence on fish which has been found to contain high levels of mercury.

"The Ministry of Natural Resources has hinted that the provincial government has found the solution to food needs in the Grassy Narrows and Whitedog reserves. Allan Grossman visited the area last weekend to see what alternative food supplies might be found to replace mercury-polluted fish. He said in the Legislature the govern-

ment believes the problem has been solved and that he would make a statement tomorrow on the matter."

[And here is what Chief MacDonald has said:] "Allan Grossman and Leo Bernier of the Ontario provincial cabinet prepared and made the statement without my approval."

That, of course, is correct. I don't ask anyone from the outside to get approval to make a statement.

Mr. Breithaupt: He is going to blame the federal Liberals next.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Read on. Read on. It gets better.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: "This"—referring to the making of the statement, nothing else—"can only be construed by my band members as an election gimmick and window dressing on the part of the Ontario government."

Now, in fact, Mr. Speaker, what the chief is objecting to—

Mr. Singer: The election gimmick, yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —is what the members of the opposition insisted I do—make a statement in the House as soon as I returned—and that's all he is objecting to.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The oral question period expired some time ago.

Mr. Lewis: Is that an attack on Chief MacDonald?

An hon. member: Sit down.

Mr. Lewis: What does he mean, sit down?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Speaker has the floor.

Mr. Stokes: I have a point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: State your point of privilege.

Mr. Stokes: In the opening comments made by the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development, he intimated that I had misled the House.

Mr. Deans: He didn't intimate, he said.

Mr. Lewis: Withdraw.

Mr. Stokes: And I want him to withdraw that implication, because all I did was quote directly from the last paragraph of this letter, which is a direct quote from Chief Roy MacDonald and signed by him.

Mr. Deans: Exactly the same as he did.

Mr. Stokes: I think he should retract that statement.

Mr. Martel: Withdraw.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, in view of what the opposition has done today and in order to make sure that they are happy—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —we will not take any action until we in fact have the resolution from the bands.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. minister take his seat?

Mr. Lewis: Oh, now we become vindictive, do we? What a nice fellow he is, to penalize Grassy Narrows because of the opposition.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister changed the wording, which I figure is the equivalent of a withdrawal of the first charge.

Mr. Lewis: That wasn't a withdrawal.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, let him get on his knees.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, that wasn't a withdrawal. We would like the minister prostrate on the floor of the House. We will be satisfied with nothing less.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. Ewen from the standing private bills committee presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill Pr4, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton;

Bill Pr6, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton;

Bill Pr29, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr5, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton;

Bill Pr32 An Act respecting Harford, Ltd.

Your committee would recommend that the time for presenting reports by the committee be extended to Thursday, May 15, 1975.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

HEALTH INSURANCE AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Roy moves first reading of bill intitled, An Act to amend the Health Insurance Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to prevent physicians and practitioners who opt out of OHIP and bill patients directly from charging persons over 65 years of age and persons receiving public assistance greater amounts than are paid for the insurance services under the Act.

The purpose of the legislation as well, Mr. Speaker, is to preserve the universality of the plan and to make sure the amount charged over and above the OHIP fee does not become a deterrent fee for people at the bottom end of the income scale.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

REPRESENTATION ACT

House in committee on Bill 22, the Representation Act, 1975.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Chairman, are you able to advise us at this point whether there is intention by the government to bring forward any amendment with respect to this bill, as had been suggested by the minister would be possible?

Mr. Chairman: I was just going to inquire whether there were any comments, corrections or amendments to the bill. Perhaps the House leader might like to indicate this.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): I would like to suggest that we refer it without amendment for third reading.

Mr. Chairman: Shall the bill be reported?

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Chairman, on section 3, please.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister of Housing.

Hon. D. R. Irvine (Minister of Housing): Before the bill proceeds to third reading, if the hon. members would allow me, as I haven't had the opportunity to discuss this bill in the House because I was away at various times, I would like to make some remarks as the bill pertains to my particular riding. I will make them brief.

Mr. Cassidy: Did the minister read the Toronto Star?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I just want to say that it is, in my opinion, a very sad day for the people of Grenville-Dundas when they have found that they have been separated after a very long time, not only by provincial boundaries but through their many communities of interest. We look forward to the addition of our friends to the north, but I would like to point out to the hon. members that this has to be a classic case of an independent commission not being aware of the actual facts, whatsoever, in regard to how boundaries should be redistributed.

Mr. Cassidy: Where has the minister been all this time?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: The leaders and the members of the opposition have, in my opinion, done a very good job in making sure that their goals were attained in most cases.

Interjection by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: The members thought the minister was the most powerful member of the cabinet.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: However, as far as I am concerned, the government of this province was unable to obtain certain changes that should have been made because of the fact that we would have been accused of gerrymandering. I wish to point out very clearly to all members here today that—

Mr. Cassidy: The minister has been bulldozed. Now he knows how it feels.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —the independent commission appointed by this government has, in my opinion, made a very sad and very crucial decision when it decided to separate Grenville-Dundas. I believe the boundaries should have been extended. I believe the boundaries could have been adjusted around the affected areas in eastern Ontario. It will not, in any way, affect the opposition mem-

bers because they are not going to be elected in any event.

An hon. member: What are you crying for then?

Mr. Cassidy: The government said that about Stormont and it also said that about Carleton East.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: All I am trying to say today, Mr. Chairman, is that the boundaries that are now coming into force—

Mr. Cassidy: The minister is in a panic, Mr. Chairman. He knows it will be repeated.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —will certainly have very definite repercussions in regard to some of the people in my area. I say, on behalf of the people of Grenville, that we are very sorry indeed to lose Dundas, to which we have been very close, and I also say to the people that we will be working very closely with them in the future. Thank you very much.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Did the minister submit a brief to the commission on this?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I would draw to the attention of the committee that the Chair was a little lenient in this case. That really should have been discussed on second reading, but I realize that the minister wasn't here.

I would like to have the concurrence of the committee that we deal with the bill clause by clause and then if there are any discussions on boundaries we should deal with that when we come to the last section. Is that agreed?

Mr. Cassidy: Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any comments, questions or amendments?

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): I would like to make a comment on section 1 of the bill, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: On section 1? The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Roy: East.

Mr. Chairman: Ottawa East.

On section 1:

Mr. Roy: Mr. Chairman, all I want to say is I want to stand here and defend that commission, which I felt was independent, from some of the remarks just made by the minister.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Don't leave now, Mr. Minister, we're going to vote.

Mr. Roy: He's had the occasion for the last year, almost, to make representation before that commission. To come into the House and make those types of remarks I think is unbecoming a member of the government and a minister of the Crown.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Foulds: Did he present a brief to the commission?

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, on the same section, I think it must be abundantly clear that the changes that have already been made in this bill had been made by an independent commission outside this House. If anyone in this Legislature now tries to make any changes in this bill, it must be considered as straight political gerrymandering and nothing more than that.

The changes have been made by an independent commission. We've had all kinds of chances to make our views known. Whether they accept those views or whether they don't accept those views is what keeps the integrity in this bill. An independent commission has made the changes; any changes made in this bill by this Legislature have to be construed by the commission as taking it out of their hands and not allowing it to be done independently. I think it's a sad day when the minister, at this late date, gets up and makes a speech such as he just made.

Mr. Roy: Right.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Stormont.

Mr. G. Samis (Stormont): Mr. Chairman, I would like to endorse the remarks of my colleague from Ottawa East. Since I come from eastern Ontario, and since the riding of Stormont is being changed and will absorb the people of Dundas, we welcome them.

Second, Mr. Chairman, our riding association appeared before the commission to make representation to this effect. The minister's riding association had the same opportunity. He knows it's too late.

Mr. Roy: He knows it.

Mr. Samis: He had a chance to do it. We're in the opposition and we did it in Cornwall. He could have done the same thing in Prescott and made a representation according to the law, not like this.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: On section 1, Mr. Chairman, I want to make a very brief comment which is that it's unfortunate one would have to consider even making proposals at this time in the House. I don't think any of them will be acted upon.

The facts are, as the member for Waterloo North knows, that the commission in all its great independence found it necessary to vary the size of urban and rural ridings by about 20,000 apiece. That made a sham of the idea of independence and that's why a lot of the second reading debate, Mr. Chairman, was devoted to finding a better way so we could get a better kind of redistribution the next time.

I agree it is done now and we've got to live with what's been done. I must say that urban concerns are so paramount in the province that urban people themselves are concerned about what's happening in the rural environment although the rural members in many cases, who sit in the back benches, do not seem to be. It really is a pity that the chance to bring representation into the last third of the 20th century was lost by the commission.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. Chairman: Any further comments on any other section of the bill? Section 2, the member for Sudbury.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, on second reading I raised this point about "the legislative assembly shall consist of 125 members." I did not appear before the commission but the reason I raised this is that I am concerned about the cost and the proliferation of government in this country.

Canada is probably one of the most over-governed countries in the world; we have layer after layer of federal, provincial, county, regional and municipal. When I see the cost the people of Ontario have to pay to support a member and when I consider that probably 50 per cent of the members presently here do not even participate in the debates and take hardly any interest in what goes on, I cannot see that we have gained anything by adding eight members to this legislative assembly.

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): Speak for yourself.

Mr. Germa: I suspect all we have gained is an expenditure of probably another

\$800,000 to operate this House because I wouldn't be surprised if it cost \$100,000 to keep each member in this chamber going.

Mr. Roy: Don't worry about it. We will get rid of some of these guys next time.

Mr. Germa: I'd like my thoughts to be identified with this position, that it is not necessary to increase continually the size of representation. If the minister is interested in some facts which I laid on the table during second reading debate, I showed the various representations of various Houses, from the House of Commons in London, England, to the elected body in the State of New Hampshire.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Your riding is not affected by this.

Mr. Germa: I'd like to remind the minister that the smallest state in the United States, New Hampshire, has 485 members which I think is a travesty of the democratic process. I think we do not need 125 members in this assembly.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That is almost direct representation.

Mr. J. R. Smith: It didn't affect the north.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, there is no quorum and there are only five Tory member present.

Mr. Chairman ordered that the bells be rung for four minutes.

Mr. Chairman: We now have a quorum.

Section 2 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Any other comments, questions or amendments to any other section of the bill? The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

On section 3:

Mr. Cassidy: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, could the government say who is carrying this bill through the House? It's in the name of the Minister of Culture and Recreation, and I haven't seen the minister here this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, I moved it.

Mr. Cassidy: Oh good, okay. Mr. Chairman—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: For the record, I would point out that the Chairman of the Management Board was one of only five Conservatives in the House, but that we thought we would call a quorum in order to—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy:—give the government members the opportunity to have some exercise before proceeding with an election.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. The hon. member will confine his comments to section 3 of the bill.

Mr. Cassidy: It is remarkable—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: It is remarkable, Mr. Chairman, just how many of them came out of the woodwork this time, as compared to last Monday.

Mr. Chairman: Please, the member will return to the comments on section 3.

Mr. Cassidy: How could you chide me like that, Mr. Chairman?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, my amendment to section 3 is intended to deal with a particular problem, which has for various reasons been left untouched by the commission. The commission was instructed to consider the matter of communities of interest to try to respect ward boundaries, township boundaries, county boundaries, and so on, where it could; and to try to bear in mind questions of social and economic congruity—neighbourhoods and that kind of thing.

They failed to do that in the case of the city of Toronto. One hesitates to suggest it, Mr. Chairman, but it does happen to be the case that the strip ridings which have been preserved in central Toronto are ridings which automatically favour the Conservatives, because they allow the north Toronto voters to swamp the voice of those voters south of Dupont or south of Bloor Street.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Cassidy: Yes, I know. I have an amendment on that. You have the chance now to declare that you don't believe either in representation by population or in the principle of community of interest, because you can oppose the amendment that I am about to put.

If you wish to support it, I would welcome your support. You would then be on the side

of many residents and citizens in this city. You would be on the side on the Ontario municipal board, of Mr. J. A. Kennedy, who ruled on the block wards in the city of Toronto two or three years ago. And you would be on the side, I think, of almost every expert political scientist, and so on, who has looked at the questions of representation and on the need to have a system of block ridings in large cities, or block districts that allow various communities—social, economic, ethnic and so on—to be adequately represented.

Mr. Cassidy moves that section 3(1) of Bill 22 be amended by adding at the end:

But that the schedule be amended by striking out the descriptions for the 10 ridings within the city of Toronto and instructing the electoral boundaries commission to draw up boundaries that will respect the social, economic and ethnic community of interest of neighbourhoods of the city by creating block rather than strip ridings, and to report these proposed new boundaries to the House within one week.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Start all over again.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, I'm just suggesting that the job be done for the city of Toronto. There are ample precedents. I had thought of suggesting an amendment that would tie this House to a specific set of boundaries, but given the fact that other business before the House will probably take a week or so to bring before us, even if the government intends to disregard its opinion polls and go to an election this spring, it seems to me that there is ample time for the electoral boundaries commission to redraw the boundaries within the city of Toronto.

We've commented on disparities between rural and urban ridings and other problems with the electoral boundaries commission, but this is a specific problem in one area, which for reasons that are hard for me to understand the commission simply did not come to grips with. There was ample guidance and advice to commission that it should look at the boundaries within the city of Toronto and come up with a set of boundaries that do respect a community of interests.

The member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell), who I hope will support the amendment—she nods that she will—is aware of the fact that the six central ridings in Toronto stretch from somewhere north of St. Clair down to the lakefront. As a consequence, there is an enormous gulf in terms of community of interest.

The member of St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman), for example, has a riding that stretches from the mansions of Forest Hill and around Upper Canada College, on the one hand, down to the low-income housing of Niagara St. and the housing on Toronto Island on the other.

The member for St. George, and it's to be said to her credit that she had strong support from all areas of her riding—she nods to that as well—has a riding which also spans a strong diversity of interests. There are times when a member such as she, who has certain talents and is known broadly within the city, can attract substantial support from all parts of a riding like that, whether they be low-income, middle-income or upper-income areas. But I think it would be foolish to suggest that is the case for all members in the Legislature, for all politicians or for all parties.

It is very difficult, as I was arguing the other day, Mr. Chairman, for a member within his own conscience to somewhere reconcile the conflicting interests when he represents a large variety of different interests. If there is a Conservative government, then there's going to be a natural propensity for a member from a downtown Toronto riding to think about and to listen to the voice of the people in the northern half of the riding because those are people with whom he has a stronger community of interest, of ethnicity, of schooling, of income, of common pursuits and recreations, of cottages and everything else.

When we win some of those seats in this election, Mr. Chairman, one could argue equally strongly that it may be that the New Democrats elected for those particular ridings might have an overly strong propensity to talk and to think of the people who are on more modest incomes, who belong to the labour movement, who are working people and who are mothers with problems about day care and that kind of thing, and to ignore the concerns of the people in the northern half of those particular ridings.

It's also fair to say, though that in addition to the difficulties of a member reconciling those interests, there is also a very strong tendency for those strip ridings both to violate neighbourhood concerns, which may cut across two or three ridings, and to make it difficult for the people in the southern half of those strip ridings to get fair and adequate representation.

Their voice is less likely to be heard in this Legislature because, for a number of reasons, their vote is not as strong, their turnout is not as strong, their information about politics is not as strong, their access to information is

not as strong and their access to education is not as strong. Neither is their access to the vote as strong, among other things, because of the time it takes in this province for an immigrant to get a vote in a provincial election, which on the average is of the order of not just five years, but in fact eight or nine years. From the time the immigrant lands in Canada to the time he votes for the first time in a provincial election may well be longer in many cases.

Bearing in mind that the immigrant must register first:

1. He may be here on a visitor's pass, to begin with.

2. He must then decide he wants to become a citizen—and he may not decide that for months or even years after the five years of citizenship eligibility have passed.

3. Having registered, he must clear the hurdles of getting through the Citizenship Court, which may take a number of months.

4. If his or her control of the language is inadequate or his knowledge of the country is inadequate he may, in fact, be denied citizenship, or fear denial and therefore not apply.

5. When an election comes—and it may take up to 3½ years after acquiring citizenship for an immigrant actually to come up and coincide with a provincial election—finally the immigrant will, in fact, have enough confidence and knowledge about what is happening in Canada that he votes in the first provincial election at which he is entitled to vote.

All of those things deter immigrants from voting before they have been in a country for up to nine or 10 years. Yet south of Bloor St., in the central Toronto ridings, a large proportion of the population are immigrants and their voice is thereby swamped, because there is a much lower proportion of the population which is eligible to vote in the areas south of Bloor St. in Toronto than in the areas north of Bloor St.

If they were block ridings, as was suggested, for example, by the Confederation of Residents and Ratepayers Associations in its brief to the boundaries commission, then that factor would sort of level itself out, because the ridings would cut off more or less at Bloor or at Dupont and, therefore, the southernmost ridings would have a high population but in general might not have as high a number of eligible voters because of this immigrant factor.

The northernmost ridings would have a higher proportion of voters but they would

not be put in a position of swamping a group of people with a different social, economic and ethnic community of interest and different neighbourhood interests.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to go on at great length. I read last time from the Ontario Municipal Board's decision about block wards. It is a pity that, in fact, they couldn't have 11 ridings in Toronto and that those ridings could not correspond to the municipal wards. That would make a much more logical situation for the city; a much more sensible and comprehensible kind of situation.

But, given that there is one fewer riding, Mr. Chairman, it would still seem reasonable that those ridings try to correspond with ward boundaries and that the ridings try to respect neighbourhoods and respect social and economic and ethnic communities of interest rather than violating it.

All I am suggesting here is that rather than suggest a particular map, the commission spend the day and a half it would take over the next week to come back to us—it can come back to us with the first map proposed by CORRA, with the second map proposed by CORRA, it can divide the city at Bloor St. in a very rigid kind of fashion, it can do any number of things like that, but the decisions need only take a weekend and do not need to delay the government's options if it does choose to call an election now.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment be supported, and that we exempt the Toronto ridings from the coming into force of this Act, in effect, for one week until this great oversight of the commission can be corrected and we can get a fair basis of representation for the Toronto ridings.

May I say this to the minister, I've been vigorous but, I hope he realizes, not too partisan in putting forward this proposal and I hope that he would react to it in a vigorous, non-partisan and positive fashion, because I think it is a worthwhile amendment.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for St. George.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Mr. Chairman, I am rising to support the amendment. When the matter was before us on second reading I spoke on the same question, I could not do anything else, and I would like to make it abundantly clear that when I was at the city of Toronto I supported the block ward system for the reasons which have been given.

I was somewhat hesitant to rise at this point in time lest it be deemed that in do-

ing so, since I represent one of those ridings, I might indeed be gerrymandering at this point, so I am very happy to rise and support the motion of the member for Ottawa Centre.

I am very appreciative of his remarks of me and happy that he did not put me in the same question that he asked of other members the other day.

It is a fact that the people in the central portion of the city of Toronto particularly, —although it really also applies, as has been indicated, to the Beaches-Woodbine area in the east and to a degree to the High Park area in the west. Generally there is a consistency of position in those downtown areas which in my opinion ought to have representation of itself.

I have to say I don't think I have had difficulty in representing the whole of my riding, with all its variety. But it is important, it seems to me, that we look at the community of interest as we see it in this representation bill. We have certainly the position now that the urban ridings are not receiving the kind of consideration they ought to have. One only has to sit in this House to recognize the fact that the large urban areas do not get the consideration of this House, by and large, that they ought to get by reason of the way in which the rural-urban representation is set up.

When you multiply that factor by the fact that within the urban areas themselves there is this kind of dichotomy one certainly has to question the way in which this matter has been determined by the commission.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose that as with everything else that we do at this time is going to have very little effect on the outcome of the situation but I would tell you that the urban centres are going to have to have a greater voice in this House. It is ridiculous that city of Toronto ridings should have about 72,000 people on the 1971 census —believe me that is not anywhere like the true situation today in my riding—to have that and have Muskoka with 30,000 is totally, utterly unwarranted when we go through the motions of a representation Act at this point.

I cannot speak more strongly about the situation than I have and I trust some consideration will be given to the amendment by this Legislature. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Kitchener.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, I would rise and support the comments made by my colleague, the member for St. George. The

members will recall that when the original motion was brought before us upon which so many members of this House spoke at the end of January, I had some rather lengthy comments to make with respect to this entire ward structure matter within the city of Toronto.

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that I referred at that point to a series of letters I had received from Mr. Robert W. Barclay who, in fact, had set out in very good detail a proposal for the division of the city of Toronto into 10 constituencies. He had drawn the boundaries very well and with great consideration and the ridings which came forward followed very strongly the ward boundaries we have had referred to us this afternoon. This matter has been of some concern particularly to those of us who share the views raised not only by the member for St. George but also by the member for Ottawa Centre. There is a strong community of interest and necessity which should require a change within the city of Toronto. Certainly the arguments which were made before the hearing of the Ontario Municipal Board and the results of that decision are all well known and need not be repeated at this point.

We are concerned that, as I understand it, a map had been prepared by the commission that in fact did set out boundaries based upon the block system. This apparently was not approved and, as a result, did not form that portion of the report which the commission brought in as a result of its earlier deliberations and which formed either the boundaries on the first map or on the reprinted map that we had last fall.

I do believe that the points raised are of sufficient concern that indeed a brief period of time could be taken by the commission to once more review this matter. Certainly the members residing in these various constituencies and representing them have a certain input and view to make on this particular problem. A number of them, particularly on this side of the House, have spoken with respect to their views. But I'm sure that members on the government side as well have particular views concerning this matter of homogeneity which has been referred to by those who have spoken over the life of this commission's report and in this debate, both on second reading and this afternoon.

We certainly support the motion that has been made by the member for Ottawa Centre. The views which have been expressed in the House on several occasions by members of

both the opposition parties, we believe, are worthy of further consideration. I hope that the government will be able to accept this serious suggestion.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any further comment on Mr. Cassidy's motion?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a few comments on this particular motion that has been put forward. I think that the most pertinent comments that have been made so far this afternoon are those made by the hon. member for Waterloo North, who said that any change in this bill at this time would be an abrogation of the whole concept of setting up this independent commission to bring in new ridings for this province.

This commission has met over an extended period of time. There has been a great deal of time for input from all those who felt that there was something wrong with its first recommendations. The suggestion that has been put forward in this particular motion about the city of Toronto was put forward to this commission, as were many other suggestions from hon. members of this House. There have been changes made several times, and the commission has brought back, as it was instructed to do—

Mrs. Campbell: Through Tories, it has.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think that that's absolutely wrong. I would ask the hon. member to stand up, if she says that now, and impugn that the commission, under Mr. Justice Campbell Grant, Mr. Lewis and Prof. Sansom was not an impartial one. Is that what she is implying?

Mrs. Campbell: I have never implied that, Mr. Chairman, at any time.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member just said that there had been changes brought in for Tory members.

Mrs. Campbell: I said by Tory members.

An hon. member: Look at Middlesex and see who has got the advantage. They saved the riding.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think the member will find that if there are any people individually disturbed, they're probably more Tory members than others. But they're willing to accept what we have here.

Mr. Cassidy: That is because of the voting power that was already in the system.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that for this House to vote on any amendment at this time to change this bill would abrogate the idea of an independent commission which has given lots of time—

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): We can't abrogate our own responsibilities.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —to bring in and to take changes from the members of this House.

I just also would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have to reject some of the garbage, I might say, that my friend was handing out about the representation in the Toronto ridings. I'm not going to quarrel with him that there may not be times that the changing in the size of the boundaries could come about. But when I look back at the men and women over the years who have represented strip ridings in Toronto, I would reject completely the kind of nonsense that he'd told us today—

Mr. Cassidy: So many of them are fine Tories.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —about people only representing one part of that riding. Look at the men and women, like the hon. members for Bellwoods (Mr. Yaremko), for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman), for St. George and others. They represent all the people. They have represented them adequately and they've represented them well. For him to suggest that because we don't have a riding that is made up of one homogeneous social class we're not going to get adequate representation is, I think, a very false kind of theory. I would hate to see us get to the point where we feel in this House that members can only be represented by people of their own class coming from an area that roughly represents their own class. That's a pretty poor theory for a democracy and for the kind of assembly that this is.

I think you could even make the point, although I am not going to make it strongly, that a person could better represent and be a better spokesman for his riding and be a better person to bring judgements on legislation in this assembly if he represented a wide spectrum of the social order in his riding, because he would have a chance to find out the viewpoints of a whole variety of people from one end to the other which, of course, they can do in the strip ridings. To say these are totally bad and the way they have been drawn is bad is wrong, I think, and I certainly reject that. I think the proposition put forward insofar as block ridings

are concerned was put forward to the commission and obviously, in its wisdom, it was rejected. I don't know why it was rejected; that would have to be asked of the commission but its members obviously rejected it. They had a chance to consider it several times and they have now brought in the final report.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if we believe in the integrity of an impartial commission appointed, as we did, by this Legislature—not by the government but by this Legislature—to bring in the new boundaries we are now duty-bound as members of this Legislature, after all the process we said should go on has gone on to pass this bill now and allow it to set the boundaries for the new ridings.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Ontario.

Mr. M. B. Dymond (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this with a good deal of interest and I look back on the days when we were under the old system of redistribution. I recall very clearly the loud complaints and the bitter criticism levelled against that system. Before the 1967 re-alignment this House accepted the concept of an independent commission; everybody wasn't pleased then, everybody isn't pleased now, Mr. Chairman, I submit to you that in all things affecting human life nothing which can be done will please everybody but at least this seems to be about the most fair way that any Legislature has yet devised. There will always be complaints about favouritism, or gerrymandering or what have you.

However, I am not going to participate in this debate about Metro ridings or any other ridings. As far as I am concerned, I am delighted with the electoral district which has been established out of the one I now represent and which will continue to be represented by representatives of this party, I know.

I am, however, concerned about another type of change that does no harm or makes no threat against the basic principle of re-alignment of boundaries. In the new riding, it was Ontario riding and is now designated under Bill 22 as the electoral district of Durham North, we stand on two regional municipalities, the region of York and the region of Durham. I did not realize at the time when the first proposal came forward that the population in the two regions would be almost identical. Indeed, sir, it is within 500 of each other.

It would seem to me that the government needs to devise a system which will make it possible to bring about changes in name

which I am asking for on behalf of my people without the formality of resubmitting it to the boundaries commission. Really, this has no effect on the boundaries whatsoever. Indeed, I believe the government of Canada has a way whereby the cabinet has authority, or did have at least, under its Act to change electoral district names.

I recall when the riding of Oshawa-Whitby was established. The name in the report was the electoral district of Oshawa. By authority of the government of Canada that became Oshawa-Whitby.

This is a plea I make, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my people. The people of York, who are going to form half of this riding now called Durham North under this bill, feel they have lost their identity. They have been known as York riding since Ontario became a province. They naturally feel they have lost something in losing their identity in the name of the riding and I would urge the government to devise as quickly as possible a mechanism which will make it possible to change the name of the riding without interfering with the boundaries whatsoever. All I ask, on behalf of my people, is that this riding be known not as Durham North but as Durham-York.

Mrs. Campbell: I'd like to speak on a point of clarification as a result of what the Minister of Education has said. I want to make this point abundantly clear; and I made it clear, I trust, in my opening remarks.

I am perfectly satisfied with my riding so far as I personally am concerned. I am only representing in this House, in the support of the block system, that which has been adopted by the city of Toronto for its ward structure and that which, in my opinion, the people feel is proper. And I don't want any possible misunderstanding of my position in this House. I don't care how you slice it, St. George will be won by Margaret Campbell the next time around.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, just so that there be no doubts about it, I certainly wasn't suggesting that the hon. member was suggesting anything else than what she has just brought out. I just thought that during her remarks she had said something about there had been changes that only the Tories wanted. I was trying to point out that we just, of course, reject this. That isn't the case. This was an impartial speech.

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps I should clarify here that we should deal with the amendment that Mr. Cassidy has moved and then we can

consider any further amendments to the schedule before we carry section 3.

Mr. Cassidy: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess it's clear from what the Minister of Education has had to say that the government has dug its heels in and does not intend to agree with the amendment that I have put forward.

I would like to make a couple of points in response to the minister, just for the record, before we go to a vote. Perhaps I can say that in the spirit of co-operation we don't intend to call a vote on this particular section as long as it's clear for the record that the government has decided to dig in its heels and to perpetuate the strip riding system. We disagree with the government. We think it's wrong.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): The member wasn't listening very carefully.

An hon. member: The changes were made by an independent commission.

Mr. Cassidy: Okay, let me come to that now. If the minister had listened to the amendment when I read it, the amendment does not try and impose an alternative. It says to the commission, "We don't think that you carried out your terms of reference in looking at the social economic and ethnic community interests for the Toronto riding, or with the congruity of ward boundaries and that kind of thing. Therefore," we say to the commission, "go back and do it again and come back to us with a system that will respect that community of interest."

We don't tell them what they have to do. We don't give them a map. It is my understanding, in fact—and I think the member for St. George mentioned this too—that they did prepare a map of block ridings in the city of Toronto, and for some reason they decided not to look into that. My feeling about the independence of the commission, which the minister knows, is that it isn't that the commission isn't independent; it was relatively independent. The bias was because of the class and breeding of the members, and they just weren't very good in many ways in what they had to do. That's probably by-the-by.

They are an independent commission and it's proper that they be asked to come back with a system of block ridings, rather than this House making those particular amendments. But it is equally proper for us to say to them: "Look, we think you blew it." This is in the same way that I would have liked to have seen the House send the whole map

back to the commission and say: "Look, you've got a bias in here in favour of rural Ontario and against fast-growing urban parts of the province. You blew it there, too, and something ought to be done." But we aren't going to do that at this particular time.

I would point out to the minister as well that nobody has anything to say against the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development, the member for Bellwoods, or other members who have represented downtown ridings. They are honourable fellows, all of them. I'm sure that all of them have, in their own ways, tried to represent the people—whether they were below the salt or above the salt, below Bloor or above Bloor. They have tried to sort out on an individual basis the problems that are particularly concentrated in the working-class ends of their ridings.

But just this week, if I can give a couple of examples, the papers reported about a woman who has been struggling for a full year to get a disability pension under GAINS, because she is completely incapacitated for work and has been enmeshed in red tape for all that period of time. You have the case of the government coming in with a \$250,000 subsidy, in effect, for the township of Norfolk which today, or last night, enabled them to definitively break the strike of the CUPE outside workers down in that township. The union has now abandoned the strike and has told its members, to go off and find jobs elsewhere.

Mr. P. J. Yakubuski (Renfrew South): What has that got to do with redistribution?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: It has nothing to do with the bill.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Would the hon. member return to the amendment?

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, the point I wanted to make is that the hon. members for the downtown Toronto ridings individually have certainly looked after or, I'm sure, have tried to look after the problems of their people. But they've also supported a government which has perpetuated a system in this province that has favoured corporations, that has disfavoured working people, that has disfavoured labour, that has kept people in poverty—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Get back to the bill.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Would the hon. member return to the amendment?

Mr. Cassidy: —and therefore those problems that they deal with on a Band-Aid basis have continued.

Mr. J. R. Smith: Nonsense.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister is unwilling to accept that that is one of the results when you have a strip riding system, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is the difference between the Tories and the socialists.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): If there's anyone who would make that redistribution of wealth, it is you.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Cassidy: Insofar as it would make a difference, Mr. Chairman, whether the members elected from south of Bloor St. were Tories, Liberals, New Democrats, Social Creditists, Action Canada or members of some other party, I think the minister would have to accept that they would be more effective within their caucus and within this Legislature in articulating the problems and seeking long-term solutions rather than Band-Aids, than they can be when they try to reconcile all of those interests within their heads. I'm sure that the record of the last 32 years demonstrates that particular point.

I'm sorry that the government resists this amendment. I think the amendment does respect the independence of the commission. I hope that some government members, in a miraculous flash conversion, will support the amendment and allow it to be passed. All those in favour of Mr. Cassidy's amendment will say "aye."

All those opposed will say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

I declare the amendment lost.

Section 3 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any further comments, questions or amendments to any other section of the bill?

Mr. Kennedy: Mr. Chairman, I want to speak briefly about the comments of my colleague the member for Ontario. He mentioned that the name of Peel is disappearing, which is regrettable, except I would point out that it is perpetuated partially in the north in the new riding of Wellington-Dufferin-Peel. It is to be hoped that in a further

redistribution, Peel will go on to remain in the annals of the names of the riding. It is also quite true, Mr. Chairman, that the federal arrangement does permit name changes down the road; Peel South federally was changed to Mississauga, although the boundaries remained the same, so apparently it's done with ease. Therefore, I would be in sympathy with his suggestion.

Sections 4 to 11, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill 22 reported.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report one bill without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THIRD READING

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill 22, the Representation Act, 1975.

Clerk of the House: The second order, House in committee of the whole.

ELECTION FINANCES REFORM ACT

House in Committee on Bill 3, An Act to regulate Political Party Financing and Election Contributions and Expenses.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any comments, questions or amendments to Bill 3, and if so, to what section?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Section 2 is the first one I would like to speak on.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, section 2(d) deals with the appointment of the chairman of the commission. Since the theory behind this Act in principle is insofar as is humanly possible the Act should be administered and the commission should be made up as impartially as possible, it would seem logical to me that the chairman of the commission, rather than being appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, should be appointed

by the Legislature, in the same manner as the Speaker is appointed. I would therefore propose an amendment at this point, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Singer moves that subsection (d) of section 2 be amended to read: "The chairman of the commission who shall be appointed by the Legislature for a term of not more than 10 years."

Mr. Singer: I think that would be in keeping with the principle of this Act and I would think it is a reasonable amendment. I might even go one step further, Mr. Chairman. It would occur to me—and it did occur to me and to some of my colleagues as we thought about the possibilities of who might be the chairman—that someone like Arthur Wishart would perhaps be a logical person.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): How would they explain to Roman?

Mr. Singer: I would certainly be prepared to either nominate him in the House as chairman or to support his nomination if somebody else put it forward, but I think it should be an act of the Legislature that should appoint the chairman and I would urge the minister's co-operation in this kind of a move.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Recommend John White.

Mr. Singer: I think the Legislature should appoint the chairman of the commission and that is the thrust of this amendment.

Mrs. Campbell: John White? How could he be the campaign manager and the commission chairman at the same time?

Mr. Chairman: Any further comment concerning Mr. Singer's amendment to subsection (d) of section 2?

Hon. J. White (Minister without Portfolio): Well, sir, this is an idea which might have had consideration at an earlier stage. I have never heard this suggestion made by any person, in the standing committee or elsewhere for that matter. This was not the recommendation of the commission itself, although it spent many months pondering the various elements within the recommendations which are now this bill, and for that reason I would ask the House not to make this amendment.

I think perhaps it might be wise for the commission itself, when established, to consider this suggestion at that time.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, since we are in committee and there are going to be a number of amendments, most of which I suspect the minister is not going to accept, my colleagues and I are going to ask for a division on this and, since there are a number, that there be no vote but that the votes be stacked and we have the vote at the end. So if you want to call the "ayes" and "nays," I think we've got five here who will stand.

Mr. Chairman: I assume that the Chair will not need to re-read the amendment. All those in favour of Mr. Singer's amendment will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

Is it the wish of the committee that we stack the votes and then deal with them at the completion of the considerations of the committee?

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Agreed. Any further comments, questions or amendments to any other section, and if so, to which one?

Mr. Singer: Section 19 is the next one I have.

Mr. Chairman: Anything before 19?

Sections 3 to 18, inclusive, agreed to.

On section 19:

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, section 19 is the section that deals with contributions, and those who have read the Act, certainly those who were down in the standing committee, are familiar with it. To refresh my memory, as well as those of other members, it sets out a scheme whereby in any one year \$2,000 can be given by a person or a trade union or a corporation to a party, and \$500 to a constituency association, except that you can multiply that by four and get up to \$2,000. Those amounts can be doubled in a year in which there is an election.

However, where I discover some considerable difficulty is in subsection 3 of section 19 which deems money to be used in a political campaign by a candidate as one of those donations. A candidate is limited to putting \$500 of his own money into his own campaign, and that's all.

There have been—and those of us who have been in politics a while will know of this—occasional campaigns where there has not been enough money collected to pay all of the debts. The people who supply the print-

ing or the posters or the lawn signs or what have you have a habit of liking to be paid. They're small merchants who have provided services. They are small retailers and small businessmen and they have advanced their goods and their services on the credit of the candidate, by and large—really only on the credit of the candidate, because in these affairs, the buck stops at the candidate. There's no one beyond that to whom the responsibility can be put.

This section limits the candidate to putting in \$500. Supposing there has been a deficit campaign, what happens to the printer who isn't going to get paid, who can't be legally paid by the candidate? The minister said if that ever happened all the good people in the riding would rally together and throw some more money into the pot. The minister is a little more optimistic than I am. Perhaps it's because of the minister's experience of always having been elected on the government's side. But if you get elected on the opposition side or, worse still, defeated—either on the government side or on the opposition side—it's very hard to appeal to all those good people in the riding to rally for the sake of the defeated candidate who wasn't even representing the party which won the election and say, "Come on, fellows, let's get together and pay the good old printer his money because he was a nice fellow. I, the candidate can't pay him but you, my good friends, should put the money in and pay him."

Alternatively, the minister suggested, "Well, too bad for the printer, but you can pay him off over a series of years. You can give him \$500 every year until the thing is finally retired." I don't think that's fair and I don't think it's a reasonable way to expect elections to be run.

The minister says it's a problem and people are just going to have to live with it. I'll tell you what is going to happen, Mr. Chairman. When printers in the various constituencies and other suppliers of election services become aware of it, they're going to stop extending credit, and not because they mistrust the candidate, but because they're going to know that the candidate is limited to \$500. If there is a deficit position in the election financing, the user of those services is not going to be able to put in the money.

However, it's easier perhaps to state the problem than it is to state the solution. I stated the problem in committee and now I think have a solution that's going to depend on this amendment carrying and another amendment to section 39 carrying. The thrust

of my amendment will be that, if there is a deficit position, the candidate can apply to the commission for permission to pay the deficit and the commission, if it feels the circumstances warrant it, shall give him that permission to put additional money into his campaign up to a limit which will be set out in section 39.

The minister made the argument, when I put forward that suggestion in the committee, and I think reasonably validly, that—

Hon. Mr. White: What limit?

Mr. Singer: I'm suggesting 50 cents a voter, which is roughly \$20,000 a riding, that you can spend up to \$20,000 in a constituency.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Ridiculous.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): What kind of people can afford that?

Mr. Singer: Pardon?

Mr. J. R. Smith: What members could afford that?

Mr. Singer: The member for Timiskaming (Mr. Havrot), when I suggested a \$10,000 limit on everything, said, "my goodness gracious. I could never run a campaign on \$10,000; I spent \$13,000 last time."

Mr. G. Samis (Stormont): He'll need more this time.

Mr. Singer: I don't know how much he will need.

Hon. Mr. White: The member for Ottawa Centre has spent \$45,000 since the last election.

Mr. Singer: The member for Ottawa—

Mr. Cassidy: It was well spent, too, in financing services in the Legislature.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Singer: Whatever it is—I'm not wedded to the \$20,000 figure—I'd think there should be a limit on top expenditures and I'll argue that one when we come to section 39.

I would think if there is a deficit position disclosed by the audit and statement the candidate has to put in—he is required by this statute to put it in—and he goes before the commission and says, "We've overspent. There are several of our suppliers who are not going to be paid, who can't legally be paid by me. I will now want permission to put more money into the pot to pay those

debts," the commission can give him that permission up to the extent of whatever the top limit is.

I think that makes some sense but to do that properly you have to make that allowance here in 19 and put a top limit on in section 39 when we come to it.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am going to move an amendment. It is not that well drafted and I notice that legislative counsel is over there and he can certainly clean up the wording.

Mr. Singer moves that section 3 be amended by adding after the word "commission" the words,

provided that if the accounts of a candidate as filed with the commission show that there has been more money spent during the campaign period than the total of what has been contributed to the candidate and paid to him under the provisions of section 45 [and section 45 is the payment back out of the public purse section] a candidate may, with the permission of the commission, contribute more than is permitted to be contributed by him by section 19 as long as the total received on behalf of the candidate from contributions and reimbursements under 45 and his own contribution do not exceed the amounts set out in section 39.

Mr. Singer: It is not the most expertly worded amendment but its intention is quite clear and I would be prepared to have it rewritten by legislative counsel.

The minister is aware of what I am getting at. I think it is an important problem and I think it is one we have to wrestle with. I think we have to establish the credibility of candidates who are running and allow them to carry on and represent themselves as responsible people to people who are going to supply services. If there are services and/or goods supplied, the people who supply them should be able to get paid and have a reasonable expectation of getting paid and getting paid legally.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Very briefly, Mr. Chairman, we will not support this amendment. It is meaningful only to people who have very large incomes of \$50,000, \$60,000 or \$100,000 a year or who have inherited great wealth or who have substantial retainers and that kind of side income in order to permit them to consider funding to the tune of \$20,000 or so a campaign which went into deficit.

On this particular point I think we are *ad idem*—is that not the word?—with the minister in saying the candidate should be bound by the same rules as everybody else. The rules themselves in my opinion are extraordinarily generous because they will permit a candidate directly and by means of his party to give \$2,500 per annum to his riding; \$5,000 in an election year. More than that, he can contribute by means of his spouse as well. Surely that is ample flexibility and surely there is a responsibility on the part of a candidate and his committee to keep from going too excessively into debt on the one hand, and on the other on the part of a riding association and a party to bail out those few campaigns which might go seriously into debt.

We will, therefore, not agree with the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, do I understand the section will be passed when we vote on this amendment or can I bring up a point after the vote in relation to section 19?

Mr. Chairman: Is it on a previous subsection of the section?

Mr. Cassidy: Well, really it is. Maybe I could just make the point, Mr. Chairman, because I am not going to bring an amendment on it. Just to continue in the vein I was talking in—the minister has heard this argument downstairs but I will make it here in the House for the record. It seems to us that the spending limits that have been put into this bill remain unrealistically high and should have been reduced. They permit any individual, trade union or corporation to give 4,000 bucks per annum in an off year and 8,000 bucks in an election year and—

Mr. Singer: Bucks?

Mr. Cassidy: Dollars—and a man and his spouse who work as one economic unit can give \$8,000 in an off year and \$16,000 in an election year. The sums that are involved are quite out of proportion to what people earn in the province today. The idea of broadening participation does not, in my view, seem to be accomplished by means of this particular section; or if it is accomplished, it just simply means that we have broadened participation from a half of one per cent of the population, in the case of the old parties, to one or 1½ per cent.

I would also suggest that the extra amounts permitted during an election year are not really reasonable. In an election year you broaden participation. A lot of people who are inactive financially, or in other ways, outside of elections, become active.

Therefore, whether it's a small merchant or an architect or a businessman or a trade union or an individual contributor, you get a large pool of contributors who are willing to donate financially to a campaign who are not so turned on by a party that they will contribute to it for its ongoing support. Therefore, it seems to us that it's not necessary to have such a substantial increased contribution limit during the course of an election year.

We would have suggested that the amount be limited to \$2,000 per annum to each registered party or its constituency association, or any combination thereof. So you can go anywhere from \$2,000 for one riding to \$2,000 spread over 20 ridings, whatever you want to do. The present somewhat artificial distinction should be abandoned, since the minister himself has acknowledged that there is nothing to stop moneys given to a political party being earmarked for a particular constituency association.

I have been thinking about that, Mr. Chairman. It strikes me that in fact there is nothing to stop money being given to the London South riding association, for example, within that \$500 limit by a partisan of the member for London North (Mr. Walker) who earmarks that money given to London South and asks that it be passed through to London North. And then the London South association, being co-operative about these things, could, in turn, pass that amount of money on to London North. It seems to me that infinite amount of earmarking could be done, so that it is just a matter of bookkeeping in order to avoid the \$500 limit.

At any rate, we don't see much point in a specific limit to constituencies, provided that the overall limit on contributions is realistic. Now, the House knows how the vote will go on this. This government would have opposed this particular amendment, and, since there are one or two points on which I want to concentrate, I don't propose to bring an amendment at this time. But that's the way we feel about these over-generous limits on contributions in section 19.

Mr. Chairman: Any further comment on Mr. Singer's amendment? The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, sir, I couldn't support the amendment. The commission investigated this matter carefully. The committee itself heard these arguments in the standing committee on justice. The committee has passed the section in front of us. I think one

of the efforts being made here is to give a poor citizen the same opportunity to run for the Legislature as a rich citizen. The idea that the rich candidate can avoid all of the rules post facto, with or without the consent of the commission, is anathema to me personally.

We all see examples here of wealthy citizens who have been able to entrench themselves here—the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman), the member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton), the member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. R. G. Hodgson).

Mr. Singer: The member for London South (Mr. White)—London South, yes.

Hon. Mr. White: And so one of the objectives is to put the less prosperous citizen on the same basis as the more prosperous citizen, which this bill helps to do. To give the advantage post facto, instead of in advance, I think does not in any way overcome the disadvantage which I mentioned.

I think it's worth mentioning, sir, that no candidate has been successfully sued in Canada—

Mr. Singer: That's not so.

Hon. Mr. White:—for campaign indebtedness, or so I'm told by experts in this field. I continue to hold the belief that the obligation is a joint one involving the candidate, the constituency association and the party, and that provision should not be made in a bill of this kind to single out the candidate for particular or exclusive responsibility for the indebtedness.

I do believe that candidates for election and successful candidates for election bear an inordinate financial burden as it is. As the member for Downsview has pointed out, a candidate together with his constituency association and the party has a period of time in which to clear off the indebtedness. In fact, a candidate may himself give in any one election year \$500 plus \$500 plus \$2,000 plus \$2,000, for \$5,000. From a practical and ethical point of view, I would hope that a candidate would never have to contribute any more than that election year maximum.

My friend from Ottawa Centre says the spending limits are too high, although he was candid enough to confess to us that he himself spends more than \$11,000 a year, mostly generated by his friends, to maintain a continuous campaign, so to speak, in his riding.

Mr. Cassidy: On a point of privilege, it is raised by people in my riding.

Hon. Mr. White: That is correct. I'm trying to make that clear.

Mr. Cassidy: It is continuous service to the riding.

Hon. Mr. White: When he objects to the limits in this context, it is rather at odds, it must be said, with the \$60,000, \$70,000 or \$80,000—what shall we say?—that the member will spend from one election day to the next election day. Once again, I think these limits are sensible.

Mr. Cassidy: It costs us \$40,000 a year just to keep you in the cabinet.

Hon. Mr. White: If they are too confining, there will be minor inventions attempted which would be completely contrary to the spirit of the Act. I do believe, sir, that the spirit of the Act is extremely important in this matter. The standards established, as well as the legal terminology, will have an enormous effect on candidates, constituency associations and parties.

Certainly we, as the Progressive Conservative Party which brought in this historic and revolutionary legislation, are determined to be the party to be most effective in its application.

Those are my comments on this section.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: The minister sets up straw men, knocks them down and waxes emotional. You forgot to say this was the best statute in the whole world; I thought that was part of the litany. You forgot that one.

Hon. Mr. White: I'm going to say that on another section.

Mr. Singer: First of all, Mr. Chairman, the amendment I propose has nothing to do with rich candidates or poor candidates as the member for London South knows full well I'm talking about a figure for a candidate's operation which is not unreasonable in light of what has happened in past elections, provincial and federal. I'm not singling out expenditures by Gillies, White, Robarts, Dalton Camp or people like that.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): How about Cafk?

Mr. Singer: I'm talking about a figure. I put forward a \$10,000 figure and the member for Timiskaming suggested he could never run a campaign within those limits. I don't think \$20,000 is elaborate at all. The sug-

gestion from the minister that this would allow rich people to take over is a bunch of nonsense and he knows it.

The minister knows far better than I how much was made available to each Conservative candidate, 117 of them, who ran in the election in 1971. If that didn't make many of them rich candidates, I'd like to know what it did make them. I don't think this is an untoward amendment at all. I think it is a reasonable one. I think it is one that is going to be repeated throughout the province particularly when and if printers, sign painters and suppliers of goods and services are not going to be legally paid, and I think that's important.

The minister got an idea from someone, I don't know who it was, that there had never been a candidate successfully sued for an election debt. I say that's utter fable.

Mr. Drea: Norm Cafik.

Mr. Singer: There are lots of candidates who have been sued for election debts and judgments have been given against them. These things don't make legal history; they aren't reported at great length in the law journals. There is nothing very unique about printer A suing candidate B for goods and services and getting a judgement for the amount of those goods and services. I am quite sure that anybody who wants to look through the law journals is not going to find a simple case for debt reported, because it makes no brand new law.

Judgements come after every election against candidates who haven't paid their bills. Whoever gave the hon. minister that advice just didn't know what he was talking about. If he said there were no unusual cases reported along that line, I could go along with it, but there have been cases.

It is unfortunate that occasionally candidates appear who don't pay their debts after the election is over, and it makes it more difficult for other people who run in the same general area, because the people who supply those goods and services get a little suspicious of supplying goods and services on credit during an election campaign. There are a lot of people in this chamber who know that to be absolutely true.

This is an important amendment and I would hope the minister will not give us a snow job. If he doesn't want to accept it, as he has indicated he doesn't, that's fine. But don't surround it with all the nonsense and all the fable, because it just isn't so.

Mr. Chairman: Does anybody else wish to speak on this amendment? I take it that the committee agrees to stack this amendment and deal with it at the end of the considerations.

Sections 20 to 30, inclusive, agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any further comments, questions or amendments to any other section of the bill?

Mr. Cassidy: Section 31, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: On section 31:

On section 31:

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, I will be brief and direct about this. The question of affiliation fees, which are a form of membership for members of the labour movement, has come up repeatedly during the course of this debate, first upstairs and then downstairs when we were meeting in committee. I have to say that the minister has been ungenerous in the way in which he has treated this particular matter, and that he may even have helped to lead us into some mistaken understanding of the previous section, section 31.

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, there has been a renumbering and, in fact, I am speaking about 32, to which I have an amendment. I can make my comments to 31 on 32? Can I refer to 32, on which I want to move an amendment?

Mr. Chairman: Shall we carry 31 and continue the comments on 32?

Agreed.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, section 31, which we have just passed, was said by the minister and was said by the legislative counsel to cover the question of affiliation fees for members of trade unions because of the fact that it allowed a trade union affiliation fee not to be considered as a contribution but to be passed through in the form of a membership fee.

That seemed to be okay. I'm afraid that there is a certain problem on our part, that we didn't read the fine print as carefully as we should have, because it also says that the party or the constituency association shall "maintain a membership list indicating the amount of such fee or fees paid by each member that is allocated to the political party or constituency association, as the case may be."

If I can go back to the beginning of the question of affiliation fees, they amount right now to the sum of 10 cents a month and they give the individual trade unionist the right

to vote in the riding to which he belongs and, therefore, are a membership fee giving him the same rights as any other direct member of the party. All he has to do is identify himself to the riding executive and state that he lives in that riding and that he is an affiliated member and has the support of his trade union secretary or treasurer. They also give an affiliated member of a trade union the right to participate in the selection of the delegates representing those affiliates at various levels of the party, at provincial council, at provincial conventions, the federal leadership convention and so on and so forth.

They are, therefore, quite different from the contribution that is made by a local or the contribution that is made by council of trade unions, or a national trade union or provincial trade union or whatever, which do not provide any rights to vote at all. They are also quite different from the contribution by a corporation to one of the older parties, which also does not provide that corporation with the right to vote within the councils of that particular party.

We have maintained that the corporate money may provide influence, but when it comes down to the democratic structure of that party the votes that are taken by representatives of individual members in every case. That's true of all three parties, as for example at leadership conventions. I wish that the minister would understand that particular distinction.

The difficulty arises that in the labour movement there are now 18 locals across the province, for example, which have affiliated status and have more than 2,000 members, and they are in violation of the Act effective today, or whenever the Act comes into force, because of the way in which the affiliation fees are going to be considered. In order to bring them back into conformity, we're going to have to ask the labour movement or the Liberal Party or the Conservative Party is going to have to ask them—if they happen to have any affiliates, because it certainly is just as open to them to have affiliated trade union members as it is to us if they should so desire—to ask them to get a list of members who were affiliated from those trade unions.

Their difficulty is that in many cases their membership may change month by month. In some cases where you have fairly transient kinds of trades, it may change on a very high level, Mr. Chairman. Every year or so a democratic vote is taken by the members of that local to confirm or continue the affiliation or to resist a disaffiliation. There is no question, therefore, about the support or the

endorsement that is involved in directing their funds to provide those rights of membership. That's not the problem. But there are enormous practical problems involved in saying there should be a membership list; and enormous problems as well in terms of interfering with the way in which the labour movement has traditionally worked.

As far as corporations are concerned and as far as individuals are concerned, there is not that interference involved in this particular bill, Mr. Chairman. As far as most sections of the bill go as well, the government has scrupulously sought to follow the recommendations of the Camp commission. However, when it came to the question of trade union contributions, the government acted otherwise. I don't know if I can find the reference here. The minister knows it and I can just quote it in general. The Camp commission report said that, "this is a traditional means by which trade union members contributed to the party of their choice and, therefore, should not be interfered with by the Act." There has been a gross interference by the Act, Mr. Chairman, because these contributions which are directed by individuals have been convoluted or changed and deemed to be contributions by trade unions.

If the president of Imperial Oil or the executive of a small machine shop or whatever, wishes to give a personal contribution, that contribution is not deducted from the eligible contribution that can be made by his company. That's true even in the case where it is a one-person company or a personal corporation, where his family, for example, controls the corporation. They can each give individually and they can still have their company give individually. We do not require that there be a list of the shareholders of a corporation to back up any donation it gives to a political party; nor do we require, as the minister suggested privately a couple of times, that in order for a corporation to give there should be positive support in the form of a signature or consent, given by each individual shareholder. That has not been done, either. Within the corporate structure it is acknowledged that, if the board of directors approves a donation to a political party, then within the limits set by the Act, that's okay.

Trade union structure is far more democratic than is corporate structure, Mr. Chairman. As we've indicated from the record, there have been disaffiliations. There have been tough fights. In certain cases you have 30 per cent or 40 per cent of the plant which has opted out where there has been a strong

campaign to do that. In every case an individual has the right to opt out so that his money is not directed into a trade union.

We're talking about a way in which a large group of people are unable to participate in the political process. That was one of the purposes of the whole series of reforms that was suggested by the Camp commission. But now the government, gratuitously and perhaps in a way trying to contribute to its own partisan advantage, has come in and interfered with this particular form of financing of the political process, Mr. Chairman, I can't say very much more. The points have been raised in committee.

Mr. Cassidy moves that section 31 of Bill 3 be amended by renumbering section 31 as section 31(1) and adding section 31(2) as follows:

Affiliation fees of not more than 10 cents per month from any member of a bargaining unit represented by a trade union shall not be considered contributions for the purposes of this Act.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, we've tried to accommodate the minister's comments in making this particular amendment. We've left the existing section 32 as it stands. I'm not sure why it's in there, but we've left it as it stands in order to close off a loophole that the government apparently may have seen.

In discussion in the committee, the minister seemed to say very clearly that as long as a membership fee was an affiliation fee—say an affiliation fee of \$1.20 a year that gave rights of membership—that was okay by him, except for the fact that he thought it should go through under the presently numbered section 31.

All I'm saying to him is that we appreciate his good wishes. We appreciate the comments that he made—a bit gratuitously, but all the same I think they were well meant—that the NDP does not have the same financial sources as the other two parties and has tended to be underfinanced. We also appreciate the other comments he made, but in practice he's not implementing that agreement that he seemed to give in words. We are asking him to agree now to this amendment, which would allow affiliation fees to be given in the traditional way, as the Camp committee recommended. We recommend nothing more than the Camp committee recommendation—nothing more than that at all.

I would ask very much that the minister agree with this, Mr. Chairman, rather than having a policy that seems to hit at one party in particular. The Camp committee was pretty fair, you know, and I wish we could keep it that way, rather than deviating from it just at the points that hurt one particular party.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, we cannot support the amendment.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, I don't think this is hitting one party any more than another party. Presumably, as these democratic unions come together they offer their support to the several parties represented in this Legislature.

I don't see this as being any particular difficulty. It is true that unions may choose to utilize the new section 31 instead of section 32, and in the process will have to list the members of the union who are deemed to be contributors and members of the NDP. But surely this is part and parcel of the whole spirit of the Act. While it is true it is a bit of a nuisance to record those names in a big union or a small union, it's a nuisance for constituency associations and others to record every penny received and every penny expended. So I think the nuisance in itself is not reason enough to change it.

My hon. friend from Ottawa Centre brings more passion to bear on this than he might in other circumstances, because through no fault of his own he missed the meeting we had scheduled with certain union leaders; and then, again through no fault of his own, he wasn't in the committee when the section was passed. So he's trying make up a little bit for the lost ground and redeem himself in the sight of these very outstanding union leaders who were more or less prepared to lynch him after those two mishaps a week or so ago.

At any rate, substantively speaking, I see no meaningful inhibition insofar as affiliation fees are concerned. If the union is large enough that this becomes a financial constraint to overall contributions, they can reorder their affairs as provided under new section 31; and while this in itself is a little bit of a nuisance, there are many features of this bill which are somewhat of a nuisance to thousands of contributors, to hundreds of constituency associations, to hundreds of candidates and so on. That nuisance is the price we pay for having an open, public financing system as provided for in this great bill.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Well I don't have to redeem myself, so I want to talk about it for a minute.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, you have to redeem yourself for many other errors.

An hon. member: We won't go into that.

Mr. Deans: My colleague the member for Sandwich-Riverside (Mr. Burr) tells me that was a religious reference—is that true?

I always thought that the purpose of this bill was to obtain open disclosure, more or less, of financial transactions related to political parties. It wasn't intended to cause any undue or unnecessary extra work. It wasn't intended to cause either or any political party any undue or unnecessary hardship. The purpose was to try to get above board the contributions of individuals, corporations and trade unions to political organizations.

Over the last number of years, the trade union movement has contributed openly, publicly, with full disclosure, to the NDP. There has never been a doubt in anyone's mind at any time that the trade unions contributed to the NDP. The amounts they contributed were public. The manner in which the contributions were determined was public and democratic. They did, in fact, comply, as one segment of society, with the general objectives of the legislation.

There were never any under-the-table contributions. The contributions from any segment of the trade union movement to the NDP—and in some instances I might say to other people in other parties, but primarily to the NDP—was a matter of public record. There was never any question about it. Nobody suggested for a moment—and I don't think this minister is suggesting—that there was anything underhanded about the way in which they dealt prior to the Act coming in.

Now, if it is true that the purpose of the legislation is to regularize and to make more open the political financing procedures of political parties, then it ought not to be used in any way to try and reduce the levels of support that are available to political parties from any sector.

I want to suggest to you that the arrangements that had been previously in effect between the trade unions and the NDP had caused no hardship. The procedure that was followed was a very regular and open process. Affiliation within the trade unions to the New Democratic Party was in most cases—I can't say in all; I haven't had a chance to look at every case—but in most instances it was at a level less than the full membership

of the union involved in order to make allowances for people who may feel under certain duress, or who may feel under some pressure not to opt out. There was, in the contributions that were made on behalf of that union to the party, an allowance, in most instances, for that group of people who would feel uncomfortable about opting out.

Let's look at the procedure sensibly for a moment. The procedure that is used, as the minister knows, is a very normal procedure. There would be a notice of motion placed on the agenda of a meeting that at a subsequent meeting there would be a discussion and a vote held with regard to affiliation of that union and its members to the New Democratic Party. A period of time, not less than 30 days to my knowledge, but certainly in most instances more than 30 days would elapse between the time that notice was posted and the membership was made aware of the meeting and the day the meeting was held for the purposes of discussing affiliation.

When that meeting was held, every single member of the union was entitled to be present—every one; and every member of that union was entitled to vote for or against the affiliation. The normal procedure used by the unions of which I have personal knowledge was that the amount of the affiliation—in other words, the percentage of the affiliation that they agreed upon—was in proportion to the vote cast.

Even if it turned out that 100 per cent of those present voted, in addition to that they made allowances that there would likely be people who would not want their 10 cents a month to go to the NDP. Once the vote had been cast, the ballots tabulated or the hands counted and the decision had been reached, assuming it was in the affirmative—that they did want to affiliate—they said to the members: "If there is one among you who would not like to have his money go to the NDP, you are free to inform the recording secretary of that and your money will not go for that purpose."

I really must say I can't think of any other organization in the world which deals as fairly as that. I say to you that when any corporation sits down to make a decision or when the board of directors sits down to make a decision on the appropriateness of making a financial contribution to the Conservative Party, or the Liberal Party no vote of the shareholders takes place.

No notice of motion goes out to the shareholders of that corporation asking if it would be okay to hold a meeting 30 days later, the purpose of which would be to discuss whether

or not an appropriate sum of money should be sent to either of the other two parties, the Liberals or the Conservatives. There is no opportunity for the shareholders to vote prior to that money being sent, nor is there a consideration that some of the shareholders might support the NDP or someone else. There is no option to opt in or out in those cases; none, no option. The board of directors, acting on behalf of the shareholders, goes ahead without any authorization of any kind, without even having to report the size of the contribution or to show it in the books in an open and aboveboard way.

We understand that what you're saying is you're attempting as a government to destroy the financial arrangement there was between the NDP and its supporters. Let's put it squarely before the public—that's what you are doing. It has nothing at all to do with whether it's appropriate or whether it isn't. What you're really about is that what you can't do at the ballot box you'll do behind the scenes.

There is no justification for that. There was not one single hint at any time of anything untoward or underhand being done with regard to the affiliation of the trade unionists to the NDP. There never was. I don't understand why the government, acting through this minister, feels compelled to alter a structure which has been in existence and which has been the financial backbone of this party over its entire history, other than vindictiveness; other than an attempt being made by the government on its own behalf and on behalf of its friends in the Liberal caucus to undermine the NDP.

Mr. Singer: I hadn't heard that.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Sometimes I wonder why the member for Downsview doesn't become a Conservative. He'd be quite at home there.

Mr. Deans: That's the purpose of the exercise, that's all it is. There is no other reason.

Hon. Mr. White: You are having a pipe dream.

Mr. Deans: The right to affiliate and to pay a membership fee, predetermined by a convention is not the same thing as making a contribution to a political party.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: The decision as to how the membership fee and how the affiliation will be made, is surely a matter for discussion be-

tween the people who want to affiliate and the party with which they want to affiliate. I don't understand why we've got into this mess. I don't really understand why you're doing this. If it isn't for vindictive reasons what are the reasons?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): They are happy with the 60/40 relationship.

Mr. Deans: What are the reasons? Why is it that you feel it necessary—

Mr. Stokes: It's 60 for you and 40 for them.

Mr. Deans: Why is it that you feel it necessary as a government to tell that segment of society which has always operated openly with regard to its affiliations and has always done so in a very structured, reasonable, predetermined, legal way—

Mr. Stokes: Responsible.

Mr. Deans: Responsible, my colleague says; it has always been that—why is it that you feel it necessary now to move in on that segment and to deny it its democratic rights?

Hon. Mr. White: What are you talking about?

Mr. Deans: That's what I am talking about. Their right to decide whether or not they can affiliate their membership.

Hon. Mr. White: You don't even understand these two sections.

Mr. Deans: I most certainly do and you are putting obstacles in the way unnecessarily.

Mr. Lawlor: Only two left.

Hon. Mr. White: You had better reread 31.

Mr. Lawlor: He knows what the game is.

Mr. Deans: I'm sorry, what?

Hon. Mr. White: You had better reread 31. You are not comprehending the import of 31 in the light of 32 as presently written.

Mr. Deans: It is okay for you to say I don't comprehend the import of 31 in the light of 32.

Let me say to the minister that either he doesn't understand the relationship—you don't understand that—or else he chooses to ignore it. It can only be one of those two explanations.

There is no justification at all, in any way, for infringing on the rights of those unions to

proceed as they have always done; and as you admit, it is open.

Hon. Mr. White: Nobody can proceed as he has always done.

Mr. Deans: I am sorry; pardon?

Hon. Mr. White: No person or association can proceed as they have always done. That's why this is a reform Act.

Mr. Deans: You are assuming, from that statement, that change for the sake of change is a worthwhile thing.

Hon. Mr. White: Never.

Mr. Deans: The fact of the matter is that the procedure followed in the affiliation process was a much more democratic procedure, allowing for individual expression and allowing for collective action. What you have done is say they can't do that. There is no reason they can't do it; they can't simply because we have to change this around here.

If you could tell me it is better; if you can tell me that's a better way to deal with it; that you will know more about the organization, you will know more about the contributions, you will have a better handle on the contributions and you will be more able to expose the degree of financial involvement under your Act than was previously available, then of course there should be change.

If there was something wrong with the way it was done; if it was somehow hidden, if it wasn't done openly and above board and democratically, with lots of notice, lots of participation and with the option to opt out at the end if you still didn't like the decision of the majority; if you can tell me there is something wrong with that procedure, then there should be change. In heaven's name, what other organization in the world says to people, "We will give you notice, the opportunity to speak your mind, the opportunity to vote, and if you don't like the decision of the majority you can opt out"?

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): Do you raise your hand or walk up to the man in charge?

Mr. Deans: You don't have to do that. All you do is put a note in his hand and say: "Please, don't allow my money to go there." What other democratic system provides that kind of option?

Good lord, I can't think of anything more democratic than to say to a man who has been defeated on the floor of any meeting:

"No matter what the outcome, if it goes against your wishes, you can opt out."

Mr. Kerr: Does he get police protection?

Mr. Deans: Don't be silly. It's a lot more serious than that.

Mr. Kerr: I know.

Mr. Deans: You don't allow that politically. You don't allow it in here. You don't say to people out in the community at large that, after there has been a democratically held meeting and a vote taken, if you don't like the outcome you can say, "No, I'm not going to do that." In the trade union movement they allowed for that; and then you turn around and tell me you couldn't leave it as it was?

What kind of nonsense are you talking about? Why do you feel it necessary to change what was a perfectly democratically arrived at decision?

I understand that other options open to us as a party. I know that in dollar terms it isn't going to cost us a single solitary cent by someone else's calculations. I don't really care too much about that. What worries me is why you intrude into something which was already public.

If you were saying to me that now there has to be a vote of the shareholders and that whatever the percentage of the moneys, based on any criteria with regard to the income of the corporation—

Hon. Mr. White: Could I interrupt the hon. member for just a minute?

Mr. Deans: Yes.

Hon. Mr. White: I would be quite willing to entertain a change to the section, providing affiliation fees were a matter of opting in—

Mr. Deans: But they are.

Hon. Mr. White: —and we parallel that on the corporate side by saying that shareholders, when levied upon by their board of directors must opt in also, because this is the analogy. It's false to compare contributions given by the corporate body to contributions given by members of a union at the behest of the union. A true analogy is funds given by the corporation and funds given by the trade union from the trade union's treasury and not from the pockets of the union membership.

If my hon. friend will accept the principle of opting in insofar as affiliation fees are concerned for both members of trade

unions and shareholders in a corporation, then I think perhaps we could make some changes.

Mr. Deans: It's a red herring and I am not going to get sucked into it, because it just happens that I know the game.

Hon. Mr. White: It would be a very fair game.

Mr. Deans: I am going back to it because it is important. You talk about opting in. I want to tell you, first of all, that there is the option to opt in. The option is exercised at a meeting when one's hand is raised or one's ballot is cast. That opts you in or out.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, could we put that in the bill?

Mr. Deans: It's already there. When the meeting is held and the people cast their ballot, they opt in or out.

Hon. Mr. White: This being the case, can we put it in the bill?

Mr. Deans: It is already there.

Hon. Mr. White: You have no objection to it going in the bill?

Mr. Deans: There must be a meeting held—

Hon. Mr. White: That is not opting in.

Mr. Deans: You can be cute.

Mr. Stokes: He is just being obtuse.

Mr. Deans: No, he is not being obtuse, he is being cute. There's a difference.

Mr. Lawlor: He is being cutely obtuse.

Mr. Deans: The fact of the matter is that there is already an opting-in process. In addition to the opting process, there is an added safeguard that the individual can opt out if he loses.

I say to the member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer) who is celebrating one of his birthdays—

Hon. Mr. White: His 29th.

Mr. Deans: —can he think of any organization that he belongs to that affords people the chance to opt in by a ballot, and then to opt out if they don't win?

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Every Sunday.

Mr. Deans: Does he know of any?

Mr. A. W. Downer (Dufferin-Simcoe): Yes, our church.

Mr. Deans: Where? Church- You don't opt in or out there. Hopefully we are all in.

I don't understand why the minister is being the way he is in this, because when the vote is held and people exercise their privilege to vote, whatever way they vote is their indication of opting in or out initially. That's the first option open to them. They opt to become a member or not to become a member. If the majority opt to become members—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): The majority of those present.

Mr. Deans: They are all entitled to be there. They don't add it up at the end of—

An hon. member: The majority of ballots cast—

Mr. Deans: That's true of any organization.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Those present here vote.

Mr. Deans: Don't pull in silly things like that. If the majority opt to go into the affiliation process, the minority then, having lost the vote, are still entitled to opt out. **And not only that, any number of the majority** who may at some time change their mind are still entitled to opt out. At any subsequent time, given the same notice of motion, another meeting can be held at which the whole matter can be reconsidered.

You can't tell me that's not democratic and fair. You couldn't sit and tell me that, because I know you wouldn't be telling me what you really believe. You can't tell me it isn't democratic and fair.

You may not change it, that's fine; but I want it on the record. I happen to think that given the wide range of procedure that has to be followed; given that there has to be the notice, given that there has to be the meeting with discussion, given that there has to be a vote taken, given that there is then the further option that if you personally don't like the outcome of the vote, as an individual you can say: "I don't want any part of it"; given that's the democratic process, then I can't think of a better one.

You can tell me about different ones. There are different ways of doing it, but they're not any better and they don't provide any more democracy and freedom of choice. You may have a different system; it's not necessarily any better.

The system that is in effect at the moment satisfies by far the majority of the people involved. It's not a matter of us, meaning the NDP, getting an edge in the financing, because that's not likely ever to happen, in terms of total financing of campaigns or anything else. I just, frankly, put to you that everything that you're looking for is already there—everything.

I don't understand why you won't just accept what is already in place, because it satisfies every single criterion of Camp. It goes further, in fact. It also satisfies every single criterion of any democratic system anywhere in the world. What you're doing is tampering with democracy, and you're doing it to satisfy your own ends.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, from time to time during the past four elections I had wondered how democratic the procedure was, because the NDP was getting the dimes and I was getting the votes. However, my eloquent friend, the acting leader of the NDP, and I use the word "acting" advisedly, has persuaded me as to the purity of this process. Now I am asking him if it wouldn't be appropriate to enshrine this pure democratic procedure in the bill before us, by requiring affiliation fees to be on an opting-in basis, insofar as they affected both members of a trade union and shareholders of a corporation.

Mr. Deans: In response to the question, if it would be possible for us to stand the section down and to draft a section which would say, (a) that there must be notice of any meeting to be held for the purposes of affiliation, (b) that that notice must precede the meeting by 30 days, (c) that every member of the organization is entitled to take part in the meeting, (d) that a vote shall be taken at the meeting at the choice of the membership, (e) that the person not satisfied with the outcome of the vote may inform the organization of his or her intention—

Hon. Mr. White: On a point of order.

Mr. Deans: Wait a minute.

Mr. Chairman: Point of order.

Hon. Mr. White: On a point of order, sir, we are not talking about contributions from a trade union treasury or contributions from a corporate treasury. What we are talking about under sections 31 and 32 are affiliation fees.

Mr. Deans: That's what I'm talking about.

Hon. Mr. White: I put a proposition to the hon. member: Let's put both members of a trade union and shareholders in a corporation—

Mr. Deans: There is no affiliation process.

Hon. Mr. White: —on an opting-in basis insofar as levying affiliation fees is concerned.

Mr. Deans: Well, then, let's go back again. As I said, you're cute but not clever.

Hon. Mr. White: Fair and square.

Mr. Deans: Cute but not clever. First of all, the corporation don't affiliate to the Conservative or the Liberal parties. There is no affiliation process, none. So, we're talking about two entirely different things.

Hon. Mr. White: There is no levy on shareholders.

Mr. Deans: There is no affiliation process from corporations to the Conservative or the Liberal parties.

Hon. Mr. White: No levy on shareholders.

Mr. Deans: There is, though, a determination made by the board of directors to contribute out of the profits to the Liberal and Conservative parties. That's another matter. That comes under contributions.

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): What makes you think you're so pure, my friend?

Mr. Deans: We're not pure. I'm trying to prove to you that there's something wrong with your thinking in it.

So, therefore, you can't talk about opting in on an affiliation basis from the corporations because they don't do it. Okay? Then you agree with me on that? They don't do it.

What we are talking about in this discussion is one segment of society that contributes in a membership way, or affiliates itself as direct participating members in this political party, the NDP. That's all we're talking about. You're not talking about anybody else. You're not talking about any of your friends. You're talking about our friends. Those are the ones you're talking about.

The intention of the legislation is clear. The intention is to make it so damned difficult that they can't affiliate; that's the intention.

I am saying to you, tell me where there is one shred of anti-democratic behaviour in the existing procedure followed. You tell me where there is one shred that deserves that it should be altered in the way that you have decided to alter it; given that we are not

talking about anyone who supports you—you meaning the Conservatives or the Liberal Party—but given that we are talking only about supporters of the NDP.

Show me one shred of evidence that the procedure followed, starting with the notice of motion, going to the meeting, going to the vote, going to the right of the individual member, if he loses, to opt out from what the majority decided; given that every single dime buys a membership in the party which entitles them to take part in every aspect of party organization; it gives them the right to attend conventions in appropriate numbers to the numbers affiliated. It gives them the opportunity to put on the record their views with regard to policy within the party.

You show me any other organization that has democracy to that extent. You tell me what's wrong with it. You tell me where the opting in process doesn't already exist, then we can talk about something that we both understand.

I am saying to you that right now when those people go to that meeting and vote—

Hon. Mr. White: May I ask—

Mr. Deans: One moment. When those people go to that meeting and vote, they are exercising their option to opt in or to opt out. And from that point on, having once exercised the option, they are then entitled, if they didn't win—in other words if they didn't get what they wanted; if the vote went against their wishes—to go ahead and do what they want in any event.

Now, for God's sake, tell me that there is something anti-democratic about that. Tell me there is something wrong with that procedure. Tell me that that doesn't satisfy every single direction and every single criterion of any group of individuals that have ever studied election or party financing anywhere in the world.

Now you can ask your question.

Hon. Mr. White: Does my hon. friend know how many unions in this province are touched in any way by the new section 32?

Mr. Deans: I am sorry; do I know? I think there are probably six. I can't recall the exact number, I believe it's about six.

Hon. Mr. White: Will my hon. friend agree that the relatively small number are the very largest unions with the most sophisticated equipment, office staff and so on? And will he not concede that those small number of unions, be it six or 16, can readily meet the provisions of new section 31?

Mr. Deans: No, they cannot readily meet the provisions; they cannot readily meet the provisions—that's the difficulty.

Hon. Mr. White: They can bring themselves within the four corners of the provisions.

Mr. Deans: They can bring themselves within the four corners at some considerable expense to their union membership.

Hon. Mr. White: We are all affected by this bill.

Mr. Deans: You are not affected by this section of the bill one iota.

Hon. Mr. White: We are all affected by this bill.

Mr. Deans: You are not affected one single whit by this section of the bill. The Conservative Party is not affected in the slightest by it. What you are doing is using your 74, or whatever number of members it is, to try and crush the trade unionists who want to belong to the New Democratic Party.

And that's what's wrong with your bill. You can't tell me one single thing that they do that deserves that this be done to them; not one. You can't. What they have asked for is so reasonable, and the procedures they follow so sensible, there isn't another organization anywhere that follows those kind of procedures and makes those kind of allowances. And you tell me that you are not going to allow them to continue to do that. You know why—because you are afraid of them. You are afraid that their support for the NDP is much stronger, perhaps, than you would like to see it. Since you can't defeat them at the ballot box—you don't have enough members to do it—and because you can't defeat us at the ballot box either, you are going to defeat us by foul means if you can't do it by fair.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: That's exactly what you are saying. There isn't a single reason in the world—not one reason in the world—why you would attempt to do this other than for political gain—not one; not one. I don't understand it. I didn't make this kind of address in the committee because I frankly thought—I'll be quite honest with you—I thought that once you have heard the procedure—

Hon. Mr. White: You weren't there.

Mr. Deans: I was there.

Hon. Mr. White: Not for this section you weren't.

Mr. Deans: I thought that once the minister had heard the way the procedure was followed, he would automatically agree it's a very democratic way to do it. I didn't think for one minute he would resist. In fact, when my colleagues came from the committee and said it wasn't going to be changed, I didn't believe it. Above all else, given that I understand he is very political, I thought he was also reasonable—

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): He is also very sensible.

Mr. Deans: I expected that the government, understanding the procedures followed, would have agreed that those are the kinds of procedures they would like to see followed in any organization. I thought that if it had to draft measures and means of determining how people could or could not affiliate, it could have used those measures and means exactly as they are and applied them to any other organization affiliating with the Conservatives or the Liberals, if that was their wish, and they would have been considered to be fair by everyone, because they are fair. They are fair in the extreme, and I don't understand the minister's resistance.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. White: Certain remarks have been made here that cannot be let go unchallenged. There is an assertion or an implication that we are in some way disadvantaging a particular group, namely trade unions and trade union members—

Mr. Deans: The minister is making it more difficult.

Hon. Mr. White: —in a way that's not the case with other organizations or groups of citizens. Exactly the opposite is true, sir. Under new section 31 the NDP, which put the request, have the opportunity of deeming that annual membership fees paid for membership may be considered to be a contribution, which apparently is their wish now, although it was not their wish as interpreted by the commission—

Mr. Deans: It is not.

Hon. Mr. White: —or it may be considered not to be a contribution. The very large unions that find the new section 32 somewhat restrictive can operate under that permissive clause in section 31.

So, in contrast to the allegations of my hon. friend, not only have the unions and union members not been prejudiced but they've been given certain privileges not available to other citizens, quite frankly. To eliminate the very modest constraint, which is implicit in section 32, as suggested by the amendment proposed by the member for Ottawa Centre, would heighten that difference.

I came into the committee without any strong views on either side of this question—

Mr. Deans: I was told that.

Hon. Mr. White: I was guided by the committee and the committee members. As the discussion evolved, it became abundantly clear that the Conservative members on the committee and the Liberal members on the committee were dead set against providing additional special privileges to a particular group within society.

The objective of keeping everybody on more or less the same plane is what led the committee, by a very large majority, to put before the House the section which we're now considering. For that reason, I simply couldn't accept an amendment.

Mr. Deans: Let me say that when one talks about the very large majority, the minister of course has to understand that it would be made up of Conservatives and Liberals. That's quite obvious. It wouldn't be in the interest of either of them to accede to what was going on previously, not because it was wrong but because it happens that what the minister has proposed is restrictive, more difficult and more costly than the procedure that was followed previously. That's why I don't understand why the minister brought it in in the first place.

I wouldn't have expected the Conservative members or the Liberal members to have risen to the support of the NDP in their request that this section be changed. The reason I didn't expect it was because we're in politics and advantage is important; at this particular point I am talking about the advantage that we have.

If the minister doesn't think the procedure followed was right, then he should tell me where it was wrong. He should also tell me where the procedure followed wasn't more democratic than the procedure that the government is imposing. Let him tell me how he can consider the right to have an affiliate membership in the same way as he considers a donation. They are entirely different things.

On the one hand the membership entitles each and every individual to participation on an equal basis, to representation in party affairs on a basis established at conventions which enables those individuals to have a say in the internal workings of the party. That's different from a contribution. A contribution is that they would like to see you get elected. The other also carries with it the obligation to work, to provide all of the background administratively, policy-wise, participation-wise which is so necessary if a democratic political party is to survive.

On the one hand you are talking about their right to affiliate and the procedures they will use, which I claim are infinitely better, with far more opportunities for getting out than any other I have ever heard of; on the other hand you are talking about the right of groups in society to make contributions. That's another matter altogether; an entirely different matter and if you deal with them separately you would see it.

Any group at all which is identified as a group could affiliate with the Conservative Party and in so doing should have, assuming your constitution would allow it, rights which enable them to take part actively in the party's affairs. The way in which they determine their affiliation is within the broad outlines of the constitution of the party and their own constitution as set out by their own membership.

That's the difference. You talk about apples and oranges; they are both fruits but they are not the same and that's where you've got a problem.

I say we have a problem. Certainly we can get around it; of course, we'll get around it but damn it, why should we have to get around it? Why do we have to go through all the mental gymnastics? Why do we have to hire the people to do the job of getting around an Act when the Act doesn't make sense in the first place?

I regret, really, that we are reduced to this kind of discussion because the whole thing is so ludicrous. The right of those people to affiliate with the party has been there since 1961—before 1961—and prior to that there were other arrangements since 1959, I guess it was, to date, that right of affiliation has been there. It has been open to every single individual who wanted to know anything about it, to know how it was done. The procedure I outlined to you before has been the procedure followed and if you want to regularize that procedure to make sure they do go through all those particular steps, I've no objection.

I've got to say to you that you couldn't ask for a better procedure. You could apply it to any other group. You could take it and use it. I'm sure they'd be delighted to let you have it. It's the only procedure I know of, as I say, which allows the man who loses to opt out anyway, after having once been given a chance to opt in or out. I don't understand you; I don't understand your thinking.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, there are ample provisions for trade unions under a variety of sections in this bill. Nearly all trade unions can continue to operate as they have been under the new section 32. A very small number of very large and sophisticated unions will find section 32 a new constraint on the total amount of money which they can give. They can thereupon use new section 31 as the members opposite must know.

I am asking myself, since they must know this, why the alarm? Can it be that the continuing and increasing failures of the NDP have led to a certain lack of confidence on the part of these big unions? Can it be that they are now going to draw down their contributions from their own treasuries and by way of affiliation fees, giving as an excuse new section 32? Frankly the alarms are much more passionate as expressed by members of the NDP than by the union leaders who have spoken to me.

Mr. Young: I have never heard you being willing to assist the unions that way.

Mr. Deans: When you got to that level this debate had deteriorated even below the level of your normal debating capacities. It must have taken—

Mr. Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Mr. Chairman, can I ask you a question: How have the rules of the House been changed to allow a bill that has been in committee to be reported back to the House and then go back into committee of the whole House?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We always do that.

Mr. Lawlor: We have for a long time.

Mr. Deans: That's the rule.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: That has never been a rule in this House as long as I can remember. I just ask you when that was changed.

Mr. Chairman: I don't know when it was changed, but we are debating an amendment to section 31 as proposed. We've got to deal with it.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: I am suggesting to you that any such amendment should have been made in the standing committee, not in the committee of the whole after it has been reported back to the House from standing committee.

Mr. Lawlor: You make your suggestion, but you will have to face reality.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: I simply think this whole procedure is out of order according to our rules—

Mr. Lawlor: You may dislike it, but we find it opportune at the moment.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: —and I would like to have it clarified, sir.

Mr. Chairman: I would inform the hon. member that I feel it's in order.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform the hon. member it's exactly the procedure we followed with Bill 72, the Education Act—

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: But two wrongs don't make a right.

Mr. Foulds: —and it is enshrined in the standing orders of the House.

Mr. Chairman: I am ruling that we are in order because we are debating an amendment to a section that wasn't presented in committee.

Hon. Mr. White: On a point of order. Let us now proceed, having gotten ourselves to this stage of the legislative process, but let this not be considered a precedent if the rules provide for an alternative course of action. I am quite prepared to proceed with this committee stage, but if the rules say standing committee or committee of the whole House but not both, I think this should not be seen as a precedent.

Mr. Deans: The rules don't say that.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: We've never had it before.

Mr. Foulds: The rules do not say that. The rules say very clearly that the bill can go—

Mr. Lawlor: We've done this many times.

Mr. Foulds: —to committee of the whole House and amendments can therefore be put.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): I was going to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the members look at rules 48(c) and 49. I think those rules set out the procedure whereby a bill, when returned from standing committee, ordinarily comes back to the stage of committee of the whole House. If the bill is dealt with, of course, further amendments can be made on the benefit that members who had not been in committee would have the opportunity to enter into such a debate. As a result, once that is proceeded with, the bill of course is then ordered for third reading in the normal fashion.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Mr. Chairman, on a further point of order, I think the debate should not be repetitious. It is now the third time that I have heard some of these arguments, both in standing committee, here and on second reading, and I think you have to keep very strict order.

Mr. Chairman: Well, there are a great many members who did not have an opportunity, as the hon. member for Kitchener said, to hear it in committee because they were in the House. Rule 49 says:

When a bill is considered by the committee of the whole House, the chairman shall inquire whether any comments, questions or amendments are to be offered and to which sections and will call only such sections. [This is what we have been doing.] If no sections are so designated, the bill will be reported as a whole.

Mr. Foulds: Good ruling, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: One comment to the member for Wentworth, I was going to call him to order. He has been very repetitious for the last 15 or 20 minutes and I was going to call him to order, but I see he has left the House.

Mr. Singer: That is why; he knew you were going to call him to order.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We in the New Democratic Party are incensed at the way this matter has been handled, before the House and in committee. As the chairman has pointed out, a number of us have been required to be in two places at once and, not having telephatic powers just yet—although being able to read the mind of the minister fairly well,

even at a distance—were unable to participate as fully as we would like to have. This is our opportunity and I would ask for your indulgence in taking that opportunity.

It is a shame at this time in your history, when you are bringing in legislation which has universal import, which fundamentally and in spirit and purpose would not be partisan legislation—it's supposed to be beneficial to all across the board—that the note of partisanship should be introduced and that it should be an operative factor throughout in the mind of the minister and the utilization of various red herrings drawn across the track.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to read what the basis upon the foundation of this whole piece of legislation said. In the Camp commission report, page 34, it talks about group contributions: It says:

Earlier in this report, we have noted that individual and business contributions may be channelled through a non-profit organization, as the federal Act now allows. Where such a simple expedient exists, limitations on donations are not enforceable.

Against these possibilities, the commission proposes that financial contributions from organizations or groups—other than corporations and unions—be allowed only on the basis of the limitations governing individual contributions; that is, any such organization may donate any amount of money through a candidate or a party, but the contribution must be made up of individual voluntary donations, all of which must be disclosed and itemized as the source of the amount, and all of which, in conjunction with other contributions the individual may have made, must be within the limitations set down in the Act. Tax credits would be issued to the individuals if so desired by them.

As an exception to the above, the commission recommends that employees, union members or salaried members of any bona fide organization, be allowed to contribute to a political party through the check-off procedure, without regard to and independent of any other political contributions by the participating individuals, provided that: their contributions are voluntary, or are made according to the constitutional authority vested in the organization concerned; and the amount of the check off is not more than 10 cents per month for each contributor.

This practice is a familiar and well-established one, notably with trade unions. And since the individual amounts are nominal, the commission would wish to encourage a practice rather than inhibit it.

What does the minister do? He prefers to inhibit it rather than encourage it. I won't go to the length of hurling across the floor accusations—

Hon. Mr. White: Rubbish.

Mr. Lawlor: —that this resembles the Bennett legislation of British Columbia. It doesn't go that far; there is far more suavity in this House. Nevertheless, it does severely wound us and cripple us in the largest trade unions in the province, and you know it. You, as a supernumerary matter, instead of leaving the section alone and drafting it precisely along the lines as indicated by the **three-man commission**, which had far more objectivity and which was far more outside the political spectrum than you or this government, would not recommend it or take it at its face value. No, you had to get in the little niggling clauses. You had to get in the thrust. You put the stiletto in between the third and fourth ribs, and you haven't quite turned it yet.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Let's get back to the bill.

Mr. Lawlor: That's your purpose—that's what the whole thing is about. We have good reason over here to be incensed. It's a rotten piece of partisan politics.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Use all of Camp; why just a part of it?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: Listen, we are not a rich political party—we never were. We've had to struggle from the very beginning just to exist over against your moguls. It has been a very difficult thing for this party to keep its head above water. If you could sink us by way of monetary measures—and that's the capitalist way of sinking anybody—you would drive us into the ground through money. You have never succeeded in doing that. We still held up our heads and we floated—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: —and ran in elections on virtually nothing—and won very often, too.

Mr. Carruthers: Socialist capitalists.

Mr. Lawlor: You think at this time in history you can emasculate us and cripple our financing.

Interjections by an hon. member.

Mr. Foulds: Will the member for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman) stand up if he wants to make a speech? Stand up if you want to make a speech. Get recognized by the Chairman.

Mr. Drea: Anybody can make a million.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: Listen, your partisanship against trade unions these days, as I listen to you on various occasions—including yesterday in private bills—is becoming something atrocious. What kind of malice have you got against these organizations of which you were such a beneficial member at an earlier time? But I'll leave it aside.

Mr. Drea: You've milked them for years.

Mr. Lawlor: Let's talk to somebody important.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): That's a pretty serious allegation. You've got a persecution complex.

Mr. Lawlor: We are being hamstrung and you know it. You gloat over it, I suspect, in secret and in silence.

Hon. Mr. White: May I interrupt my hon. friend for just one moment? There are a half a dozen or a dozen trade unions affected by new section 32.

Mr. Lawlor: They are the big ones.

Hon. Mr. White: They can utilize their automatic mailing equipment and so on to fit themselves within the four corners of section 31.

Mr. Lawlor: It won't help.

Hon. Mr. White: So, what's the problem? The only problem is they may be glad to have an excuse not to continue their present level of contributions—

Mr. Lawlor: You have your ceilings on there.

Mr. Bounsall: The minister is a dreamer.

Hon. Mr. White: —because of the lack of success of the NDP.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, the minister has the floor. The hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine (Mr. Wardle). Has the member for Lakeshore finished?

Mr. Lawlor: I was contending—

Mr. Stokes: What do you mean, was he finished? He was interrupted on a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: I am asking the member for Lakeshore; I'm not asking the member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Lawlor: No, no, he stood up on a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: Do you wish the floor?

Mr. Lawlor: I always defer to him on this matter.

I say that we have always been an impecunious and struggling political party. The legislation as a whole we welcome, of course, and haven't fought. It is just in this single instance, which was taken cognizance of by the very body that reported to you and to this government in a totally non-partisan and kind of sovereign way. But you saw fit to move in.

Listen, your coffers are full. The Liberal coffers are pretty damn full. What's the man in the pin-striped suit been doing? My friend here has been out scurrying around in the underbrush for two years now, garnering the chips.

Mr. Roy: What is the member for Lakeshore talking about?

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): Come on, get on with the bill.

Mr. Foulds: All the lines between Ottawa and Toronto were tied up.

Mr. Lawlor: Your treasuries are full. There is no disclosure of that, nor is there any intention of there being.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: We rely on the little man and his 10 cents a month for heaven's sake and you fat cats are talking \$100.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: Come off it. What kind of partisan legislation is this? It is a most grotesque instance of discrimination written into non-partisan legislation. Don't worry, when we become the government it will be changed damn quick. It will be changed damn quick. And, you know it, despite all your palaver,

all your subterfuge and all your pretending not to understand. I give the Minister without Portfolio far more credit than that. You know what is going on; you know what the game is.

Mr. M. B. Dymond (Ontario): The member for Lakeshore is not well cast in that part.

Mr. Drea: Why doesn't he buy a house in Scarborough?

Mr. Lawlor: You are just playing the game according to your rules. I'd hate to play euchre with you early in the morning, with all those cards under the table.

Mr. Foulds: Marked ones.

Mr. Lawlor: Pure blackjack and you are the dealer, aren't you?

Hon. Mr. White: While my friend is pausing for breath I will say if there is any special advantage contained in this bill it is in favour of the trade unions, because I point that every trade union branch may contribute up to this maximum, and if the UAW has 100 such locals it can give 100 times \$2,000 plus \$2,000 plus \$500 plus \$500.

Mr. Lawlor: What about the big locals in Hamilton?

Hon. Mr. White: What is the case of the automotive industry itself? It has three kicks at the can instead of 100 for the UAW. So, if there is any advantage in here it is for the trade unions.

Mr. Lawlor: You know you are making dents. We wouldn't be protesting so bitterly if you weren't.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: The member for Lakeshore lost the case.

An hon. member: Where were you when he yelled at Dovercourt?

Mr. Lawlor: Dovercourt? Are you a member of this House?

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Roy: What it's going to mean is a bit more walking, a bit more door-to-door to get a few more votes for the member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: We will manage to do that too.

Mr. J. H. Jessiman (Fort William): Pat, watch your blood pressure.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Has the member for Lakeshore got anything more to contribute on this?

Some hon. members: Always!

Mr. Foulds: He says more in one pause than all the Tory members do in a whole speech.

Mr. Lawlor: It doesn't seem to me that we are getting through very well. You have had many days.

Mr. Roy: Make a speech for a change.

Mr. Lawlor: At least we will raise our voice in protest and tell that you have set up a discriminatory piece of legislation and we will go to the country when the time comes and say the same damn thing. We will prove it to them.

You know it is true, and while you have some kind of intoxication I suspect over your palaver, over the business to play this kind of game, it is beneath the Minister without Portfolio. He is a better person than that. He has better quality. He knows what he is doing to this party. All right, that is the way we play politics in this province. There is no necessity for it. It is regrettable and even shameful that it should have come to pass in this particular way. We will raise our voice against it and we will keep the debate going to drive it home. At least we will get that much catharsis out of the situation.

Hon. Mr. White: Sir, those charges are not true. They are provably false and are part of the pre-election hysteria that emanates from a party that is going down the drain just about as quickly as any party could.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: You watch us.

Mr. Foulds: That's one of his more rational speeches.

Mr. Chairman: Order. The member for Beaches-Woodbine.

Mr. T. A. Wardle (Beaches-Woodbine): I have listened day after day, also in committee, with a good deal of patience to certain things said by the members of the New Democratic Party. They are great people to talk about democracy, Mr. Chairman. They are great people to talk about discrimination but in this particular bill, on this particular section, the members of the New Democratic Party, through their donations from the trade unions—

Mr. Foulds: We don't make donations to the trade unions.

Mr. Lawlor: It's peanuts to what you people pay.

Mr. Wardle: —do not show democracy as I understand it. They may show a new democracy, not democracy as I understand it.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: The new brand.

Mr. Wardle: What they do is show discrimination.

Mr. G. Nixon: Right on.

Mr. Wardle: I mentioned this in committee, Mr. Chairman, and I think it's worth repeating.

Mr. Foulds: Is anything you say worth repeating?

An hon. member: What about you? You've never said anything here as yet.

Mr. Wardle: Mr. Chairman, when a member of the PC Party gets up, it's very difficult to speak because these people don't want to know the truth when the truth is being spoken.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: They are afraid of it.

Mr. Wardle: What I said in committee, Mr. Chairman, was this and I think all trade union members should ponder this. If a union has 100 members, rather than stand up and say their election funds should go to the New Democratic Party when no doubt many of those members are members of the Liberal Party or the Progressive Conservative Party, why should their union dues go to the New Democratic Party?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Undemocratic.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. G. Nixon: No way.

Mr. Lawlor: Many of them opt out; hundreds do.

Mr. Wardle: Mr. Chairman, all I am trying to do is understand their philosophy and it's very difficult.

Mr. Bounsall: It's called democracy.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: You listen now.

Mr. Wardle: I made this particular suggestion and here's a very good—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: No, you listen. You might learn from it.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. Let's have order for the member for Beaches-Woodbine.

Mr. Wardle: I am making a suggestion I think is perfectly democratic and I urge the NDP to accept this. A union has 100 members and they decide they are going to make a contribution of, say, \$1,000 to political parties. They have a secret ballot and they vote what percentage of that money will go to the New Democratic Party, Progressive Conservative Party and the Liberal Party. If the Liberal Party, say, gets 25 per cent of the members, it will get \$250.

Mr. Young: The same for shareholders of corporations?

Mr. Wardle: The PC will get its percentage and the balance will go to the New Democratic Party. To me, Mr. Chairman, this is perfectly democratic and the way it should be done is by a secret ballot.

Mr. Bounsall: The Chairman should vote on it. We'll buy it.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: You didn't pick up the minister's offer.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wardle: I made this suggestion in committee but the New Democratic Party didn't feel this was possible. That is not democratic in their eyes but why isn't it democratic? The other thing I wonder about, Mr. Chairman, is why, with all their catering, they receive less than 20 per cent of the labour vote? Why is that? I am sure it's because the people in labour realize the free enterprise system is the enterprise system which gives them their jobs.

I challenge the New Democratic Party, I challenge the people in labour unions to bring that suggestion up at their meetings. Let's have a secret ballot. Let the union funds go to the party of the members' choice by secret ballot.

Mr. Dymond: The leader would never let them.

Hon. Mr. White: I would have no objection to this change but I think it is a little late to incorporate it in the present bill.

Mr. Stokes: Will you do the same for corporations?

Hon. Mr. White: Perhaps it could be considered for the next session.

Mr. Stokes: Will you do the same for corporations?

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Sure.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury has the floor.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, I am particularly interested in this amendment before the House and I can only treat with scorn and ridicule the presentation made by the member for Beaches-Woodbine. I know he has been paying trade union dues for these many years now.

Mr. Dymond: Your stock in trade—scorn and ridicule.

Mr. Germa: All of these little merchants in Ontario are all big trade unionists. This is precisely his background and he knows not of what he speaks when he speaks about how to operate things within a union hall. I am particularly interested in this because I am a member of one—the biggest—

Mr. Wardle: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Mr. Wardle: On a matter of personal privilege, I come from a trade union family, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Germa: Tell me the last year you paid your union dues.

Mr. Chairman: That is immaterial.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Chairman, I come from one of the largest unions in the Province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. White: This will be your last session here, so make the most of it.

Mr. Stokes: We will guarantee it is yours.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): It is yours for sure.

An hon. member: Do you know what the Sudbury Gallup poll said? You are tied with the Communists.

Mr. Stokes: You saw the writing on the wall.

An hon. member: Remember the Sudbury Gallup poll? How many seats do you have in the north? One? Two?

Mr. Chairman: Order please. If this House can't come to some order and deal with the business—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Germa: I'm quite familiar with your friend Joe. Joe doesn't scare me at all, because the Conservatives in Sudbury ain't going no place and you know that. They haven't elected a member in Sudbury for 25 years, and it'll be another 25 years before they elect another one. Even your friend Joe Fabbro is not coming to this House. I'll guarantee you that.

What I was saying, Mr. Chairman, is that I belong and I'm a dues-paying member of the biggest local in the Province of Ontario. I know that this sly minister knows exactly what he's doing when he brings in legislation like this. He is going to cut the throats of the members of this particular organization. I was in that union hall on three different occasions in the past 10 years when a motion was put to donate from their dues five cents per member per month. That was voted on democratically and it carried three times, on three different occasions, by a majority of three to one.

Mr. Jessiman: By a show of hands?

Mr. Germa: If you do not believe in the democratic process, then what are we all here about tonight?

Mr. Dymond: By secret ballot?

Mr. Germa: I hear some members calling for a secret ballot. Let me tell you something else about the way things happen in a union hall. At another meeting we spent \$250,000 one night, without a secret ballot, to buy our union hall.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Fat cats.

Mr. Germa: If there is a proposition on which a union can spend \$250,000 without a secret ballot, surely they can spend five cents without a secret ballot. That proposition is completely ridiculous.

Mr. Wardle: It is the principle.

Mr. Germa: During the debates, Mr. Chairman, certainly there were members who were supporters of the capitalist parties. I don't deny that at all. They did make their point that maybe the union should make some donation to these particular parties, but that was defeated by the democratic vote. Their voice has been heard; they've had their opportunity.

Mr. Bounsall: As in any election.

Mr. Germa: Your proposition that this has to be a contribution from the union involved is just ridiculous. It's not a contribution from workers who have by democratic choice decided to support a certain political party at the rate of five cents per month. I object strenuously to this provision, Mr. Chairman.

I would also like to reiterate that if we do accept the proposition from the member for Beaches-Woodbine, maybe when the International Nickel Co. is sneaking that \$100,000 under the table to you guys, you'll consider peeling off a little bit of it to us, if that's what you're talking about when you think that this—

Hon. Mr. White: On a point of order, this kind of allegation is completely unfair and completely unworthy of this debate.

Mr. Jessiman: That is all he is capable of.

Hon. Mr. White: I have no idea if Inco gives us a five-cent piece or what they give us.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Well we have no reason to believe they didn't give it to you.

Hon. Mr. White: It is unfair to use these words, "sneak under the table;" having in mind, if I may pursue this for a moment, that from now on they're confined to \$2,000 to each party per year—

Mr. Lewis: Oh yes, I can see Inco confined to \$2,000.

Hon. Mr. White: —whereas the Steelworkers can contribute \$2,000 to their party or to a party for every one of their locals. Let's not talk about Inco sneaking anything to anybody.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: That is unfair.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister feel at a disadvantage?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member for Sudbury has the floor and I would like him to come back and speak to the amendment.

Mr. Germa: I know the minister is not so naive as to think he is going to be able to police these corporations in their contributions to the political party of their choice.

Mr. Lewis: They will find a way.

Mr. Germa: They will find a way with all their padded accounts and all their loopholes. You know how they do it, you are an expert in the field. Don't tell me you are going to police them properly. I've met them on the street, and I know how they function.

Mr. Foulds: The minister is going to be a special consultant to them on acquisition.

Mr. Germa: He knows very well, and it's never been denied, that corporate executives have said they contribute to the political parties on the basis of 60-40-60 per cent to the party that is in and 40 per cent to the party that is trying to get in. I refer to those two parties there, the Conservatives and the Liberals. Don't tell me they don't put money under the table. They have admitted it, and you know it.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, each corporation, and all of its affiliated subsidiaries and affiliated companies, is confined to \$2,000 a year.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: Each?

Hon. Mr. White: No, not each, in total. If Inco has 100 subsidiaries, Inco and its 100 subsidiaries are confined to \$2,000 to each party each year. Once again, in contrast, every local of the Steelworkers, of which there may be 100, can contribute the same \$2,000.

Mr. Foulds: How many of those corporations have a democratic vote of their shareholders to approve of the contributions.

Hon. Mr. White: They don't levy on their shareholders.

Mr. Deans: They do.

Hon. Mr. White: They don't compel their shareholders to become affiliated members—

Mr. Foulds: It doesn't come out of the profits or the dividends, does it? Where does the money come from if it doesn't come from the profits or dividends?

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. White: This is what I have said—and I'm glad the leader of the NDP is in here—let's fix this up and put it all on the same plane: Let's require both corporations and trade unions to require opting in for affiliation. Let's have it completely parallel between unions and corporations.

Mr. Foulds: They own you. What do you mean affiliate?

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: We are quite prepared to have it parallel, provided the procedure currently used in the trade union movement is applied equally to the corporate sector.

Mr. J. A. Taylor: You had better quit while you are ahead.

Mr. Lewis: We had that secret meeting in your office and ironed all this out. Have you told that to the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. White: No, I didn't squeal on you.

Mr. Lewis: You haven't talked about that yet. Maybe we should talk about it; maybe your colleagues would like to know.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. Germa: By implication, the minister intimated that unions or the members were compelled to make this contribution. I am going to tell you again—I just told you five minutes ago—that on three different occasions in the union of which I am a member, we did vote by a majority of three to one to make a contribution to the New Democratic Party; and I resent and object to you using the inference that we compelled those members to make the donation.

If you want to draw a parallel, at what point in time did any shareholders' meeting of any corporation in Ontario take a vote of the shareholders to support your political party? If that's not extortion, I've never heard of it; if that's not compulsion, I've never heard of it. What shareholder ever had an opportunity to vote that he would support your political party? You tell me that.

Hon. Mr. White: What corporate shareholder has ever had a levy placed on him by his board of directors? None.

Mr. Deans: Every single one.

Mr. Germa: Where does the money come from?

Hon. Mr. White: If it is so perfectly democratic, how is it that the NDP have all the signs in many sections of London and I win every poll in those areas? Do you think there is a little bit of persuasion, shall we say involved?

Mr. Deans: What kind of pressure and arm-twisting do you apply?

Mr. Lewis: Did you ever think that was a non sequitur? Ponder it for a while.

Mr. Chairman: All in favour of Mr. Cassidy's amendment will say "aye".

All those opposed will say "nay".

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Shall we stack this vote with the rest?

Agreed.

Are there any further comments?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, section 39.

Mr. Chairman: The sections will carry to 39. Agreed?

Sections 32 to 38, inclusive, agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, section 39 is the section that for some reason the government suggests puts a ceiling on expenses incurred for advertising in the 21-day period, quite contrary to the recommendation made by the majority of the commission. I think it should be noted that the majority of the commission was Dalton Camp and Douglas Fisher, the Tory and the NDP nominee. Quite contrary to the recommendation made by them, the government did yield to the pressure brought upon it by members of both opposition parties and by the media and, in its usual compromising way, attempted to impose a ceiling on advertising expenses, and only on advertising expenses.

For a large part of the province this ceiling, even if it was meaningful insofar as controlling expenses during an election campaign was concerned, could have no meaning to candidates who are running in large cities. Certainly in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, the more than 30 ridings in that area are covered by large and expensive daily newspapers, many radio stations and many television stations. Very few candidates I know in any of the parties, even if they had the money, would participate in advertising in the media, by and large because of the expense and, secondly, because the coverage being given is far too great for any riding. You're paying for coverage, you're not paying for effect. For a very large number of ridings in the province this advertising expense limit is completely meaningless.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, the thing that puzzles me is why the government in its compromise singled out only advertising and the particular type of advertising it defined, which is media and outdoor advertising. As everyone of us knows, and knows full well, there are many more expenses during an election campaign than advertising. There are pamphlets, lawn signs, committee room expenses, telephones, staff expenses and on and on. If there is going to be any top limit on election expenditure, surely the whole thing should be dealt with?

What did the minister tell us downstairs in the committee? He said, "It doesn't work anywhere else in the world." That statement is about as effective as his statement that nobody has ever sued a candidate for election expenses. There are many jurisdictions where it does seem to work and work very well, and the United Kingdom is one of them.

Hon. Mr. White: Name one.

Mr. Singer: The United Kingdom.

Hon. Mr. White: Oh, ho, ho.

Mr. Singer: Oh, ho, ho. Yes, the United Kingdom.

Hon. Mr. White: You've got to be kidding.

Mr. Singer: Do you know what happens in the United Kingdom? It's policed. One party watches the other and the system of elections in the United Kingdom is far better controlled and is far less expensive than in any jurisdiction on the North American continent. If you had been there and looked at it you would have seen that. If you had been there and talked to the candidates, the Members of Parliament in the United Kingdom, whether they be Liberal, Conservative or Labour, they would have confirmed that to you. We went to party headquarters and our select committee were there and we discussed that with them. Certainly, I came to that conclusion and I think your colleague from Victoria-Haliburton—was he on that committee that went to England?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: No, I wasn't over there.

Mr. Singer: All right. Some of the members of the House were there, and certainly it was my feeling that members of all parties came to the same conclusion.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: They would have listened too much to the member for Downsview and not to me.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, you were there, I believe, and I am sure you came to the same kind of conclusion.

In any event, what we have created here is a very elaborate system of reporting and a system of auditing. We've brought in the Institute of Chartered Accountants and they have sat with us and they have suggested certain amendments, and we've gone along with them because they're an important part of this. If all of this system of reporting and the forms and the auditing and accounting is going to work, why can there not be a system of checks insofar as end expenses are concerned?

That is the really important thing, Mr. Chairman, that this statute should be talking about. If there is going to be disclosure of what comes in, surely there should be a limit on what goes out.

The minister, a little earlier this afternoon, in answering one of my suggested amendments, said he wasn't really worried about it. He wouldn't accept it because he thought it would be protecting or giving an advantage to rich candidates. If there is anything that gives an advantage to rich candidates, or candidates and/or parties that seemed to have for a peculiar reason an ability to raise lots of money, it's unlimited permission to spend as much as they want in an election campaign.

I just can't accept at all, Mr. Chairman or in any way, the argument that it is impossible to control. What are our control mechanisms?

We've got a commission. There are going to be on that commission two members from the Conservative Party, two members from the NDP and two members from the Liberal Party. There is going to be a chairman appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. There is going to be a benchman of the Law Society. There is going to be the chief electoral officer of the province or the Clerk Rod Lewis. All of those people are there, and they are going to set up rules and regulations and forms that are going to govern the functioning of this Act.

That's what we've been talking about. The accountancy profession is being called upon to certify the financial statements that are submitted and that information is going to be made public. If it is believed that you can certify what comes in and keep the system honest, why can you not similarly certify

what is going out and keep the system honest?

Surely, Mr. Chairman, one of the objects of this statute, if it has any real purpose, is to control what is coming in, control what is going out and make public declarations of what has been happening in the election campaign. The government has only taken half the step. In avoiding taking the other half of the step, one must wonder about what their motives are. One must wonder why they have deliberately avoided the expedient of writing in a system of control of all expenses. If what the hon. minister says has any meaning at all, how is it that he believes that you can control advertising, but you can't control all of these other things? I just don't understand it.

Mr. Chairman, this point has been made many times.

Hon. Mr. White: May I answer that question? May I just comment very briefly?

Mr. Singer: I'm not going to prolong my remarks. I'm going to move these amendments to section 39, which I think will take care of the most glaring, serious and obvious deficiency that exists in the statute.

Mr. Singer moves that the first 10 lines of section 39 be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

The total expenses incurred by a political party, constituency association or candidate registered under this Act, including expenses incurred by any person, corporation or trade union with the knowledge and consent of the political party, constituency association or candidate, shall not during the campaign period exceed

Mr. Singer: That will replace the existing first 10 lines. I will move a companion amendment to that.

Mr. Singer moves that the amount of 50 cents, as set out in the third line of subsection (b) of section 39 be changed to the amount of 25 cents; and that the amount of 25 cents as set out in the third last line

of subsection (c) of section 39 be changed to the amount of 50 cents.

Mr. Singer: The thrust of those two amendments Mr. Chairman is this: The section will be amended, if my amendment is adopted to cover all expenses; and the expenses will be, in the case of a registered party:

In relation to each elector, 25 cents—that's subsection (b); and in the case of a candidate 50 cents, which is subsection (c). Now 50 cents, in the average constituency, would amount to something like \$20,000.

Those figures perhaps are going to be met with great shock by those who think this shouldn't be done and that it's too much. If you want to reduce it to \$10,000, I couldn't care less, but I think there should be some control on it. I've suggested controls that I think are not unreasonable in light of the circumstances.

I would urge, Mr. Chairman, that these amendments be accepted by this committee in order that a very meaningful addition be made to this statute, without which the statute is not going to function nearly as well as it should.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, sir, they are unacceptable for reasons I'll give at 8 o'clock. But let me only say that the member for Ottawa Centre has already spent more than \$40,000 on his campaign.

Mr. Deans: What!

Hon. Mr. White: And there is no jurisdiction in the world that has found a way to control these expenditures. That is what he told the committee.

Mr. Foulds: That is a lie.

Hon. Mr. White: It is not a lie. He's spending more than \$11,000 a year on his election centre there.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. It being 6 of the clock I do now leave the chair and will return at 8.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 1, 1975

Energy prices, statement by Mr. Davis	1369
NorOntair service, statement by Mr. Rhodes	1371
Energy prices, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Roy, Mr. Deacon, Mr. Cassidy	1372
Teacher-school board bargaining legislation, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Roy, Mr. Foulds	1374
Effects of Hydro borrowing, questions of Mr. Davis, Mr. Timbrell: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Deacon	1376
Energy prices, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Renwick, Mr. R. F. Nixon	1377
Land severances in Brockville area, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Lewis	1379
Hydro block, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mrs. Campbell	1379
Mercury pollution, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Stokes	1379
Deserted wives' and children's maintenance legislation, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Roy	1380
OMA fee schedule, questions of Mrs. Birch: Mr. Shulman	1381
Land severance regulations, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Reid	1381
Judges on police commissions, questions of Mr. Clement: Mr. Bounsall, Mr. Singer ..	1382
Property ownership, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Haggerty	1382
Inter-church appeal, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Burr	1382
Ministry of Housing field offices, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. R. S. Smith	1383
Report, standing private bills committee, Mr. Ewen	1385
Health Insurance Amendment Act, Mr. Roy, first reading	1386
Representation Act, reported	1386
Third reading	1396
Election Finances Reform Act, in committee	1396
Recess	1421



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, May 1, 1975
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975



CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MAY 1, 1975

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ELECTION FINANCES REFORM ACT (concluded)

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. J. White (Minister without Portfolio): Speaking to the amendment of the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer), there are three essential points here. First of all, the amendment would restrict overall campaign expenditures, but I point out, sir, that this has been tried in a dozen jurisdictions all over the world and in no case has it been successful. I had occasion at 6 o'clock tonight to mention the fact that the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy), the principal socialist—the second principal socialist—

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): There is no principled socialist.

Hon. Mr. White: —confessed to our standing committee on justice a week ago that he spent something over \$40,000 in the last 3½ years on what is essentially a campaign activity; that is, an office of his own in his riding. This is a small example of many that could be offered to prove the fact that there is no way of constraining these expenses over a lengthy period of time.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): What about your executive assistant running all over the place doing constituency work?

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: What's wrong with that?

Mr. Stokes: There is nothing wrong with it, but call it what it is.

Hon. Mr. White: My executive assistant has never done anything political in his life.

Mr. Chairman: Order please, the hon. minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Serving the people; that's what it is.

Mr. Stokes: Some people.

Hon. Mr. White: So the first point I want to make is that it has been tried elsewhere without success. It hasn't worked anywhere in the world and this is the reason the royal commission recommended against it.

Now I come, sir, to the next point, that this advertising constraint of 25 cents per voter doesn't effectively apply in Metropolitan Toronto ridings.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. White: That's right. That's right it doesn't, because they don't use mass-media advertising. It does apply very much in medium-sized communities like my own, and there are many other representatives here of communities not unlike London South, where these are very real constraints and where these constraints — 25 cents per voter — will drive down the expenditure in mass-media advertising by 10 or 20 or 50 per cent. That's the reason we've singled out that particular measure.

We've singled out this measure also because it's a particular expenditure which can be qualified, where costing can be done precisely by the commission itself and by opposition parties, so it is easily policed. I offer that in contrast to the form of conscription the NDP has, of putting union organizers from Saskatchewan into by-elections and general elections here in Ontario, bringing socialists from all over Canada into a particular riding or half a dozen selected marginal ridings—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Do they pay them?

Hon. Mr. White: —and where it would become impossible, as experience has proven, to quantify the cost of that particular contribution.

My hon. friend, the member for Downsview, who has offered these amendments, is being somewhat inconsistent, I do believe, because it was only a few hours ago—

Mr. Stokes: That's something like you talking on behalf of Premier Moores in Newfoundland. Do you want me to dig up some of your old speeches made in Newfoundland?

Hon. Mr. White: —that he himself was begging the House to support an amendment which he himself offered, to enable a candidate to pay \$20,000 toward his own campaign—

Mr. Stokes: Ontario's red Tory goes to Newfoundland.

Hon. Mr. White: —in contrast to the present maximum of \$500.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): On a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member with his point of order.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, if the minister had listened he would recall that what I said was that after you take the amount of contribution, the amount of payment back, you can get up to a maximum amount of \$20,000. If the minister could read and understand, he could put the figures in this amendment together with the figures in the other and find out they are both entirely consistent.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Hear, hear. That is a point of order if I ever heard one.

Mr. Chairman: I am not denying that is a point of order. Will the hon. minister continue?

Hon. Mr. White: Yes, sir. That's exactly what he said. He said the present constraints—which amount to \$2,000, plus \$2,000, plus \$500, plus \$500, for a total of \$5,000—were far too little, post facto, for a candidate and that the candidate should be enabled to pay \$20,000 post facto. That is what he said, sir.

Mr. Singer: I didn't say that at all. I said if we want small businessmen to suffer we will enact this legislation in this present form.

Hon. Mr. White: And that will be voted on shortly, no doubt, and I hope and trust I have confidence the House will turn that down.

Mr. Singer: Why does the minister dislike small businessmen?

Hon. Mr. White: So now we have a series of amendments offered, completely in conflict with similar motions offered by the member for Downsview less than three hours ago. So for these several reasons, sir—

Mr. Singer: Why does he hate small businessmen?

Hon. Mr. White: —I would ask that the House turn back this and the other amendments.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It will.

Mr. Chairman: Before I recognize the—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Does the Minister of Education want to make an announcement? We very rarely see him in here at night.

Mr. Chairman: I would like to interrupt this spirited debate to recognize the member for Scarborough North.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, I think it's quite appropriate that we have the galleries full tonight for the debate on this very important bill.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): More than the benches have been filled.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Where are all the Tories?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think these are good citizens from the riding of Scarborough North—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): That's why you're putting on the big show.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, a good number of them are members of the Scarborough North Progressive Conservative Association.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is that who they are?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think they're very pleased, Mr. Chairman, to be here to see this government putting through one of the most progressive pieces of campaign disclosure legislation in Canada.

Mr. Stokes: We could have applauded, but not that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Some of our friends over there perhaps will come to realize that one day.

Mr. Chairman: The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to join with the minister in welcoming the good taxpayers from Scarborough

North because they, along with the other taxpayers of the province, are going to be called on under the provisions of this bill to pay an average of \$6,000 to each bona fide candidate in the constituencies in the next general election. I'm not sure what the total bill will amount to but it will be substantial. The point is directly on the amendment put forward by my colleague from Downsview. I believe wholeheartedly that if we are prepared to dip into the consolidated revenue fund of this province to pay for election campaigns, the other side of that coin, or those many coins, must be that a limit on expenditure be established. I cannot understand what kind of conscience would lead the Conservative government to say, on the one hand, we're going to provide the original ante, the first \$6,000, in every one of the campaigns out of public funds and not at the same time say there will be a limit. In other words, you're going to get the \$6,000 and then turn to those barrels of money you keep in the basement of the Parliament Buildings, or wherever your headquarters is, to spend without limit.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If democracy is to be served, I would think the taxpayers, perhaps if they thought about it very carefully, would say we should give every bona fide candidate, whatever his or her political allegiance might be, an opportunity to put forward his or her basic alternatives to the issues and to campaign with at least a coverage of a mailing and some advertising. Beyond that, there must surely be a limit so that no party and no individual with access to unlimited funds—as the Conservatives have been in the past—is going to be in a position to buy an election or buy a government.

Mr. Chairman, I believe wholeheartedly that the amendment put forward by my colleague must be supported. If we are going to support the contention that we are going to pay the basic cost from public funds there must be a limit and anything else is truly unconscionable.

Hon. Mr. White: No, sir, I can't let this pass. It's the Liberal Party that's going around this province bragging it is going to spend \$5 million on the next election.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: What do you say now?

Hon. Mr. White: Now I hear them say, "Apply constraints at the riding level." And I hear at the same time the member for Downsview saying, "Let the rich candidates

who earn \$20,000 be almost unconstrained." What we're going to do, sir—

Mr. Singer: How much did you return in 1971. Can you tell us?

Hon. Mr. White: Just a minute. What we're going to do, sir, is take the advice of the royal commission insofar as overall expenditures are concerned; they not having worked anywhere in the world—

Mr. Singer: They have so.

Hon. Mr. White: If somebody could offer me some information of a successful model, we would be quick to take it.

Interjection by hon. member.

Hon. Mr. White: What we're going to do, sir, is place limits on mass media advertising which all of us can police.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): You're on your way out.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What we're going to do, sir, is limit the contributions in, which is a precisely measurable amount where particular penalties can be effectively applied.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Cash in and cash out.

Hon. Mr. White: That's the reason, no doubt, that my hon. friend the Minister of Education was able to say in front of these great Conservatives—I knew they were Conservatives when I saw them—

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): You're looking in the wrong direction, they're on the north gallery.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Hon. Mr. White: My wife and I have learned in the last 25 years that you can spot a group of Conservatives by their looks, they are so good looking.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): They are not all as beefy and good looking as you are.

Hon. Mr. White: And so intelligent looking.

An hon. member: The working class socialist.

Mr. Breithaupt: You can certainly tell a Tory but you can't tell him much.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. White: I am serious.

Mr. Chairman: Will the hon. minister return to the amendment, please?

Hon. Mr. White: I am serious on this.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): I suppose you are the exception that proves the rule.

Hon. Mr. White: I am indeed.

Mr. Chairman: Will the minister continue please?

Hon. Mr. White: No sir, I don't want to take you away from section 32, but I want to say this, I am not kidding when I tell you my wife and I have concluded, after two decades of political experience, you can tell a Conservative by looking at him or her.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But you can't tell him much.

Mr. Chairman: I draw to the hon. minister's attention that section 39—

Hon. Mr. White: When I see these lobbies fill up with socialists, I could tell you it's a very sad sight.

Mr. Lawlor: Don't play to the gallery, John.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Mr. Foulds: John, you are beginning to sound more like W. A. C. Bennett every day.

Mr. Lawlor: More like W. C. Fields.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, you could do worse than that.

Mr. Breithaupt: Not much.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: What did Barrett do with your profession, can you tell me that?

Mr. Foulds: Pardon.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: You heard me.

Mr. Foulds: Not quite.

Hon. Mr. White: Well anyway, sir, we have debated this at some length before 6 o'clock and now again for the last 10 or 15 minutes. I can only say this, that the moment we can

find an example anywhere in the world where overall constraints are working, we are prepared to adopt it. Until the time comes, where there is one such successful experiment, we are not going to embed it in the statutes of this province only to have it in some way corrupted.

Mr. Martel: You people should talk about corruption.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Martel: It is the last party that should be complaining about corruption.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, I have before me an amendment. I am seeking your advice on the matter.

First of all, on a point of order, is Mr. Singer's amendment in two parts, are there separate and distinct amendments as you take it, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Singer: If I could be of some assistance to you. It is written on two separate pages, but it is really the same amendment.

Mr. Chairman: It is the same amendment but there are two pages.

Mr. Lawlor: Make it two parts, because we like one and don't like the other.

Mr. Singer: Well I don't really care. It is the same principle; and the same stubborn minister is going to vote it down anyway.

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): The Liberals don't really care—

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps if it would be of assistance to the hon. members we could deal with the amendment in two stages.

Mr. Lawlor: Right, okay.

The amendment I have before me partially covers the member for Downsview's amendment. It goes further, though, in one of the sections, and I would ask for your indulgence in submitting it just the way it was written out and let it go at that.

Mr. Lawlor moves that section 39 of Bill 3 be amended by changing the figure 25 in subsections (a) and (c) to 12½; and by changing the figure 50 in subsection (b) to 25.

Mr. Lawlor: You will note, Mr. Chairman, that the member for Downsview has correlated on subsection (b) but not on the other, although I get the impression he probably isn't all that much disturbed about the other one way or another.

The reason for this amendment, as in the case of the Liberal amendment under this head, has to do with the grotesque and exorbitant amount—

Mr. Singer: Could I ask the member a question?

Mr. Lawlor: Sure.

Mr. Singer: How could you possibly spend \$5,000 under subsection (c) and get \$6,000 back out of the public purse?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's pretty good business.

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Mr. Lawlor: Are you really asking me that question; or let's ask the minister for a change?

Mr. Singer: Yes. I can't quite follow the member for Lakeshore on that.

An hon. member: This only applies to advertising expenses.

Mr. Lawlor: I was saying that the sums you leave yourself with respect to advertising are very great sums indeed. They certainly give you all the swat and elbow room with respect to inundating the other less affluent political parties in the province in the way in which you successfully did the last time when you bought up all that advertising time. We really got rocked between the eyes on that occasion with every form of shibboleth and every form of banality.

They are slick guys you have got working for you down there on Bay St. and they have the Brooklyn accent. They know the style. You don't hire them and pay them that money for nothing and the effect is a kind of an indecorum on the democratic principle. It's a form of—from our point of view—a little bit of an obscenity. Since you fellows are so grotesquely opposed to obscenity these days, parading up and down on a law and order platform, we thought maybe you wouldn't want to commit any obscenities yourself.

In this particular area are the very vast sums which you know that we at least have no access to nor can pretend to have access to and which you this afternoon gave us less access to by cutting us off at the knees with respect to our provincial party. The riding funds are fine. It's the provincial central fund precisely for purposes of access to the media, to television and radio, that we are being throttled on. The form of

visceration you perform is very effective indeed in this particular area too.

We find these sums are much too great. They do upset the internal balance of the democratic process of getting one's message across, being able to address the public and being heard. When one party has the predominance of power in this way, the whole machinery becomes extremely questionable.

I admit that you write it in for your own benefit. It is highly partisan. It is a biased form of serving your own interest. You have got the loot. You are going to use it and you want all the room in the world in which to exercise that privilege. Nevertheless it runs counter to your deepest motivations behind this legislation and what you are seeking to do, to give some kind of equality of status in the voices heard in this community. You amplify your own voice a thousand times and diminish others.

If you are going to have some kind of equality, we wouldn't be able to match the figures we are giving here, 12½ cents per head. We'd never find that kind of money. You could easily, no problem about that. We are prepared to put up with that amount of discrimination and that heavy a load against us. We can forefend against that.

As you well know, we have other means of meeting the electorate. We go out and meet them at the door. It is very hard, struggling work. You sweat a lot in the process and you get bitten by the odd dog but at least you talk to people personally and in a direct way. This is what elections are all about. You are using the mass media.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lawlor: You don't do it to the extent that we do nor have you the pertinacity. You don't stick to it the same way. You use the mass media in the province to an extent that we couldn't possibly nor would we wish to. According to McLuhan and according to the powers that be, the electronic media have an enormous impact upon human personality these days. There is no minister of this House who knows that better than he because he is very much aware of Lewis Mumford and Marshall McLuhan's works in these areas of saying what the impact is. I give him credit for that but knowing this and knowing it so deeply, there is no reason in the world why he shouldn't modify this legislation either along the lines given by the member for Downsview or in accord with the principle enunciated by us here tonight.

I would ask you to reconsider this proposition and give some thought to setting your sights, your ceilings a little lower than you presently do.

Hon. Mr. White: This is the strangest thing. We have heard for 3½ years accusations that we, the Conservatives, spent \$5 million in 1971. That was never true.

Mr. Breithaupt: How much did you spend?

Hon. Mr. White: That was always false.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Tell us what you spent.

Hon. Mr. White: That was always a lie, that accusation. Now we have imposed limits on advertising amounting to something over \$1 million.

Mr. Singer: Something over, yes. Was it 10½?

Hon. Mr. White: And the claim is now made that this \$1.2 million is too much. Why should that be? Well, I suppose, first of all, because the NDP doesn't dare put their leader on TV if that can be avoided.

Mr. Lawlor: On a point of personal privilege. What is going on?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Lawlor: Watching the leader of the NDP of recent date, his image is almost transmogrified.

Mr. Breithaupt: He's almost as mellow as the member for London South (Mr. White).

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Has the hon. minister finished his comments at this point?

Mr. Lawlor: None of these snide remarks.

Hon. Mr. White: The NDP deliberately kept their leader off television in 1971, and the effort will be redoubled in 1975.

Mr. Breithaupt: Going to spend twice as much.

Hon. Mr. White: In 1971, the NDP bragged that they had, for the first time ever, more than \$1 million to spend.

Mr. Lawlor: We have grown more humble in a sense.

Hon. Mr. White: So, these amendments are a form of posturing, which I think don't reflect the true state of affairs. And certainly we, on this side of the House, cannot accept it.

Mr. Foulds: Why not? Why can't you accept it?

Hon. Mr. White: If the hon. member will recall Lewis Mumford's principal point with respect to decentralization, as well expressed in the "Pentagon of Power," he will remember the very persuasive and compelling arguments of Mumford with respect to the need for getting power from the centre into the periphery of organizations and society.

That is the reason that I, among others, insisted that the ridings have the same total amount of money, the same per capita amount of money as the centre itself. So, that the natural inclination for the centre to acquire power wouldn't be in some way exaggerated by this bill. And so we find ourselves in a form of equality.

Mr. Singer: Oh, come off it.

Mr. Lawlor: Except you got the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow.

Hon. Mr. White: And for that reason the NDP motion, which would have the effect of ploughing twice the resources into the centre as exists in the constituencies, is completely unacceptable to me. And for these reasons, sir, I would ask once again that the House turn back the amendments offered by the socialists here tonight.

Mr. Foulds: You know you are a charlatan.

Mr. Chairman: I would alert the members of the committee that we will deal with Mr. Lawlor's amendment as an amendment to the amendment. We will, I assume, stack that along with Mr. Singer's amendment, and deal with them at the conclusion of the debate.

Are there any other comments, questions or amendments to any other section of the bill?

Mr. Singer: Section 40, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Section 40; the hon. member for Downsview.

On section 40:

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, section 40 deals with foundations, and as it originally appeared in the standing committee it made the setting up of a foundation a permissive matter, and the foundation was supposed to receive the moneys the party had in hand prior to the coming into force of this Act.

I would have thought, listening to the minister a few moments ago, that he was

anxious and eager to declare publicly how much money the Tories had in hand. Now, I urged upon him an obvious course whereby this could be done in the standing committee, but he rejected it there. So let me urge it upon him again tonight.

In the committee he did accept the fact that a foundation be compulsory, and that when any party had money in hand, after the passing of this Act—which, presumably, might be tonight or tomorrow or whenever—that it had to put it into a foundation, and the foundation had to be handled in accordance with certain rules.

He accepted the compulsory feature of the foundation, but the next feature he rejected. I said it was important that the amount of money in the foundation be declared, so that he could put up or shut up. He talks about how much money the Liberals might have had or might intend to spend. We have some belief, for some peculiar reason, that the Tories have an awful lot of millions of dollars in hand. We would like to know how many dollars they're going to put in the foundation.

So, I'm going to be moving an amendment in a few moments, Mr. Chairman, that will make it compulsory that when a foundation is set up that there has to be filed with the commission a statement of the amount of money put in the foundation. So, that if the Tories only have \$100,000 in hand now, or if they have \$5 million in hand now, they will declare it. And they will declare it to the commission and it will be available as a part of the public record just how much money we have. And I know we will be anxious and eager to declare how much we have in hand, and so will the NDP.

Mr. L. Maeck (Parry Sound): Tell us now.

Mr. Singer: Now, I think it only fair, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. minister wants to be as fair as he is talking about being, he should go along and subscribe to this amendment.

The second thing is that the minister talked about equality of opportunity in elections, and the whole statute is apparently designed for that purpose. It would seem logical to me that if there is going to be equality of opportunity in elections the parties should start off reasonably equal from the starting gate. We'll even let the Tories have an advantage in this one. But in the second one everybody should be even. Let every party be compelled to put into the foundation all the money they now have in hand and to declare publicly to the commission how much it is, and let them either spend it in this coming election

or else let the money escheat to the Crown. Let it be given to Her Majesty the Queen in the right of the Province of Ontario, in the event that you don't spend it. Mr. Chairman, I ask you, what could be fairer and more equal and reasonable than that?

Mr. Singer moves that section 40 be amended by adding after the word "year" in subsection (c), "and the amount in the foundation," and that there be added a new subsection, subsection (d): "If there are any funds left in these foundations after the next general election held in Ontario, such moneys shall then be paid to Her Majesty the Queen in the right of Ontario."

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. minister wish to comment?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in this bill to prevent the Liberals from announcing what they have in their foundation. Given the nature of the amendment, one would expect them to be honour-bound to do so, and so we will all look forward with some interest to seeing if they have got some or all of the \$5 million in their coffers that they have promised the people to spend in this election.

Insofar as the other parties are concerned, the royal commission said very clearly that the rules should not be changed in the middle of the game, that the funds in trust with the several parties should be established in a foundation according to law, and that the transfer of moneys, whether that be interest or capital, should be fully revealed, as transfers were made to the parties, to the constituencies or to the candidates. We have accepted the royal commission's recommendations in full. That's our position, sir.

Mr. Breithaupt: It is not a royal commission.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): What is this royal commission stuff?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Again, Mr. Chairman, I want to move a subamendment.

Mr. Lawlor moves that section 40(c) of Bill 3 be amended by inserting after the word "report" the words "of the assets and."

Mr. Lawlor: The purport of the amendment is precisely along the Liberal lines with a different kind of wording. We would like to be on the record as independently being opposed to this section—

Mr. Singer: A rose by any other name.

Mr. Lawlor: —both, my friend, vis-à-vis the Liberal coffers and the ones over there. We suspect that they have outdistanced the Liberals somehow.

Mr. Singer: I would agree with that.

Mr. Lewis: No, I am not sure of that.

Mr. Lawlor: Oh, no, they didn't do as well in Montreal as they thought they were going to do.

Mr. Lewis: These beggars have been gathering money in the bushes for six months now.

Mr. Breithaupt: It has taken us 32 years to get where we are now.

Mr. Lawlor: My considered judgment is that they are pygmies beside the ghosts. The real ghouls are over there. The Minister without Portfolio knows it, and he set up these foundations on that very basis. We want to lift the veil on this. You don't want to lift the veil on it, and I don't blame you. On the other hand, unless you do lift the veil, again you are betraying in a basic way the principle of the legislation and what it's supposed to be all about, a public disclosure of funds, an overt, open-breasted revealing of what goes on behind the scenes during an election campaign and in preparation therefor, so that we will know where the monetary balances fall in this society and who rules the roost by way of the holdings of money. In this society money sings. It's the only thing that does. You don't hear people singing any more on the streets, at least, but you hear money.

Mr. Turner: We hear you.

Mr. Lawlor: You hear the jingling. Well, I'll try to break out in song any moment now.

Mr. Lewis: It is the only lyrical note in the Legislature.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, well, it's because I'm a piped piper and I belong to the socialist hordes and all we have is song left to gladden our hearts. The only thing is that the echoes missed yours too. In this particular area it seems four simple words would have that effect.

An hon. member: That seems reasonable.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister knows the covert quality of the thing, the thing that was wrong with Watergate, the thing about the American system, about everything being hidden and, most of all, it had to do with

election funds, with these funds being snaffled through, laundered money all over the place.

An hon. member: Laundered money!

Mr. Lawlor: All that Machiavellian covertness that's written into this Act. You perpetuate that here in terms of this legislation. You don't want to make this type of fundamental disclosure. Again, it will come about. It's in the cards; it has to be. It's a democratic principle. You can't operate on an aristocratic principle, as you have for so long, in terms of hidden resources and using them in the particular way in which you do.

You would be a pioneer of history if you would break through this evening and give some recognition to this principle. What you are is a mincing posture of a reformer at the present time in terms of this legislation. You move crab-wise toward eternity and it takes a long time to get there in that particular step.

If you moved in the area along the lines I propose the whole thing would become unveiled. It would be open to the public. They could make their own judgement. People are going to vote Conservative. They're going to vote anyhow. They're going to say: "Yes, we are the well-to-do, by and large, as we are and we're proud of a party that has gone against such pelf and lucre." It has attracted such respectability that it's able to do so. This is a signal sign of the election on their foreheads.

Mr. Maeck: Is that right?

Mr. Lawlor: And they'll say: "On the other hand, look at those paupers over there. They haven't got anything to reveal. It's funny that they haven't even got panches in the rear of their pants." Did I say "panches" instead of patches? Well, there you are—this is what happens when indignation strikes. When I see a thing overjuggernauted by great hordes of money—

Mr. Lewis: We will reveal all.

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): What a vivid imagination.

Mr. Lawlor: —my mind turns over and grows dull under the impact of all that money. Maybe it's straight human curiosity, if nothing else, to learn just how much is involved in the party. We're quite willing to make disclosure. Our disclosure is already made. We know precisely how much we get and where we stand and we make no bones about it. We're rather proud of it and we want you to do the same thing.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Singer has moved the following amendment—

Mr. Lewis: Wait a minute, Mr. Chairman. I want to hear the minister.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. minister wish to reply?

Hon. Mr. White: I'm repeating myself, sir, except to say that there's no reason why the NDP can't reveal what they have in their foundation if they wish to do so.

Mr. Lewis: We would be happy to.

Hon. Mr. White: We are once again following the advice of Mr. Douglas Fisher, ex-MP, ex-NDP, or present NDP, whichever he may be.

An hon. member: No, he's ex-NDP.

Hon. Mr. White: We're following the advice of Farquhar Oliver.

Mr. Lewis: He told the government to put a limit on the expenditures. Why doesn't the government follow it?

Hon. Mr. White: He said you shouldn't change the rules in the middle of the game. The government's position, sir, quite frankly, was not to change the recommendations in any way unless there were obvious and compelling reasons for doing so.

Mr. Martel: The government only uses those words when it is convenient.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: When it suits it.

Hon. Mr. White: We've accepted this recommendation from the commission once again.

Mr. Lewis: Like the trade unions clause.

Hon. Mr. White: I do feel myself compelled to observe that shortly before 6 o'clock the hon. member was putting forth special pleading on behalf of the allies of the NDP in a way that was completely inconsistent with the remarks that he has just made now in this latter section.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, because the government is discriminating. It is acting against—

Hon. Mr. White: We have adopted the commission's recommendations almost in toto, and where we've departed from the commission's recommendations we have done so to make the bill more stringent than it had recommended.

Mr. Foulds: Against the NDP.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, just as a footnote, the minister abandoned the Camp commission recommendation on the section we were discussing before 6 o'clock because it suited his purposes. It's nefarious and not very honourable. It makes no great difference in the world. You understand that and we know that, but you chose to discard the Camp recommendations when it suited your purpose.

Let me tell the minister what some of us believe. I don't think in this clause there was anything independent about the Camp commission at all; not anything independent. They agreed to keep the foundation money private. They agreed to the so-called "no change of the rules in the middle of the game" because they were sure that you wouldn't accept other things unless they did.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: That's right. I want you to know what I believe. I don't believe in the independence of that commission at all. You are trying to tell me that Dalton Camp didn't speak to the Premier (Mr. Davis) in the process of the preparation of those recommendations? You are trying to tell me that behind the scenes the Tories didn't intimate what was going on?

Hon. Mr. White: Did Doug Fisher talk to you?

Mr. Lewis: No. Well, Doug Fisher talked to me occasionally but not about the substance.

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): Terrible.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: I hesitate only because Doug Fisher talks to me very rarely, on the commission or off the commission.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): That's because he is an ex-NDPer.

Mr. Lewis: That's because he is an ex-NDPer, because he has a very ambiguous feeling about the Lewises; so he doesn't talk very often, generally.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): I don't think it is ambiguous.

Mr. Lewis: My colleague from Wentworth says he doesn't think it is ambiguous at all; I think he's probably right. The reality is that there is no independence in this move at all; this is a buy-and-sell operation. You

accept the other recommendations, we will allow the privileged secrecy of the government to be maintained; that was the saw-off, that was the quid pro quo.

Mr. Turner: What nonsense.

Mr. Lewis: We all understand that, but it makes a sham of the legislation if the legislation involves revealing the sources.

You want to know what's in the NDP foundation? Your curiosity can be sated quickly, you know. There is not all that much. How much is it now in dollars?

Mr. Turner: The member for Lakeshore wouldn't know.

An hon. member: How much have you got in your pocket?

Mr. Lewis: I would be glad to trade the information with you privately if you like. If you'll tell us what you have we'll tell you what we have.

Mr. Turner: Tell us.

Hon. Mr. White: What is it in dollars, what is it in roubles?

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact, there may be more in roubles than there are in dollars, as it happens. I won't know until they get back.

Mr. Martel: There must be a little hatchet around here. The Minister without Portfolio would fit the bill.

Mr. Breithaupt: You should try to find out how much it is in US funds.

Mr. Martel: The minister is a born hatchet man. He is right back where he started from sitting in that seat.

Mr. Chairman: I think we should return to the amendment.

Mr. Lewis: I have never thought of you as a hatchet man.

Mr. Breithaupt: I have.

Mr. Lewis: I've always thought of you as a sinister presence manipulating the Tory party; but never as a hatchet man, never that.

I say to you that if the legislation is to be given substance, then what all of us have in the foundations at the point when it takes place should be revealed. We have less to reveal than most, I admit; but it all should

be made public and it makes a mockery of the Camp commission recommendations.

That they should have agreed to this is a simple part of the barter of the political process. It reflects no honour on anyone. That you should be defending it is perfectly understandable, but don't give it divine sanctions by saying the commission indicated. Good Lord, you've discarded the commission at will when it serves your purpose.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, just before the minister answers, I must take exception to this unwarranted accusation of partiality.

Mr. Deans: Unwarranted.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Of course unwarranted. We paid them \$150 a day to be impartial, didn't we?

An hon. member: The three of them.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Of course, and they are still working, as far as we know. That commission is still going on.

Mr. Lewis: For life, snail-like to eternity.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: For anybody to say that those three commissioners somehow were sawing off for political reasons is unconscionable. These were three people who have extensive political experience in their previous incarnations with each of the three parties represented here. I thought there was something rather magical about the fact that they were brought together under these circumstances.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, it is magic all right; it is supernatural.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, it is also unwarranted that the hon. Minister without Portfolio conducting this legislation should be saying that he is accepting the recommendations of the commission in this case when he certainly wasn't prepared to accept the recommendations of Farquhar Oliver in his views for a limit, which were certainly valid and should have been accepted by this House and which may still be accepted if we vote properly in the amendment that is before us.

But I believe wholeheartedly, Mr. Chairman, that this bill does bring us into an entirely new era of politics in this province. With the exception of the coming election when the government party had an opportunity to raise substantial funds—that was

back in the Shouldice days before that revelation came forward, when Ross was still raising money—

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton West): Shame on you.

Hon. Mr. White: Shame.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What do you mean shame? If there is shame it is right over there.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): What about the Harboursgate?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If there is anything shameful about it, it is that you people employed a political toll-gate to raise money after the election of 1971—

Mr. G. Nixon: That's nonsense, and the member knows it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —and you are sitting back and waiting to spend it right now.

Mr. Havrot: That's garbage.

Mr. G. Nixon: Do you believe that one?

An hon. member: What about Fidinam?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be supported on all sides and the Kelly-Shouldice toll-gate should be revealed once and for all before this next election so that the people of the province know just what the Tories are prepared to do to try to buy yet another election. And I'll tell you, you won't be able to do it.

Mr. Havrot: Tell us about the Harboursgate scandal.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Lewis: Give us a little lecture on treason now. This is the moment for Rene Levesque.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. White: Norman Webster is wrong. The Leader of the Opposition isn't tough, he is nasty. He is nasty and he is a bully. And to rush half way down the aisle in a classroom to berate a modest French-language teacher is not my idea of tough.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

An hon. member: You're scraping the bottom of the barrel.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. White: Now he stands up again with his cranky, nasty attitude, which he himself typified once again—when was it, Saturday night?

Mr. Breithaupt: Ah, poor baby.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, it's not going to work, is it? We know it is not going to work.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I wonder if we can get back to the reading of the amendments?

Hon. Mr. White: I would say, sir, that the Lewises got even with Douglas Fisher a little bit tonight—just a little bit, ambiguously.

Mr. Lewis: Here now, that's almost personal.

Mr. G. Nixon: You said it—nobody else.

Mr. Lewis: Douglas Fisher is also the grey eminence in the New Democratic takeover in this province.

An hon. member: How many provinces have you got?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: Will the hon. minister return to the amendment?

Hon. Mr. White: He was absolutely true to form, though, I think. And once again the Liberals put down the boy orator from Grey riding.

An hon. member: He did it!

Hon. Mr. White: He should have been in the Senate 10 years ago.

An hon. member: He will be.

Hon. Mr. White: Sir, the government can't accept these recommendations for the reasons given by the commission itself.

Mr. Lewis: A boy orator! That's fantastic.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Singer has moved that section 40 be amended and Mr. Lawlor has moved an amendment to the amendment.

Shall we stack these amendments to deal with them at the end of the deliberations? Agreed.

Are there any further comments, questions or amendments on any other section?

Shall the remainder of the sections carry?

Hon. Mr. White: Sir, before you carry the sections, let me say that it has been a very great pleasure for me to carry this bill which the Premier himself introduced. Time will prove this to be the most historic reform measure to be brought before this particular Parliament—

Mr. Breithaupt: In all modesty.

Hon. Mr. White: It now sets a new style, not only for Canada but for other jurisdictions in the world, in putting the matter of financing and expenditure in an open public setting.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Put the shovel aside.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. White: This is an historic reform Act, which will find its niche in the history books of this country—

Mr. Breithaupt: Oh, my God!

Hon. Mr. White: —and which has been brought into being, as one might expect, by the Progressive Conservative Party, which is the reform party in the Province of Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Sections 41 to 56, inclusive, agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, can I ask a question? Are these Conservatives in the galleries?

An hon. member: They sure are.

Mr. Lewis: Are they?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Well, I couldn't understand the reason for this little performance of yours, but now it becomes clear.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. White: I would make the same speech to a socialist gathering in London if I could find one.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Call in the members.

Mr. Lewis: This is in fact—

What is happening? What are you doing?

Mr. Chairman: I thought you had finished so I said to call in the members.

Mr. Lewis: You're muzzling the House.

Mr. Chairman: The members will listen for a few moments before we call them in. I'm sorry.

Mr. Lewis: I'm only going to take a moment. This is in fact—

Interjections by hon. members.

On section 57:

Mr. Lewis: This is, in fact, a useful piece of legislation, reforming financing, we concede, in several ways, with two immeasurable deficiencies which are the only things history will record.

No. 1: You refused to put a legitimate ceiling on election expenditures, thereby reinforcing all of the negative features which have characterized campaigns. No. 2: You refused to meet the integrity of this legislation by revealing what you have collected so far, therefore, entering this election on all the nasty rules of the old election. For that, you will be noted and be rated.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. It seems this is developing into a philosophical debate. I would say that we are not dealing with any particular section of the bill.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking to the final section of the bill, actually in response to the comments made by the Minister without Portfolio who said this would be the shining—did he say epitaph?—to the Conservative record. I think since he has called me a mean politician, cranky and nasty, he certainly would not want it forgotten that the thing that sparked this legislation was the \$50,000 donation by Fidnam Ltd. to the Conservative Party and nothing else. That's what brought it forward.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Call in the members.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, sir, could I have 60 seconds to reply to the Leader of the NDP?

Mr. Stokes: This is becoming a debate.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, are you going to call the minister to order?

Hon. Mr. White: The reason we are not introducing overall constraints is that they haven't worked anywhere in the world. There

is no way that the some \$40,000-odd expended by the socialist from Ottawa Centre in the last 3½ years can be brought into this kind of accounting.

Mr. Lewis: They wouldn't have to be brought in.

Hon. Mr. White: In so far as the foundation is concerned, every nickel—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, surely the minister is not going to be allowed free rein to ride roughshod over the rules of this House. You should call him to order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, you should call him to order and enforce the rules.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order. The Chair has been listening very patiently to all the debates and it seems to me that the hon. minister is speaking to section 57, much as the other members were too.

Mr. Singer: Oh, come on.

Hon. Mr. White: On a point of order, sir, I didn't call the Leader of the Opposition mean. I called him nasty and cranky.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Order. What section are you speaking to?

Mr. Foulds: On section 57. It is a pity that this particular bill, which is intituled—

An hon. member: What section?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Foulds: Will the walruses please be quiet, Mr. Chairman? On section 57, it is a pity that the bill is intituled the Election Finances Reform Act.

Mr. Lawlor: It is a great pity.

Mr. Foulds: It is a pity that the word "reform" is in there.

Mr. Lawlor: Let's delete it.

Mr. Foulds: It should be deleted. It is a pity that this particular minister, who has had a kind of meteoric career in Ontario—

Mr. Lewis: Mediocre.

Mr. Foulds: —has had to carry this particular piece of legislation, because his particular epitaph will be that he went out not with a bang but a whimper. Thank you.

Section 57 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Call in the members.

The committee divided on Mr. Singer's amendment to subsection (d), section 2 of Bill 3, which was negated on the following vote:

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 24, the "nays" are 39.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and the subsection and section carried.

Section 2 agreed to.

The committee divided on Mr. Singer's amendment to subsection 3, section 19, which was negated on the following vote:

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 13, the "nays" are 50.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and the subsection carried.

Section 19 agreed to.

The committee divided on Mr. Cassidy's amendment to section 31, which was negated on the following vote:

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 11, the "nays" are 52.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and the subsection carried.

Section 31 agreed to.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the remaining amendments, I believe we are prepared to take the first vote and dispense with the reading of the remainder of the amendments in order to benefit the House.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): You are a little embarrassed.

Mr. Singer: Read them, then.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, I will accept that proposal.

Mr. Chairman: Shall this be agreed?

Mr. Singer: The Treasurer wants them read.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Deans: I am not sure what we are agreeing to, so let's have the vote.

Mr. Chairman: The Chair will read Mr. Singer's amendment.

Mr. Singer has moved that the first 10 lines of section 39 be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

The total expenses incurred by a political party, constituency, association or a candidate registered under the Act, including the expenses incurred by any person, corporation, or trade union with the knowledge and consent of the political party, constituency, association or candidate shall not during the campaign period exceed—

[The second part of the motion read:] That the amount of 50 cents as set out in the third line of subsection (b) of section 39 be changed to the amount of 25 cents, and that the amount of 25 cents as set out in the third last line of subsection (c) of section 39 be changed to the amount of 50 cents.

The committee divided on Mr. Singer's amendment which was negated on a stacked vote, the same count as the first vote.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

The committee divided on Mr. Lawlor's amendment to the amendment to subsections (a), (b) and (c) of section 39 of Bill 3, which was negated on the same count as the first vote.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and the section carried.

Section 39 agreed to.

The committee divided on Mr. Singer's amendment to subsection 4 of section 40, and adding a new subsection (d), which was negated on the same count as the first vote.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and the subsection carried.

The committee divided on Mr. Lawlor's amendment to section 40(c) of Bill 3, which was negated on the same count as the first vote.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Section 40 agreed to.

Bill 3 reported.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report one bill without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THIRD READING

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill 3, The Election Finances Reform Act.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, before we discuss the estimates of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, I would like to say that the minister is presenting his estimates this evening for the 14th time to this assembly.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I would like to say that he has done it with distinction and to our knowledge he is the best Minister of Agriculture and Food who has ever existed. I want to assure the House with every degree of assurance I can give that this will not be his last time.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): May I ask the House leader a question? Is it his intention to bring in supplementary estimates before the election?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Absolutely not.

Clerk of the House: The 12th order, House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND FOOD

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Is this the minister's swan song?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Chairman, I would say that everyone is so delighted with this historic

piece of legislation that has been passed to-night that we are all just in a very jubilant mood.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): I am not sure it is the legislation that has done it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Naturally, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the kind words of the House leader of our great party, which is in power now and which I have no doubt will continue in power for many years to come.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Is this a little pep talk for the troops?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I must confess, Mr. Chairman, that when the House leader asked me this afternoon if I would be prepared—

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): This is the biggest crowd of Tories I have seen for a long time.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. The Minister of Agriculture and Food has the floor.

Mr. Martel: All the noise has come from that side of the House. Why don't you call them to order?

An hon. member: Where's the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald)?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): He's in Russia.

Mr. Lewis: He is not in Russia; he is in Romania.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): He's in China; he's in China.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. All those who are interested in agriculture will please come to order and let the minister proceed.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I gather that all my friends in the House, regardless of what side, are interested in agriculture, some more than others, and some much more knowledgeable than others. If my friend from York South learns something about agriculture in Romania, it will be all to the good for him. I am not sure what good it will do the rest of us but it may be good for him.

This afternoon, when I was asked to proceed with these estimates this evening, I welcomed the opportunity to bring them before the Legislature for the consideration of all members of the House. I also want to take this opportunity to make a few an-

nouncements that I think are of interest to the farm people of the Province of Ontario.

First of all, we all recognize the number of young people now leaving our agricultural colleges and going back to the farms. Fifty per cent of the agricultural graduates of our four colleges of diploma agriculture across Ontario went back to the farm in the last two years, 20 per cent of the four-year graduates went back to the farm from Guelph last year, and I assume that about the same percentage is going to the farm this year as well. The graduates who have not gone back to the farm in the agricultural colleges of technology, which are operated by our ministry, are going into agri-business where they are providing a service to the farm community which is badly needed and certainly required.

We feel that many of these young people, having graduated from college, and many young people who would like to become established on the farm, would welcome the opportunity to participate in what I would like to describe as an Ontario young farmer credit programme.

The programme will consist of bank-guaranteed loans, without limit on the loan, to a maximum of \$25 million to start with in this year. It will apply to young farmers 18 to 35 years of age. It will be a conditional type of loan in that there may be some who are beef farmers and who are experiencing the difficulties that we are all familiar with in the beef industry today; they will be able to have the loan for two years, with interest payable only, and for the remainder of the 10-year loan they will be able to pay interest plus principal.

The interest rate will be prime plus one per cent and the young farmer will first of all make application through the local agricultural representative, who will be able to work out with him a programme which would justify the loan, his method of repayment and how he would go about operating his farm, whether he owns the farm or whether he rents it or whether he owns and rents at the same time. There are many young farmers who have got their start in the past. Mr. Chairman, by renting land to get established and by getting around them some capital equipment to start them off. We think this method will provide a source of guaranteed credit to them by the Province of Ontario that will avoid the necessity of going to credit institutions that might charge a rate of interest which might not be as acceptable as the rate of interest which is involved in this type of a loan programme.

We hope to have the forms in place for these loans to be acquired from the local banks just as soon as possible, but, in the meantime, we will be getting word out to our agricultural representatives who will assist the young farmers to prepare their applications. The applications will then be submitted to a committee here in the head office of our ministry, which will review them, approve them or suggest some changes that may be needed for the advantage of the young farmer. He will then take it to his local bank. We are hopeful that he will have no further difficulty in getting the kind of credit that we think is necessary to continue to develop agricultural land in this Province of Ontario. To my way of thinking, it's a move forward and in the right direction.

Mr. Chairman, I have been approached by my good friend and colleague, the member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Lane), on a number of occasions. He has brought to me the concern that he has expressed for the beef cattle people of Manitoulin Island, which has a reputation, which it has enjoyed for many years, for high quality production beef cattle. This is one of the greatest and earliest sources of high quality beef cattle for the feedlots of Ontario.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Why don't you include Algoma in that, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would also pay tribute to my friend, the member for Algoma, who has also drawn to my attention the concern of the beef cow-calf operators in his area as well. We all recognize the problem that they have faced. It is not dissimilar to the problem faced by many beef cow-calf farmers throughout Ontario. Frankly, there is no easy solution to a problem of such overproduction magnitude as we find apparent in the beef cattle industry that pertains not only to all of Canada but to all of North America and, in fact, on a world-wide basis. We think cattle prices are bad here. I have reports of cattle prices from New Zealand and Australia, of dressed beef there that is going into storage because there is no market for it to go to and they have to market the cattle at 19 cents a pound, wholesale dressed beef prices.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): They are the 1945 prices.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It's a way back beyond that, as far as that's concerned, and that's a very depressed situation. Now we're hopeful that if Japan opens up its markets, as it may, there will likely be a movement of beef into

Japan. As many members are well aware, they had to cancel many of their orders to divert dollars to purchase energy that might otherwise have gone to pay for the contracts of meat that might have gone into that country. That's just one illustration of a problem that exists the world over.

However, there seems to be a bit of optimism at the moment in the beef industry. How long it will last no one knows, but certainly the American market has bounded back, Omaha prices yesterday being in the 43- to 45-cent range—

An hon. member: Of the bulls.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —and that is about Toronto prices for the first time for many months. It looks as though that may continue for a few weeks or months, but no one really knows. Certainly, the number of cattle on feed in the United States is far below what it has been for a great many years and it may well be that feedlot cattle supplies, the top quality beef, may be drying up to some degree, certainly in the United States and in Canada, so that while there is an abundance of stocker and feeder cattle that normally would be going into the feedlots they are going to have to go to grass or they are going to have to go to the slaughterhouse and be slaughtered without proper finishing. Nevertheless, that beef is moving across the counter. There has been a drop in retail beef prices, since October up until the end of March this year, of some 20 per cent in Toronto retail prices of beef. That, to me, is significant in what it has accomplished as far as the increase in per capita consumption of beef is concerned. It has been quite phenomenal. We are almost back up to the levels of 1972, which was an all-time high as far as meat consumption in Canada was concerned. That has not let the beef go into storage; it has moved it across the counter. So storage stocks of beef are not at levels one might have expected them to be with the enormous kill of cattle we have had. It has ranged at an all-time high for the last several weeks.

With regard to the farmers of northern Ontario, we have had a system of northern Ontario grants, Mr. Chairman, which have amounted to \$210,000. That has been designated as special northern Ontario grants to the districts of northern Ontario. They are administered by the local farmers in the respective districts. The secretary of the committee is usually the agricultural representative in the respective district of the north and the programme is administered by the

local farmers. They make the determinations as to what is to be done with the money allocated to their respective district.

With the request made by my friends from Manitoulin and from Algoma, and certainly supported by my colleagues in cabinet from northern Ontario—one of them, the Minister of Community and Social Services, (Mr. Brunelle) sits here with me tonight—

Mr. Foulds: He is the only one of your cabinet colleagues with you tonight.

Mr. Martel: You will manage to get everybody in before you are finished.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —we have approved the doubling of those grants for northern Ontario effective as of now.

Mr. Martel: Must be an election year.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It will mean special grants of \$420,000 for those farmers who may decide to use that money for whatever purpose they see fit within their own district. That, of course, is in addition to the grants available on a regular basis which pertain to all farmers throughout Ontario.

I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that in 1974 our ministry paid out over \$60 million in direct grants to farmers. These were grants which had to do with farm tax rebates; the 50 per cent capital grants; and the interest subsidization on junior farmer loans. We have something like \$75 million still out in junior farmer loans throughout the Province of Ontario at four per cent and five per cent interest. We make up the difference between that and the normal rate of interest the government is paying for money and that's charged through our ministry. It is a direct subsidy.

We have paid out money on interest subsidization for farm tile drainage loans. Most farmers in Ontario who have used the loans, and there are literally thousands of them who do, make application to the local municipality for the money. The money is provided through a debenture guaranteed by the Province of Ontario at four per cent interest. The province, our ministry, picks up the difference between that four per cent rate and the pertaining rate at which we borrow.

We also pay out grants of one-third on all municipal drains throughout Ontario. In the 11 counties of eastern Ontario we pay out two-thirds of the cost of those municipal drains.

This is simply an illustration of the types of grants we have paid out. Of course, we

have a sizable amount of money put out in the industrial milk production incentive programme, which is 20 per cent forgivable over a period of five years. I think that amounts to about \$40 million in round figures already out on those loans.

We have a fairly substantial programme going along which I think is meaningful to the farmers of Ontario. Mr. Chairman, I simply wanted, through you, to advise the members of the Legislature and the farmers of Ontario that this government and this Ministry of Agriculture and Food will continue to provide the kind of leadership, the kind of service, the kind of assistance to help farmers help themselves which has always characterized this government. We welcome the opportunity to do it. We will continue to do it.

As we go through these estimates I will welcome to this table in front of me the new Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Food who is in the wings tonight, Mr. R. Gordon Bennett, who is well known to Ontario farmers.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I want to add my congratulations to those expressed to the minister in the presentation of his 14th annual agricultural estimates budget. I know that he has been a very durable person in a particular—

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): Very capable one, too.

Mr. Gaunt: —form of activity where longevity isn't really one of the strong points. The minister has managed to endure through the years and to stay with this portfolio—a rather difficult portfolio, I might say—and he has been able to weather the storms, the ups and the downs, and come out on top.

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): The member is halfway over there, Bill.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member for Huron-Bruce is right. Very capable—that's right.

Mr. Gaunt: Well, I must say that I haven't always agreed with some of the policies, but I recognize that—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: We wouldn't expect you to.

An hon. member: He's done his best.

Mr. Gaunt: —the minister has tried his best and put forward his best effort; and I think he is recognized as being capable and well respected throughout the agricultural industry.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): But not as respected as the member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. Foulds: Even though working with difficult colleagues.

An hon. member: Easy to replace.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: How would you know?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gaunt: That's the good news; and now the bad news.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, there's no bad news.

Mr. Foulds: The good news is the Minister of Agriculture and Food, the bad news is the Chairman of Management Board.

Mr. Gaunt: In any case, I wanted to get on with the estimates tonight and to deal with some of the programmes the minister has announced; and I was particularly interested in the Ontario young farmer credit programme. I'm not sure I can identify this programme—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Gaunt: —with any one particular person, but perhaps I can associate it, at least in part, with my good friend the new Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Food, Mr. Gordon Bennett, whom I must congratulate at this point. I have known Mr. Bennett for many years. He served as agriculture representative in Huron county for a number of years. He was very highly regarded. And so I pay tribute to him and wish him the very best.

I don't know whether this particular programme is going to really serve the critical need that exists in the farm community today insofar as young farmers getting into farming is concerned. I listened rather carefully to the minister and I understood him to say this was a bank guarantee the province is going to undertake for young farmers who are getting started in farming and who wish to have added capital for the operation. Undoubtedly that is a very important need and hopefully this kind of programme—I think it's \$25 million that the ministry is setting aside for it—will be of some assistance in that very critical and important area. I would certainly hope so.

I think, though, that when one takes a look at the overall problem related to the agricultural industry in the province today, one can't help but be somewhat saddened, discouraged and even depressed, at what one sees. Ontario, over the past number of years, and specifically 15 years, has been losing its place as the pre-eminent agricultural province in Canada. I think this has been due to the policies and lack of commitments of this government in relation to agriculture.

I was very startled to see some figures that showed this in a rather dramatic fashion where in many of the major commodities we have slipped back in terms of production over the past number of years.

The cattle output, for instance, taking the years 1960 to 1964—and I'm quoting from the table that was part of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture brief when they presented their story to the cabinet six weeks or so ago—the figures indicate that the cattle output now as compared to the Sixties has dropped two per cent, the hog output has dropped 3.3 per cent during the same period, the egg output has dropped 1.5 per cent and the poultry output has dropped 3.8 per cent.

The only area in which we're holding our own here in the Province of Ontario is in the field of milk production. We're holding our own both in the industrial milk production and in the fluid production. Even though our population is increasing, the actual output is remaining fairly constant or edging up slightly.

I think in a province such as this, a province that has enjoyed the status agriculturally that Ontario has enjoyed, this kind of picture is to be regretted. Such a deficit from the provincial requirements is certainly a serious cause for concern in a world where food resources are increasingly scarce. I think it's fair to say that we have a lot of the attributes to produce agricultural foods and commodities in this province, and it seems for one reason or the other that we're not fully utilizing them.

Interestingly enough, I notice that Saskatchewan, for instance, last year I believe it was, in 1974, for the first time overtook Ontario in farm cash receipts. Four years ago, in 1970, Ontario's gross farm income was double that of Saskatchewan. And so we've seen a consistent pattern—

Mr. Haggerty: The minister shakes his head. You can't believe it, can you?

Mr. Gaunt: —over the last 15 years, where a number of these other provinces have gradually increased their total percentage of

the agricultural output while we in Ontario have declined. Ontario's share of the Canadian farm production in major commodities has declined persistently over the last 15 years. That was one of the major points that was made—

Mr. Martel: A socialist plot, Bill.

Mr. Gaunt: —in the Federation of Agriculture brief which was presented, as I indicated, a few weeks ago. We have good soils, a favourable climate and an invaluable farming area, particularly in its capacity for producing a variety of foods, and it seems to me that it's really unthinkable that we should let such an outstanding opportunity go by default with such clear warnings of its international importance all around us.

People are starving in many places throughout the world and we here in the province are, as I say, for one reason or the other, declining consistently in our agricultural productivity and output. Unless we take positive action to reverse the present drift, we will be in a serious deficit position in all of the major food items within the next 20 years. As I understand it, according to the people who should know, if the present trend continues unabated we will be importing 60 per cent of the food needs in this Province of Ontario by the year 2000.

Mr. Haggerty: We are doing quite a bit of it today.

Mr. Gaunt: There are other things on the agricultural scene that are rather disturbing and unsettling. The matters of rapidly rising input costs have been related in this House time and time again. I don't want to repeat them at any length, other than to say that the inputs of fertilizer, baler twine and machinery are continuing to escalate at very rapid rates and, when combined with falling prices to the farmers, are putting them in very difficult financial straits indeed.

I don't think it is a case any more of a farmer being able really to get by by simply tightening his belt. We are at an entirely new price plateau now with respect to input costs. At one time when farmers faced depressed prices they were able to cut back on their demands and they were able to curtail their requirements insofar as the various inputs were concerned and so they were able to get by the rough periods. I don't think that applies any longer, particularly with the prices we are experiencing at the moment. They just simply can't do it. I have a number of feedlot operators in my riding who are losing huge

sums of money. I was told the other day that one operator in my area had lost \$84,000 in 1974 on his beef operation and many of the other beef operators have lost corresponding amounts.

I say again, that it is simply not possible for a farmer to ride out the rough periods any more. Unless something is done by this ministry, and hopefully in concert with the federal ministry, then I think we are going to be in very serious trouble in this province agriculturally and perhaps throughout the entire nation.

I think energy is one of the big factors in input costs with respect to farmers. Huge consumption of gasoline, diesel fuel and hydro takes place on the farms. These things are very important to farm people. When the price of these commodities goes up, it certainly affects the farmers in a very dramatic fashion.

The 30 per cent increase in hydro rates that is proposed is a situation that is going to affect the farm community very dramatically. It is interesting to note that rural residential rates are lower than farm rates. Farmers use about two per cent of the total kilowatt-hours in Ontario, but this amounts to more than four per cent of Ontario Hydro's total revenue. That's an inequity that should have been corrected long ago, but it hasn't been. When we are talking in terms of hydro going up 30 per cent, this certainly has a very bad impact on farmers and their input costs because they are not able to get that back out of the marketplace. They can't pass that added cost on, as can many other people in the system.

I look around too and I see the consequences of unguided urbanization. From 1966 to 1971, 500,000 acres went out of production. I think we are only starting to suffer the consequences of that particular event.

It seems to me that we must have a commitment on the part of this government to preserve good agricultural land. We have talked about this time and time again in the House. I have talked about it a number of times in the estimates, but as yet we see no firm commitment on the part of the government in this regard.

Good land continues to go out of agricultural production. Farmers continue to leave the land in droves. There were 127,000 fewer farmers in 1971 than a decade earlier, and a loss of more than seven farms every day.

Between 1961 and 1971, Canada lost 1.7 per cent of its farm acreage. Ontario lost 14.1 per cent, eight times the national aver-

age. If that rate continues, Ontario's supply of arable land will disappear before the year 2,000; or as my leader said in the Throne debate, before the Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell) celebrates his 90th birthday.

It seems to me these are things that are very tough to face in the agricultural community. We have, on the one hand, the fact that input costs are going out of sight, while on the other hand the prices are falling back. The costs of an efficient corn grower, I am told, have increased over the last two years by over 55 per cent. Total net farm income last year decreased by 23 per cent; and again this year there's a further decrease expected, in the neighbourhood of 12 per cent.

That's the reason I say, Mr. Chairman, as one looks around and sees the situation as it presently stands on the farm today, it's rather sad and even depressing. That's why I say this government is going to have to come in with some form of policy, an Ontario farm income protection plan, which we talked about last year, which the federation talked about this year, and which I would like to talk about for a few minutes tonight.

I think really this is the only long-term answer with respect to assuring farm people that at least they will get their cost of production back when they produce the food. In my view, unless they are given this kind of assurance, we're going to continue to lose good agricultural land to urbanization. We're going to continue to lose farmers to the cities and to industry; they're going to continue to leave farming in droves, as they've done in the past decade.

I think that this government has to commit more than the \$20 million it has committed to the stabilization programme. That \$20 million is just a drop in the bucket for the kinds of things that have to be done if the minister really felt seriously about this matter—to launch the types of programmes that are going to give the farmers in this province the type of guarantee we're talking about.

If the \$20 million was applied to the corn growers in this province—as was indicated in the most recent edition of Farm and Country—it would provide protection of 20 cents per bushel. Current production costs are \$2.50 per bushel; price predictions for harvest are \$1.50 per bushel. So, the 20-cent protection would leave an 80-cent deficit.

If the amount was applied solely to protect pork producers, it would amount to \$6 per pig.

I think we can assume that this kind of

programme would be spread throughout a number of commodities, and just wouldn't apply to any single commodity. And so, when we take a look at it on that basis, we see that the programme is really a negligible one, to say the least. It really wouldn't do anything for the farmers to meet their increasing production costs.

Last year's operating expenses for Ontario farmers totalled \$1.6 billion. The proposed \$2 increase in the well-head price of oil would cost Ontario farmers an additional \$16.8 million in one year, so it would almost wipe out the entire benefit of the \$20 million on that one item alone.

I think Ontario farmers deserve better than that. After all, Ontario farmers did pay \$31 million in property taxes last year; \$194 million in wages; \$113 million in interest payments; \$247 million for farm machinery; \$98 million for fertilizer; \$452 million for feed; and \$16 million for seed and plants.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that if the government were really serious about doing something for the farm community, they would certainly redirect that \$108 million they're giving to industry for production machinery, which really won't produce one job. I think all of us who look at the programme will readily admit that. There's not one job guarantee in the entire \$108 million, and yet you're providing this kind of thing to industry.

If you can do it for industry, it would be far better to do it for the agricultural community. It would certainly do a lot more good for the total economy if it were applied in the agricultural industry, rather than where it's being applied at the moment.

I notice the BC government has budgeted \$27 million for income assurance in 1975. It expects to pay out something just a shade over \$26 million in claims. The Ontario farming industry has roughly six times the volume of BC agricultural production and I think it is fair to say we should be prepared to provide at least six times the amount of money to support our agricultural industry in this province as is BC.

Mr. Martel: Isn't the Minister of Agriculture and Food the one who said the socialists do nothing for the farmers? Was that you who said—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. You will have your chance.

Mr. Martel: I want to ask the minister. Every time he gets up he rants about socialists.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The member for Huron-Bruce has the floor.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I was just making the point that in this province I think we simply have to countenance the kind of income protection plan promoted by the Ontario Federation of Agriculture. There are certain aspects of it which can be adapted, I am sure; basically the concept is sound as far as I am concerned.

I know the matter of the OFA being the sole negotiator is a point of contention but I think that's a point which can be negotiated. There's no reason in the world why all members of the farm organizational community can't sit on that negotiating board. I am sure that kind of thing could be worked out with the federation and with the other farm organizations in the province.

I don't see that as any great stumbling block. I say again I think the concept is sound. I think it's workable and I think the minister should definitely consider it.

This kind of income protection is necessary when one considers that farmers in this province are making $2\frac{1}{2}$ times more money per year from increased land values than from product sales. It's no wonder they are leaving the land.

If one considers the amount of benefit the total economy derives from pumping this kind of money into the agricultural community, I think it can be substantiated that it produces a benefit which far outweighs most, if not all, money spent in other sectors of the economy by government.

Ontario farmers and, indeed, farmers throughout are the best spenders in the world; if they make a dollar, they spend it. I think the resulting lift to what the Treasurer has termed the sagging economy would be remarkable indeed if this kind of money could be pumped into the farm community. It would not only provide the security which is absolutely necessary to farm people in this day and age, it would reverberate through the entire economy, from the farm gate right up through the entire system.

When one considers that one out of every three jobs in this country is either farm connected or indirectly related to the production, manufacture and processing of food, I think we can readily see what sort of impact would be felt with that kind of expenditure in the agricultural community.

I think the minister has an obligation. I know of no finer way for him to put his seal

on the agricultural community as he moves into the sunset of his political career than to come in with—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gaunt: —this kind of income protection plan. I know he has thought about it. I know it has a certain attraction for him but I suggest to him that he would be doing the farmers of this province a real service if he would make an announcement now that he was prepared to commit this kind of money to see that the farmers are given this kind of assurance.

Mr. Martel: The House leader won't give it to him.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I'll give him anything he asks for.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Minister, go ahead and ask for it quickly.

Mr. Gaunt: Don't leave it until an election is called, do it now; because I think we all realize that if people are going to be fed in this country at reasonable prices we have to ensure that our farmers are going to make a reasonable return—

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Minister, that is real power.

Mr. Gaunt: —on their investment, for their labour and for the risk that they put into the production of food. I don't think we can expect our farmers in this province to carry the full risk of food production any longer, and this is a way in which the government can show its intention and say to the farmers of the province: "Look, we don't want you to bear the brunt of the vagaries of the marketplace any longer. We're prepared to help you."

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member must have been reading the minister's speeches. That is exactly what he is going to say.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I wonder if the hon. member would complete his remarks.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I'm just about through. I can finish up in a minute or two if you want, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Martel: To adjourn the debate you will need a motion to sit past 10:30.

Mr. Gaunt: If you wish, I can wind up very quickly, or if you want me to carry on tomorrow, I can do that too. The only thing is, Mr. Chairman, if I start tomorrow I'll be another 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman: Do the hon. members of the committee agree?

Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will return to the consideration of the estimates of the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. Clement). So that they can be prepared, I would like to inform my colleagues in the House that on Monday our first order of business will be item 11. I hope, if the minister is available to me, to call item 10. Tomorrow I will announce the business further.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, May 1, 1975

Election Finances Reform Act, reported	1425
Third reading	1438
Estimates, Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Mr. Stewart	1438
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	1446



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fifth Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Friday, May 2, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

Daily index of proceedings appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff (Phone: 965-2159).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MAY 2, 1975

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, I wish this morning to introduce to the House the last four remaining members of that entertainment group from World War I known as the Dumbells. They were formed in France in 1917 and I think we all know the story of their successes and morale boosting. In the past, after that conflict, they appeared all over the world, one might say, but in particular they appeared at what is known as Lambert Lodge in Toronto, and through the courtesy of Mr. Bill MacNeil and Cy Strange of the CBC, they've been brought to Toronto for a reunion back at Lambert Lodge tomorrow evening before the destruction of that edifice.

I am then pleased to acknowledge these members here this morning—Jack McLaren of Goderich, Jack Ayre of Toronto, Bill Redpath of Toronto and Jerry Brayford of British Columbia. I might say that they have been in Toronto since last Wednesday and I think they're still able to do a little heel-kicking. Mr. Speaker, through you to the assembly, I would like to introduce these gentlemen.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, from this side of the House, we too would like to join in welcoming this group representative of a very interesting and distinguished part of the entertainment history of our nation. I suppose, coming into a room like this, they may find before the morning is over that some of the lines and some of the comments date back to the things they thought were funny 60 years ago. We are pleased to welcome them.

We remember the stories of what happened in the trenches and as I recall it, their brigade patch, which was in the form of a dumb-bell, started the whole thing for that happy troupe of those who were prepared to bring a little light and joy into lives that were shattered not only by war but by the aftermath of war. We are indeed honoured that you can be with us this morning.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our group, I would like to add to those words of welcome. Perhaps some of us in this House don't quite remember when these boys did their stuff across the world, but there are some of us who were very small boys at that time who do have some recollection of the entertainment and the kind of levity and lightness which was brought to the whole situation in those days. I just wanted to add that word and to say that we're delighted to see these men here and we hope they will be returning to meet us once more.

Hon. M. Birch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to welcome to the House, through you, 19 members from the West Hill Collegiate Institute and their teacher, Mrs. Tobias. Would you join me in welcoming them, please?

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the House to join with me in welcoming 30 students under the chairmanship of Mr. Adam from Ecole Notre Dame de la Merci in Coniston. Thank you.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce 35 grade 12 students and their teacher, Mr. Hall, from Thomas L. Kennedy Secondary School, Mississauga. Would the members join me in welcoming them?

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF CIVIL SERVANTS

Hon. A. K. Meen (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 24, 1975, the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) asked certain questions concerning a Ministry of Revenue employee, Mr. Brian Charlton, a property assessor in the Wentworth regional assessment office in Hamilton. I indicated at that time that some of the information the hon. member referred to was new to me and that I was looking into the matter. I wish to reply at this time in more detail.

My investigations show that Mr. Charlton has been involved in various aspects of political activity for some years. Following receipt of a letter sent to Mr. Charlton on Nov. 10, 1970, by the regional assessment commissioner, drawing his attention to certain restrictions on political activity contained in the Public Service Act, Mr. Charlton stated that he was involved in supporting NDP municipal candidates and that the NDP municipal organization was not sponsored by either the federal or the provincial party.

We understand that at the time this correspondence took place neither the regional assessment commissioner nor Mr. Charlton was aware of any regulations which applied specifically to Mr. Charlton's employee classification. It was not until the fall of 1971 that the assessment commissioner became aware that employees in Mr. Charlton's classification were prohibited from taking part in municipal and provincial political activities.

Further, the matter of schedule 2, which lists positions prohibited from taking part in political activities, was at that time under review, and there remained some uncertainty in the commissioner's mind concerning its application to Mr. Charlton.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): My goodness, what a background!

Hon. Mr. Meen: Although we now know that Mr. Charlton expanded his political activities beyond the municipal level, and in fact, was elected president of the Hamilton Mountain New Democratic Party Riding Association, this information did not come to the attention of the regional assessment commissioner until it was reported in the *Hamilton Spectator* on Feb. 28 last. The regional assessment commissioner, upon learning of Mr. Charlton's violation of these prohibitions, referred the matter to the head office of the ministry at Queen's Park.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that in the fall of 1974, in response to a number of inquiries from different offices of my ministry, a memorandum was circulated to all our offices advising of the prohibitions contained in the Public Service Act.

Mr. Martel: Except if one is right at the top.

Hon. Mr. Meen: In respect of Mr. Charlton's case, a review was held at head office which led to a decision to give Mr. Charlton two weeks to choose between his political aspirations and his job with the ministry. This decision was based on two simple facts:

First, Mr. Charlton's political activities are prohibited by section 13 of the Public Service Act, and section 16 of the Act deems such conduct sufficient cause for dismissal. Secondly, the ministry has in the past required other employees to make the same choice. In fact, the precedent by which Mr. Charlton was given two weeks in which to make his decision was based on a case involving an employee who had been elected as an officer of a local riding association of the Progressive Conservative Party.

Mr. Lewis: It was wrong then too.

Hon. Mr. Meen: In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refute in unequivocal terms the suggestion of the member for Scarborough West that the ministry was motivated in its decision by the possibility of an election or by any other political considerations. I can assure the House that we have enforced the prohibitions against political activity contained in the Public Service Act in a fair and even-handed manner, regardless of the political affiliations of the employees involved.

Mr. Martel: No, not if they are at the top.

Mr. Lewis: It is not the affiliations.

Hon. Mr. Meen: In making this reply, I would also like to correct some of the observations on this case made by the hon. member for Scarborough West. Contrary to the member's statement on Thursday, April 24, Mr. Charlton never requested leaves to participate in political activity, as the hon. member for Scarborough West has suggested—

Mr. Lewis: Certainly he did. He took days off work to participate in political activity.

Hon. Mr. Meen: —an action which would have required the approval of the regional assessment commissioner. His absences for political purposes were taken as part of his vacation time and did not require the special attention of the commissioner. Mr. Charlton has confirmed this fact. I repeat Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charlton has confirmed this fact, as do our records.

Mr. Lewis: So?

Hon. Mr. Meen: As previously noted, the extent of Mr. Charlton's activity came to the attention of the commissioner through a newspaper item in late February, 1975, and to the attention of head office immediately thereafter.

Mr. Lewis: That is not true.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Therefore, the hon. member's declaration that these facts are false is a totally erroneous statement.

Mr. Lewis: Well I believe them to be false and I want the minister to know that. I believe them to be false.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Finally, the hon. member suggests that Ontario should provide the public servants of this province with the same rights as are accorded them by the federal government.

Mr. Lewis: No.

Hon. Mr. Meen: He is, or at that time was, obviously unaware of section 32 of the federal Public Service Employment Act, which provides that no employee may work for or against a candidate for election—

Mr. Lewis: But he can take a leave of absence to run.

Hon. Mr. Meen: —to federal or provincial office, or for or against a political party.

If this government followed the suggestion of the hon. member, we would be adopting a far more stringent policy in this regard than presently exists in Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on. This government has the worst policy in Canada.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Finally, I would like to clarify a point Mr. Charlton raised in correspondence to the regional commissioner. Mr. Charlton writes that he is under the impression that, and I quote:

Those sections of the Public Service Act relating to political activities and those sections of the regulations designating job classes ineligible for political activities are all under review. Further, any actions against myself will be postponed until the completion of that review.

This is not the case. In this regard, I would point out that my colleague, the Chairman of Management Board, when asked by the hon. member for Scarborough West whether or not this particular dismissal would be held off until he reviewed the designated categories, disagreed and replied: "I am not going to stand here and say that I will withhold whatever action is legal in this particular instance." Further, any such review of the Act would have to be fairly extensive and would not necessarily result in any change that would assist Mr. Charlton.

There is one aspect of this matter which I think should be emphasized, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Charlton's conduct to date is grounds for dismissal; however, it is not our intention that he should be dismissed for his violation of the Public Service Act to date. It is our intention that further violation cannot be condoned or permitted. Mr. Charlton, who is an otherwise desirable employee, is, at present, knowingly in contravention of the Public Service Act, and the status of his employment will be determined by a decision solely of his choice.

Mr. Lewis: That's fair.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Due to his apparent misunderstanding of the action we might take, as indicated in his recent correspondence which I have cited, he will be given a further week in which to inform us of his decision.

Mr. Speaker: as a result of my review of the facts surrounding this matter, I have concluded that Mr. Charlton is being treated in a fair and equitable manner, consistent with the treatment of other employees in a similar position.

Mr. Martel: Not those at the top. What about the campaign manager for the Minister of Culture and Recreation (Mr. Welch)?

UNIVERSITY GRANTS

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to advise the House today that the BIU value which will be used for calculating 1975-1976 operating grants for the universities will be increased a further \$3 to \$2,111. This is made possible as the actual enrolment on which the 1975-1976 grants will be based is slightly lower than we had forecast earlier.

The Ontario Council on University Affairs had indicated to me that should funds remain after the allocation of the extra-formula grants, these should be distributed as formula grants. This increase is being achieved with the global expenditure limit of \$568 million that I advised the House of last November.

In addition, in order to relieve some of the pressure on university operating funds, we are reviewing the needs in the area of physical facility maintenance of the university system. I will inform the House when this review is completed and we see what action we are able to take to assist them.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION POLICY

Hon. J. R. Rhodes (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, the

hon. members will undoubtedly have noted recent press releases and statements by the federal Minister of Transport concerning studies presently under way by his officials toward the preparation of a new and comprehensive national transportation policy. On Feb. 17 of this year, for example, Mr. Marchand told the House of Commons, in response to a question:

The policy, which I hope can be announced shortly, will cover not only the regional air carriers, but it will cover the third level air carriers, the railways, the highways—it will cover everything that moves in Canada.

I believe it is appropriate for me to take this opportunity to inform the House concerning the views of the government of Ontario respecting these developments, especially since I have been informed by persons in the transportation industry that federal officials have given the impression that Ontario is actively involved in the definition and the conduct of these studies.

It is my understanding that the present activities in Ottawa stem from the announcement in the federal Throne Speech of last September, as follows:

The government of Canada is conducting a comprehensive examination of existing ground, air, and marine transportation systems to meet present and growing future demands for passenger and goods services. Also under review are the roles of the various bodies which manage, operate and regulate the transportation system. The aim is to determine the role of government in both the public and private sectors of transportation, the most rational use of available capital resources and the most appropriate means of balancing existing regulation and direct government intervention. While the co-operation of all parties will be sought, these problems are of a scale that they require federal government co-ordination.

This statement, especially when it is read in context with Mr. Marchand's remark, which I quoted earlier, raises some obvious questions concerning the role of the provinces in the development of policies to cover "everything that moves in Canada."

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Does it include bicycles?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The review of national transportation policies which is currently under way has been conceived and is being carried out entirely within the federal government. The federal minister and his officials

have been kind enough to provide briefings as to their work plans, but there has been no active involvement by Ontario to date.

I must confess that I personally am still rather unclear as to the objectives and the time frame of the federal study. If its objective is simply to resolve internal questions, such as the power of the federal minister to set overall policy for the various transportation agencies which report to him or to resolve specific national scale questions of undoubted federal competence, such as the capacity of the railroads through the Rockies, the requirements for a Canadian merchant marine or the retirement of the Seaway debt, then the federal initiative is appropriate, although affected provincial governments will undoubtedly wish to have an opportunity to express their views before final decisions are reached.

But if, as I suspect, the federal government is proposing to make decisions on a broader and more detailed scale which will directly affect this province and its ability to make appropriate use of transportation to achieve its own legitimate economic and social objectives, then the active participation of Ontario is required. The federal government does not have a mandate covering "everything that moves in Canada"—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Give them Krauss-Maffei.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes:—nor do the broad objectives of the federal government make it an appropriate body to embark upon a unilateral review of policies which will have a direct impact upon the regional development of this province or the service requirements of Ontario municipalities.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Krauss-Maffei doesn't move, so this government's safe.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I raise this matter this morning, Mr. Speaker, not out of any intention to make the federal government's path more difficult—and let me say that it is indeed an extremely complex task upon which my federal colleague has embarked—but, quite frankly, because I fear that the political pressure which exists as a consequence of the federal Throne Speech and of the election campaign promises which preceded it may lead the federal government to use this review as a basis for snap decisions which will adversely affect the ability of this province to meet its responsibility in the transportation field.

The government of Ontario is in no way opposed to the idea of a comprehensive review and an updating of the national transportation policies, although from our perspective we have been reasonably satisfied with the operation within Ontario of the National Transportation Act and with its underlying principles of intermodal competition. While we would not go so far as the federal minister's statement that national transportation policy "is a mess"—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Well, it is.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes:—we do agree that there are a number of problems which are of concern, a number of them specifically related to northern Ontario. Ontario also recognizes that solutions to transportation problems—

Mr. Stokes: It is a mess. For heaven's sake, don't stop them. It's the first time in 30 years they have ever undertaken to do anything.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes:—must be co-ordinated to make the best use of available modes irrespective of formal jurisdiction. It is especially important under current economic conditions that there be a rationalization of the use of the taxpayer's dollar between governments to prevent wasteful expenditures at cross purposes.

For these reasons, Ontario welcomes the idea of a comprehensive review of transportation policies in Canada, but believes that this review, to be successful, must come to grips with the fundamental question of responsibility—of which level of government should be involved with which aspects of transportation services. Let me underline my belief that the issue is no longer a simple question of legal jurisdiction, but of ensuring that each level of government in Canada has the ability to guide and direct transportation services where appropriate to serve its own legitimate social and economic objectives. This may well mean such things as greater federal involvement in the Trans-Canada Highway or greater provincial authority over third-level air carrier and regional rail services.

Improved transportation policies at the national and regional levels can only be achieved by a genuine co-operative approach to existing problems by the federal and provincial governments in Canada. The initiative is presently with the federal government. I know that given an opportunity to become actively involved Ontario can make a contribution toward a new and truly national transportation policy.

Mr. Lewis: What does all that mean?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It's going on the record.

Mr. Lewis: What point is he making?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions. The member for Kitchener.

ONTARIO STUDY ON QUEBEC SEPARATION

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Premier or the Chairman of Management Board, perhaps I could put a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development: Can the minister advise us whether a statement on the "As it Happens" radio programme last night was correct, to his knowledge, that the government of Canada has asked the Province of Ontario to do a study on the results of the separation of the Province of Quebec from Confederation, and the effects on Confederation of that occurrence, should it occur?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am personally not familiar with that. I will take that as notice and draw it to the attention of the appropriate minister.

MERCURY POLLUTION

Mr. Breithaupt: A further question of the same minister, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the matters of mercury pollution which he was investigating. Can the minister now advise us whether members of his staff have contacted the research unit at the Hospital for Sick Children with respect to the new product penicillamine which apparently can help to remove mercury and other heavy metals from the human system?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I drew the attention of my colleague, the Minister of Health (Mr. Miller), to this question when it was asked in his absence—whenever the member opposite did ask the question—and he said he was going to take this matter in hand. I'm afraid the member will have to wait to ask this question of the Minister of Health. I am sure he will have something to report on it.

HOME BUYER GRANT

Mr. Breithaupt: A question of the Minister of Housing, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the

information contained in appendix B to the budget about the Ontario Home Buyers Grant Act. Can the minister clarify for us the comment with respect to item 5 on that page in the budget concerning title or possession of the housing unit especially as in the matter of many condominium units possession might take place but the actual title might not pass for, perhaps, a period of even a year until the units have been completed and the necessary legal work has been attended to?

Can the minister clarify which of those two items is necessary for application for this grant or are both, in fact, required?

Hon. D. R. Irvine (Minister of Housing): Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding both are required but it would not apply to a condominium.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary, the member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, there are people who have moved in who have not yet acquired title to property, people who are renting and who subsequently buy; there are people who have moved into homes ahead of the closing date by special arrangement. Where do they fit into all this? Is the closing date the date to be used for purposes of this grant or some other date? What do we tell people?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: It's the registration of the particular building, whatever it may be, condominium or semi-detached or single home.

Mr. Deans: One other question. The minister says it's the day it is registered in the registry office?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Yes.

Mr. Deans: That's the date? That's different from what we are being told by the ministry. We were told the closing date; that's a different day. Quite frequently they are quite far apart. Is it the day of registry? Could the minister put it on the record so that we know for sure?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, first of all it is my understanding it is the date of registration. I am not the one who made the statement as to whether or not it is something different. If the member for Wentworth is saying that, I have not said so.

Mr. Deans: No, I didn't say the minister did. I said it was from the ministry.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: The Minister of Revenue is the one who is responsible for the implementation of this particular Act.

Mr. Deans: Would the minister tap him and ask him?

Mr. Breithaupt: While the minister is being tapped, perhaps I could ask if condominium units are to be involved in the programme, which I understand they may be, then surely, if a person took possession of a unit on April 9 but because of registration difficulties the actual title to that unit did not pass until Jan. 5 of next year, that person would not receive any of these benefits? Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: That is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that unless the condominium, as a whole unit, is registered the person is out of luck. It has to be registered.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, if I may, the registration is obviously there for the condominium unit as such. That is, that registration may have taken place, but I'm concerned with the actual title from that condominium corporation to the individual, which might not take place within this calendar year.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Again, Mr. Speaker, I say it has to be the total unit that's registered and not the particular unit. One doesn't register one unit; the building is registered as a whole.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Mr. Breithaupt: I'm not sure what the minister means, Mr. Speaker.

MIRRORS ON CARS TOWING TRAILERS

Mr. Breithaupt: I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Is he aware of some interest with respect to the use of additional heavy mirrors on passenger cars pulling trailers? Is there any policy within the ministry that would not only require those mirrors to be used while a trailer is being pulled, but also to perhaps have those mirrors removed when the trailer is not being pulled by a car because of certain pedestrian dangers that might occur from those very large mirrors?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of some concerns on this. In fact, not too long ago I received a letter from the hon. member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook), concerning this very matter, as well as letters from other persons.

All I can say is that we do require that there be adequate rear-view capability on all vehicles on the highway. I can't quote the regulation and the section to the hon. member, but it is required that there be adequate rear-view capability when towing a trailer. At the present time we are looking at the situation as to the mirrors being left on the cars when they are not towing a trailer. The only restriction we would have there now is to the maximum width that is permitted of a vehicle on the highway. We are aware of it.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Scarborough West have a question?

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION POLICY

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. What underlies this statement he made today before the orders of the day? Can he give definitions to this peculiar phrase: "... especially since I have been informed by persons in the transportation industry . . ."? Which part of the industry is putting on the pressure and asking him to clear it up?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, first of all no pressure has been brought to bear at all. It has simply been in general conversations that are bound to occur between my ministry and the various transportation modes in the province. Federal government officials, who are carrying out this particular study, have indicated to them in their conversations that Ontario was actively involved in these studies. I want to make it very clear to this House and state this government's position that we are not actively involved. We would very much like to be involved.

Mr. Lewis: And that is what the statement is all about. It is a request.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: And we are concerned that Mr. Marchand may stand up in the House of Commons and make a statement as to national policy and give the implication that the provinces have been involved when, actually, we have not been.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): By way of a supplementary question, would the minister let me know whether he has had any direct communication with Mr. Marchand about this matter, or whether this is his method of communication with Mr. Marchand? Surely it would be an easy matter for the minister to call his colleague in Ottawa and inform him of his views.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that I have had a number of meetings with Mr. Marchand, the latest being within the last month and a half here in Toronto in my office—meetings with the minister and his officials. We discussed these very matters along with others. I have indicated to him that we were concerned that there was no involvement with the provinces in the development of these **transportation policies**. I can say that there has been some improvement in the discussions at the staff level—and I am gratified that this is happening. I did tell Mr. Marchand at the last meeting—

Mr. Reid: It's a part of the government's election campaign.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I told Mr. Marchand at the last meeting that it was my intention to state Ontario's position on this matter in the Legislature, and he is aware of this statement being made.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have a further supplementary question. What is the nature of the areas in which the minister wishes to be involved? Has he a clear conception of the kind of involvement and active participation that he wishes Ontario to play with Ottawa in this national study?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, the federal government have indicated that they want to revamp the total National Transportation Act and to develop comprehensive policies for the whole country. We totally agree that this is a very worthwhile objective, and we would like to participate in their development.

Our concern is about a statement made by the hon. minister that their policies will cover everything that moves. We're concerned about the federal government making decisions.

Mr. Reid: Krauss-Maffei doesn't—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I wish it would cover their own government. Maybe that's the problem—

Mr. Reid: Krauss-Maffei doesn't move—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The problem is, sir, that we want to make sure that the federal government remembers that this province has certain jurisdictional positions—on highways, on certain types of carriers—

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): I think they are very sensitive to that—almost too sensitive.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We want to discuss how this aspect can be integrated into a national policy without losing our initiatives within the province to develop our own systems for the social and economic well-being of this province.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We simply want to be part of the overall discussion and development and to have our input before any hard policy decisions are made by the minister, such as have been made by the Minister for Communications, which sometimes leaves us in left field.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): A supplementary—

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): A supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A supplementary from the member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. Ruston: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question of the minister: Is he really saying the provincial government wants to have complete control over any subsidies from the federal government, such as the one they announced in their last Throne Speech or before the time of the last election whereby they would be giving grants to municipalities for transit and so forth?

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): They withdrew that, didn't they?

Mr. Ruston: Is the minister saying he wants complete approval of these and he is going to want to have the complete say over any of these things that come from Ottawa? Is that what he is saying?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, what I am saying initially is that we want to be involved in the planning. I hadn't discussed the matter of subsidies, but as the hon. member has brought it forth, absolutely—constitutionally, it is the position of the provinces that they deal with the municipalities and that the federal government does not deal directly with them.

We are simply stating our position, as we have to other ministers, that we are prepared to co-operate and deal with the federal government. But those subsidies and their funding methods quite properly must be processed through the provincial government to the municipality—

Mr. Deans: Why don't the governments just agree on the system?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We don't want to delay them or hold them up, but we want to have some control over what's happening. It must be very clearly understood that if the federal government is allowed to fund directly to municipalities for various projects then in essence the federal government is doing the planning of transportation in this province, and we can't allow that to happen.

Mr. Speaker: Further questions?

Mr. Reid: A supplementary—

Mr. Foulds: A supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are developing quite a few supplementaries. We'll have one from each party. The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Assuming that the minister is invited to actively participate in the formulation of this national policy, is his ministry preparing a position with regard to freight rates as they discriminate against northern Ontario, and particularly northwestern Ontario, in view of the apparent lack of success of his policy of trying to reduce freight rates through the ONR system?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the points we want to be involved in as part of the discussions at the federal level. We have seen the sort of paper that has been put out by the federal government in response to the western provinces concerned and we've read that material. We would like now to discuss the freight rate applications and how we can resolve these problems in northern Ontario. There is no question about that being part of it.

Mr. Reid: A supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: This will be the final supplementary.

Mr. Reid: Could the minister at some time, perhaps next week, give us a fuller account of exactly what the discussions were about with the federal government? He has told us he had the discussions and yet he doesn't seem to be satisfied. Is he perhaps—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question has been asked—

Mr. Reid: If I may, while I'm on my feet, sir, I would like to ask the minister if he is perhaps a little upset because they are

including everything that does move and don't move, such as Krauss-Maffei, things that he is trying to get in under this policy?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): The minister wonders where Trudeau's promises are?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I think what we want to be able to do is to discuss with the federal government what sort of national policies they are developing.

Mr. Reid: What would be discussed?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The problem is, Mr. Speaker, the federal government have a tendency to come out with federal policies and call them national; there is a distinct difference, because they don't discuss them with the provinces.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): Just like this government.

Mr. Reid: This government comes up with province-wide policies which it doesn't discuss with municipalities.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The discussions I have had with Mr. Marchand have dealt with a number of subjects relating to the direction he and his ministry wish to go in developing these policies. He has told us some of the things he plans to do. I'm not at liberty to give this information here—

Mr. Reid: And we have no input?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: He's asked me not to discuss those subjects, rightly so, I think, because they are in the development stage. I have advised the minister that I am concerned about the lack of participation by this province and others in this study that is going on. We want to be involved, to know exactly what is being planned and how it's going to affect our systems in our provinces. All we are saying to him is, let us take part in it. He has been told that our position would be made public here in the Legislature. He is aware of that.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: I haven't the faintest idea what the minister said, but he said it very well. He handled it in an accomplished way. It's quite remarkable.

Mr. Reid: He's been studying the member's speeches.

Mr. Lewis: Well, apparently—and catching on a bit.

STATUS OF PHYSICALLY DISABLED PERSONS

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Minister of Community and Social Services, has he now reviewed the number of people in Ontario who are categorized as permanently unemployable but whom he will not recognize as disabled for purposes of coverage under the GAINS programme? How many are there, and of what does the review consist?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): As the hon. member knows, Mr. Speaker, our estimates start on Monday and I will have a full statement at that time.

Mr. Lewis: Just a second. By way of supplementary, is the minister about to change government policy or is he going to clarify the present situation? If he is going to clarify it Monday, why can't he clarify it Friday?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: The member asked me this question on Tuesday I believe, and at that time I told the hon. member that I would get the figures, and also that there was an ongoing discussion in Ottawa. I was there yesterday and the day before at the federal-provincial conference of welfare ministers. Our officials are meeting today with the federal officials in this very question of the disabled and the permanently unemployable, to get the guidelines defined.

Mr. Lewis: To get the guidelines defined? By way of supplementary, does the minister not think there is something really unacceptable, certainly mean to the recipients, in that he is applying the distinction without having the guidelines? Doesn't he think there is something wrong with placing people in categories for which there are no guidelines, and now he tells the Legislature he is looking for them?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No. My understanding is—and there have been several discussions with the federal government—that if we were to transfer all the permanently unemployable to the GAINS programme many of those would not meet the criteria of the federal government for cost sharing and, at the same time, there was a possibility that we could lose those that are presently being shared. This is what our officials are meeting with those in Ottawa today to clarify.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. Lewis: I just singlemindedly want to follow on this for a moment or two longer. Does the minister realize what he is saying? He has just said to the Legislature that these people, numbering somewhere between 3,000 and 10,000 in Ontario, are the objects of a cost-sharing dispute with Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Does the member not realize that this is developing into a debate?

Mr. Lewis: I'm sorry. All right. May I ask—

Mr. Speaker: The minister has indicated that this same matter will be under full discussion in the estimates at the first of the week.

Mr. Martel: Well, we won't get to it then.

Mr. Lewis: This is the question period and I have a right to use it.

Mr. Speaker: I agree, but it is not a debating period. The hon. member may rephrase his question.

Mr. Lewis: I want to ask the minister why people who are being penalized financially by the government, are now the subject of a cost-sharing dispute? Does he not think he should be evaluating them on their physical merits rather than on who finances the cost?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Again, Mr. Speaker, I think on Monday I will have a full statement on the numbers being transferred and on this whole question of the permanently unemployables as well as the disabled, and I think it makes for a more meaningful discussion at that time.

Mr. Lewis: Well, maybe it will. I have one further question then. If these people who are receiving family benefits and are permanently unemployable are receiving a Canada Pension Plan disability pension, which many of them are, recognized for disability by the federal government, why has Ontario not recognized them for disability as a provincial government?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, again, the criteria for eligibility under the Canada Assistance Plan are different criteria from those under the family benefits programme as well as under the GAINS programme.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF CIVIL SERVANTS

Mr. Lewis: To the Minister of Revenue: What was that business in the first part of his statement today, that the regional officer involved didn't understand the interpretation of the Act, that it was under review and that he just let it go as it applied to Mr. Charlton?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, in November, 1970, about the same time as the correspondence was exchanged between the commissioner and Mr. Charlton, a regulation was passed, and I understand that it only came to his attention later in 1971. At that time the whole matter had been, as everyone had understood it, under review. But later in 1971 when the regulation was passed which took assessors 3 into the prescribed category—prohibition of political activity—he then notified all the people in his branch and others of the nature of the regulation.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister still hold to the belief that in the intervening four years of explicit and publicized political activity the superiors for this man never knew until early 1975 of his involvement? Does the minister hold that to be a believable statement?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, I questioned the commissioner at length and I concluded that, however difficult it may be to understand with the degree of activity that Mr. Charlton had, he would not have known of it. I have concluded that, in fact, he did not know of it.

Mr. Breithaupt: Nobody knew he was in the NDP?

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary; the member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Why are assessors 3 excluded from participating in political activities? What justification is there?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, they are involved in the assessment of value of everyone's home. They are dealing with matters of a very difficult nature, one might say. It has been felt that they were in an area in which it was not desirable that they should take part in political activity. I mention that the matter is under review.

Mr. Lewis: It's forever under review. People lose their jobs in the process.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I am not suggesting that any change is going to take place. I per-

sonally feel that civil servants should be apolitical.

Mr. Lewis: Apolitical, why? The minister is unbelievable. What does he mean by apolitical?

Hon. Mr. Meen: In the sense of overt activities—

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister know how many civil servants support the Tory party?

Hon. Mr. Meen: —on the part of a provincial or a federal political party.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister mean all those mandarins under the gallery there should be apolitical?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I am expressing my personal view as to the role of the civil servant. It happens that there are still exemptions from the categories of exclusion—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Meen: —and then there are the other categories of preclusion from political activity.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? The member for Downsview.

LAWRENCE HEIGHTS COMMUNITY CENTRE

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Housing. Could the minister advise us whether or not arrangements and agreements have now been completed by his department, the federal department and/or CMHC and the municipality, either of metropolitan Toronto or North York, to reconstruct the community centre—the one that was burnt down—and other appurtenances in Lawrence Heights—or are there still barriers between the various levels of government that haven't been determined?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I have a proposal which is agreeable to ourselves and to the federal government, but whether it is agreeable to the borough is another question. It has been before them for some while. I think it is a fair proposal.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, since the proposal that the minister now has in hand is agreeable to the federal government and is agreeable to the Ontario government, would the minister do everything in his power to get the thing under way so that the people

in that community—the nearly 6,000 of them—can begin to use the community centre before the snow flies again?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, absolutely. I would be only too delighted to go ahead as has been suggested. We have already said that we are in agreement. I am not sure that the borough is in agreement with the amount of money they are receiving. I think that's the holdup.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur.

STAFF FOR ASSOCIATIONS FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED

Mr. Foulds: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With the disappearance of the Minister of Community and Social Services, I would like to ask a question of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development. Why is it that new positions, which I believe are called protective counsellors and workers for the mentally retarded, are being advertised for and selected by the Ministry of Community and Social Services? Why are they being put on the staffs of the associations for the mentally retarded without guaranteeing to the associations for the mentally retarded funding from the government for paying these people?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, that is an internal problem within the ministry itself, one I have no jurisdiction over. I find it very difficult to believe that such a situation does exist; in fact, funding has been approved for the mentally retarded programme to include just those kinds of people the member has been speaking about. There is every indication that certainly the local associations will receive the funding required to provide those kinds of workers.

Mr. Foulds: A supplementary, if I might, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister not aware that the associations, by and large, have not been guaranteed funding beyond, I believe, a nine-month period? They are very afraid they may have to phase out the positions—obviously valuable and valid ones—if the funding is not continued and guaranteed. Is this an attempt to sort of hide or keep down the number of civil servants so the government can keep its promise not to increase civil servants? Surely, this is not the sort of issue on which that kind of fooling around should take place?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I will take the member's question as notice and get that information from the minister.

Mr. Speaker: The member for St. George.

LYNWOOD AVE. ENTERPRISES LTD.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, my question is of the Minister of Housing. Is the Minister of Housing aware of a situation relating to Lynwood Ave. Enterprises Ltd. when, on the purchase and sale of that property to tenants—40 per cent of whom are between the ages of 60 and 94—and who have resided there for up to 40 years—two of whom, at least, are now facing a monthly rental increase of \$200? Does he feel his present policy of waiting until he builds new housing is really going to solve that kind of problem?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the particular project the member has referred to. I would be happy to receive the details if she would be kind enough to give them to me.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury East.

HEALTH AND SAFETY HAZARDS AT ELLIOT LAKE

Mr. Martel: Yes. A question of the Minister of Natural Resources. In view of the fact that it is now approximately one year since the conditions at Elliot Lake came to the fore and throughout that period of time the men have continued to work in the same conditions, can the minister indicate when some action is going to be taken whereby the men will no longer be exposed to dust levels which are considered hazardous?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I think it is entirely incorrect to say that in the past year nothing has been done in the Elliot Lake area by our mine safety branch on the working conditions in the mine.

Mr. Martel: Yes, it has done some studies but the conditions are still the same.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They are not the same, Mr. Speaker, and I want to make that very emphatic.

Mr. P. Taylor (Carleton East): They are still dangerous.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Tremendous improvements have been undertaken in the Elliot

Lake area. I strongly object to the NDP and the member for Sudbury East constantly saying there are no improvements being made in the Elliot Lake area. This is entirely incorrect. I think the member is doing a dis-service to the people of Elliot Lake and the people of this province by continually saying that nothing is being done.

In addition to the improvements in the Elliot Lake area, we will have a major policy statement to make, possibly next week, dealing with the entire situation.

Mr. Martel: Is it not a fact that until last month the conditions in the majority of the places where the men worked were in excess of TLV limits? Is it not a fact that Dr. Stewart has indicated there would be another 100 cases of silicosis if we didn't move and that conditions still are virtually the same?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, Mr. Speaker, it is not a fact.

Mr. Martel: It is a fact and the minister knows it.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It is not a fact. There are certain areas within any mine where the dust levels are higher for a specific period of time.

Mr. Martel: A year after.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We are dealing with the situation and I am very confident that we will resolve it to the satisfaction of those workers at Elliot Lake.

Mr. Reid: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The final supplementary.

Mr. Reid: Could the minister table in the Legislature, the reports on the dust levels in the various parts of the mine over the last year?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, these reports are made public and they are posted at the mine site for all to see. They are available and I will attempt to see if I can get them to date and have them forwarded to the member.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

WINDSOR PROVINCIAL PUBLIC BUILDING

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Government Services. Would the min-

ister care to tell the House the status of the provincial public building that now has been promised for quite a few number of years?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): In Windsor?

Mr. B. Newman: In the Windsor area.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Oh, the Windsor building, Yes, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe there really has been change in the status of that project since the member asked me last.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Snow: The architectural drawings have now been completed. As the member knows the site was settled some time ago. The architectural drawings have just been completed. The building was not included in our capital programme this year, as many of our projects that were in the planning stages in all areas of the province had to be left out of the capital construction programme because of budgetary constraints imposed by the Treasurer. So we do not have it in our capital programme for this year.

Mr. B. Newman: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Snow: I might say, Mr. Speaker, that there is some consideration being given as to the possibility of this building and certain others being considered as leaseback buildings, and there has been no determination on this as of this time.

Mr. B. Newman: Would the minister consider for the time being the use of the Steinberg block, that is directly across from the county courts building in the city, until he can construct a provincial public building? Mr. Minister, the government has been promising this since before 1959.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I would point out that, in general, all of the government facilities in the city of Windsor are quite well accommodated at this time.

Mr. B. Newman: The registry office— is the minister satisfied with that?

Hon. Mr. Snow: The registry office is one facility that certainly does need improved accommodation, but in general the offices are reasonably well accommodated. I am still very strongly recommending to the government and my colleagues that we build a consolidated building to give the registry office proper accommodation and to bring the provincial

offices together to better be able to serve the people of Windsor.

We have looked at the Steinberg building. I have had some of my senior staff visit Windsor and do a report on this building for me, or make some recommendations to me. The costs were going to be very high, although the rental rate, I understood, would have been quite low on a per square foot base. The costs would have been very high for transforming a department store with no windows and so on, into suitable office accommodation. We did not feel it was a suitable long-term arrangement to do this, and the costs were just too high for short-term.

I would like to put my energies into getting the building that is planned ahead as quickly as possible, rather than spend money on something that will not be a permanent solution.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor West.

REMOVAL OF RED GLASS FROM LEGISLATIVE STAR

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, a question of either yourself, or the Minister of Government Services. Perhaps you could advise us as to whom we direct questions relating to the building that comes under the Speaker's jurisdiction. Can we ask it of yourself, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: It would have to be the minister.

Mr. Bounsall: But, anyway, the question is: Are they aware that the red glass is being removed from the red star which shines in front of the building to alert the citizenry of Toronto when the members sit beyond the normal working hours? Why is that red glass in that traditional red star being removed?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I don't know, Mr. Speaker—do you want me to answer on your behalf?

Mr. Speaker: If the member would care to send me a letter, I would get the answer for him and forward it to him.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Really, I would like to see a blue light up there, but on the other hand—

Mr. G. Nixon (Dovercourt): Right on.

Mr. Singer: There is little time left to be able to do that.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I believe it would be—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the NDP gets in, it will be a big red light.

Mr. Stokes: A green one.

Hon. Mr. Snow: As I believe the instructions for the change came from the Office of the Speaker, I would suggest that maybe the member deal with this by way of a letter to the Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The red light district.

Mr. Speaker: If you write to me, I will give you the answer.

A new question? The member for Rainy River.

REFORESTATION PROGRAMME

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. Since the Ontario Professional Foresters Association has written to the minister and expressed its concern about the way we're falling behind in regenerating our forests, what action does the minister intend to take? And can he indicate to the House just how far behind our replanting and reforestation are behind what we're using in any given year?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I think if the member will recall the discussions during my estimates in committee, I did relate to him at that time the programme we were involved in. It's a 10-year programme and we're in the third year of that particular programme now. For the last three years we've been allocated funds over and above our regular programme for a regeneration programme. I might say in connection with the foresters that they're quite concerned as to our position. In the overall picture, I'm confident that the moves we've made in the last three years are very positive ones. As an example, we have a total, I think, of around 800 people now involved in a forestry programme throughout the province.

Mr. Martel: The minister is being irresponsible, too.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: In fact, last year alone I think we engaged something like 35 or 40 additional foresters. So we are moving ahead in the direction that I think they would like to see us go.

I think that that particular letter was written prior to the woodland tax rebate programme—

Mr. Reid: It just came out.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —which we introduced just last week, which will further accelerate wood production on private woodlots.

I am confident that the direction we're moving in is the correct one. To say exactly where we stand in the overall picture, I'm afraid I don't have that information at my fingertips.

Mr. Reid: A short supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker: Is it not a fact that even with the ministry's 10-year programme we're constantly falling behind and that in about a 40-year period we're not going to have enough merchantable wood to use either for lumber or for pulp and paper in the Province of Ontario, even with the 10-year programme?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, that is not correct, Mr. Speaker. We set a target for wood that will be available in the year 2020 and, to my knowledge, we'll be able to reach that target.

WORKING HOURS FOR TRUCK DRIVERS

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Labour. Has the minister had any success in finding a way of protecting truck drivers operating in this province from the excessive hours of driving now being demanded of them by trucking firms, some of which are now American-owned?

Hon. J. P. MacBeth (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I have not found any manner adequately to combat it. The problem, as the member knows, is a divided jurisdiction between the federal and our own provincial authorities. Our own province is quite strict with the trucking industry concerning the hours of work. We feel that there should be more control at the federal level because, as the member for Sandwich-Riverside realizes, people travelling on the highways who have not had adequate rest are a real danger. It's a safety factor which I'm searching for ways to control.

Mr. Burr: How hard is the minister pressing the federal ministry on this matter?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: That's a question, I suppose, sir, of judgement. Probably not as hard as the member for Sandwich-Riverside suggests he would like me to do, but I will undertake to press harder.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

NEW HOME ASSESSMENT DELAY

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Revenue. Is the Minister of Revenue aware that in the assessment department of his ministry in many municipalities if people move into homes they may live there from six to eight months before the assessment is finalized so that the municipality can put them on its tax rate?

Hon. Mr. Meen: No, I'm not, Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that through some mechanism, either in the municipalities or in my assessment offices or, generally speaking, in both, the assessors would be aware of the completion of a dwelling and its occupancy and there would be a supplementary assessment issued. I think it is under section 43A of the Assessment Act. To repeat, I am not aware of any great delay in that regard.

SMOKING BAN IN INDUSTRY

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: I have a question of the Minister of Labour. Is he aware of the announcement or statement by the Minister of Health that it is his intention to ban smoking in certain areas of industrial plants where the combination of smoke or smoking and industrial dust emissions is believed to cause cancer? Is the minister convinced that it is possible for the Workmen's Compensation Board to deal fairly with employees who may have contracted cancer, given that the minister has established a correlation between smoking and dust emissions?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I understand the medical authorities agree there is a correlation between smoking and dust for people working in dusty environments.

We can ban it, as I think we are prepared to do on the recommendation from the Minister of Health. We can say, "This is an area in which you cannot smoke." I think there is some added danger from inhaling cigarette smoke; maybe one takes in more of the environmental dust at the same time.

The real problem is the fact that people smoke at all and there is no way of banning smoking when they are out of the particular environment over which my ministry may have some jurisdiction. It's the fact that they smoke as well as work in a dust environment which is the real problem. I don't know how the Workmen's Compensation Board could try to differentiate between the two.

Certainly, banning smoking is one of the possibilities we are considering—we do it in certain places now—particularly tied in with this dust environment.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Can the minister assure the House that the Compensation Board will not attempt to use the fact that a person smokes as a reason either for disallowing or for cutting down on the degree of pensionability of any individual who has contracted disease in the place of work?

Secondly, doesn't he think it makes more sense to do away with the emissions?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, no, I cannot give my friend the assurance that the Workmen's Compensation Board will not consider whether smoking away from the environment has caused the person's condition. I don't think it would be right to do that because we are looking at compensable injuries which have arisen out of the workplace. If there is some evidence, and I don't know how they do it, to show this was not caused by the workplace but by smoking generally, I think it is the board's duty to take that into consideration.

Mr. Lewis: Is he opening the door for the board.

Mr. Deans: He is going to have an awful lot of problems.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to minimize the difficulty the board has. The philosophy of the board, which the government supports, is if there is a question the doubt should be in favour of the worker. If it is clear-cut that this man developed cancer from something other than the environment, I don't think the board can take that into consideration as far as awarding of compensation is concerned.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Welland South.

ONTARIO ENERGY CORP.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. Since the establishment of the Ontario Energy Corp. last December, could the minister inform the House in which direction this corporation is moving now to reduce the energy crisis? Is it doing any exploration at all?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This question should properly be directed to the Minister of Energy. I will take it as notice and draw it to his attention.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury.

SUBSIDIZED DINING FOR MEMBERS

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Government Services. How does the minister justify subsidizing meals in the legislative dining room to the extent of \$1,000 a year when most of the people, the members, the press gallery and the government officials would not meet the means test for public welfare?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the member direct that question to you in writing as this matter falls under the jurisdiction of the Speaker's office.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

I recognize the member for Durham.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the members of the Legislature would be pleased to join with me in welcoming some 35 students and their teacher, Mrs. McCallum, from Clarke High School in the riding of Durham.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. Ewen from the standing committee on the administration of justice presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill 36, An Act to amend the Corporations Tax Act, 1972.

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendments:

Bill 35, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act.

Mr. Speaker: Shall these bills be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 35, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act.

Bill 36, An Act to amend the Corporations Tax Act, 1972.

Clerk of the House: The 11th order, House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, PROVINCIAL SECRETARIAT FOR JUSTICE

(continued)

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I've had the opportunity of reading, as reported in Hansard—in fact, I've got my own copy—the summary of the provincial secretary's (Mr. Clement) remarks that were made on the introduction of these estimates.

I have to say that the ministerial approach this year is a little bit better than it was last year. At least we got 14 pages of paper with some words on them. Last year, we got no pages of nothing and we had no words. This year, the 14 pages of words don't really mean very much, and I'm going to deal with them at some length during the course of my remarks this morning.

The first point I want to make is going to be pertinent to my ultimate conclusion, which will be a motion to reduce vote 1101, item 1, from the sum of \$469,000 to the sum of \$1. The first portion of my remarks is going to relate to the references made in the COGP to the system of secretariats and to express my continued wonderment as to why the government keeps this apparently doing nothing department still before the people of Ontario and why this year it is asking for \$469,000.

The minister said during the course of his remarks that he had read last year's debates, or earlier debates, and he was informed by them. I don't know the extent to which he was informed by last year's debates, but just to refresh his memory he will recall that his immediate predecessor introduced his estimates with about eight lines, saying he wasn't going to say anything. That pretty well was his conduct through the whole course of his estimates. He didn't explain anything and he didn't say anything.

I pointed out fairly early in those estimates that the COGP reports make specific refer-

ence to the setting up of the system of secretariats. I quoted—and I think it's worth quoting again—report No. 3 at page 17, which said:

Therefore, as an extension to the recommendations made in previous reports, we now recommend that policy ministers without operating responsibilities [I don't think the Provincial Secretary for Justice comes within that category, but this was their positive recommendation] be appointed to devote full-time attention to setting priorities, to providing leadership to policy development and to co-ordinating related programmes of government within their respective policy fields.

If the minister had carefully read last year's debates relating to this department he'd have grabbed that very quickly. As well, we can make a reference to report No. 10 of COGP, on page 6:

We therefore reached the conclusion that a new kind of minister was needed—one who would be completely free of the responsibilities and burdens of a chief executive of a department. Called provincial secretaries, they would provide leadership in the development of policy for those reasonably separate and distinct areas of public affairs arranged into relevant policy fields.

The language is clear, and not open to any different kinds of interpretations. They didn't say it once, they said it several times. The report goes on to say:

There would be no reporting relationship between a provincial secretary and the other ministers within a particular policy field. Indeed, a provincial secretary would not have responsibility for, nor control over, a minister's programme management or his policy proposals.

The government embarked on the implementation of the COGP report, or so it said. But the whole secretariat system seems to have flown apart. Take TEIGA; I don't know whether the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) believes he is a policy secretary. There's one of the policy secretaries going out now. I was hoping he'd stay, because there are some remarks I'm going to make a little later on that should have concerned him.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): You have only two members on your own side.

Hon. A. Grossman (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): How long will you be?

Mr. Singer: He made some remarks about you and the great job you've done during his introductory remarks. I wanted to put that into a somewhat different context than the minister has. But we'll come to that a little later.

Hon. Mr. Crossman: I'll be right back, don't go away.

Mr. Singer: Policy secretaries; what do they do? What do any of them do? As I say, I don't think the Treasurer regards himself as a policy secretary. The secretary who is going out gets himself into great difficulty because he really doesn't have any policy. He went up to talk to the Indians the other day and came back with a statement that nobody would believe.

We have the charming lady provincial secretary (Mrs. Birch) over there and I'm certain that she was very flattered when she was given that important-sounding appointment, but the extent to which she influences policy remains as a great conundrum, to me at least, and I suspect to many members of this House.

But we have really the ludicrous position that the Provincial Secretary for Justice is now in. He flies completely in the face of the recommendations of those COGP reports, because he has responsibility. He's the Attorney General and he's been the acting Solicitor General for four weeks or six weeks. As cabinet positions get shuffled around here, that's a fairly long tenure in one department, even for an acting minister. So he's got those two plus the secretariat, and if the secretariat is supposed to function along the lines that COGP had in mind then certainly it isn't doing it.

I think, Mr. Chairman, the time has come that we should get, either from this secretary or from his leader, the Premier (Mr. Davis) some kind of a statement as to what good the secretariats do. This was the theme we were on last year.

I was directing a whole series of questions as to how the dollars were spent, one after the other. It became somewhat ludicrous when the then deputy secretary was trying to explain the number of positions on the list of positions available, or the list of people you can employ and who was holding the positions. We ended up with many clerks and a couple of drivers.

We found there was provision for two minister's salaries. The minister of the day assured us he was only getting one salary. I

didn't disbelieve him. This minister indicates to me he is getting three salaries.

Hon. J. T. Clement (Provincial Secretary for Justice): I would like to get three.

Mr. Singer: Well, good for you. I'm certain a man of your ability deserves at least three. But if you'd only get into one portfolio and do a good job in there, perhaps I could go along with voting you three salaries for doing a good job in one department. But when you roam the field and really don't get anywhere other than to produce this kind of pap, then I begin to wonder.

You see, we were very upset last year and the year before that with the provincial secretaryship for justice. I would have thought, rather than this kind of an introductory speech, you would have said, "In the last year we have done all sorts of things and here is the list of some of them that we are going to do."

What do you get down to? You tell us that you are going to bring in an Act to amend the Land Titles Act. I guess every year that I have been here since 1959, I have seen some kind of an Act that is going to amend the Land Titles Act. If that is the job that the secretary for justice is doing—he is going to tighten up a few other sections of the Land Titles Act and he feels that is important—then I think it's an awful waste of time and staff and people and public money and talent.

If you are concerned about the system of land registry in the province—and I presume you are; in your day you were known in the Niagara Peninsula as a pretty competent barrister and solicitor, so I presume you are concerned about the system of land registry in the Province of Ontario—I would have hoped you would have said: "We are moving to the point where we are going to make it very simple to identify the owner of the particular piece of property. We are going to have everything under land titles within a year or two years or five years. We are going to be able to eliminate and take off people's shoulders the burden of having to pay five or six sets of legal costs as solicitor after solicitor certifies the title and charges them 1¼ per cent."

That would have been the kind of thing I would have hoped you would say. What have you got in here? You are going to bring in an amendment to the Land Titles Act. What a great boy are you! I think it's a farce, Mr. Chairman.

What did you do in the last year? We've had all sorts of reports. I don't know whether you are going to be able to say you can't answer these things until you put on your other hat a little later on—your Attorney General's hat or your Solicitor General's hat—but I would have been interested to hear from you.

I asked you in the House one day what you had done about implementing Judge Pringle's report—you know, the one on the Landmark. I was very disappointed in you yesterday when you sat on both sides of the fence about the role of judges on police commissions.

First you said Mr. James Chalmer McRuer recommended very strongly that they be not there.

And that we all know.

Then you said Ottawa is taking away their extra pay. Well, I don't know that that is really the criterion, because Ottawa, in addition to taking away the judge's extra pay, is giving them a very substantial pay raise. I don't suppose to many judges it makes a great deal of difference. Probably they find it much more exciting to go and sit on a police commission instead of sitting in court on a particular day. As long as they are getting enough money in at the end of the month, it couldn't matter less to them.

But what I would like to have heard from you is whether or not you are going to take judges off police commissions, because my good friend Judge Scott—and I have never met him; I know him only by representation, having got to know him as Landmark emerged—apparently continues still to be the head of the Niagara Police Commission.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): They took one off in Windsor last week.

Mr. Singer: He, as that story began to unfold, said: "I have looked at it. I, Judge Scott, looked at it; nothing wrong." That confirmed my view that McRuer was correct. Well, Scott now continues to issue statements. I noticed he had one in the paper the other day: that the intelligence section of the Niagara regional police unit has been reshuffled.

But I would like to have heard, perhaps as a policy statement, the extent to which the secretary for justice has read and digested and understood Judge Pringle's remarks, and accepts or rejects them as part of the policy of the government of Ontario's programme of administration of justice. We haven't heard anything like that at all. I would have

thought that that might have been a role for the secretary for justice.

We had a little flurry a few weeks ago about justices of the peace. You may remember—I'm sure the secretary for justice remembers—the kinds of remarks that McRuer made about justices of the peace. He couldn't get an accurate count of how many there were. I re-read that the other day and he said there were justices of the peace appointed who knows how many years ago; there were no records of their being appointed, when they were appointed, who appointed them or whether they were still alive or dead. He said there was no actual way of counting them.

The Attorney General or the Solicitor General said there were 1,074—he produced some figure the other day. Well, presumably he has found a method of counting justices of the peace that escapes Mr. McRuer. If so, I congratulate him for that. But hasn't the time come when you take officials charged with the administration of justice off the fee basis and allow individuals to make \$30,000 a year?

Doesn't Pringle refer to that in his very sarcastically phrased comments about the justice of the peace in the Niagara region who issued the search warrant? I think his quiet recommendation was that enough money should be given to that gentleman so that he could keep his duplicate information in the filing cabinet.

I happened to be there the day he appeared before the commission and he walked in with his day-book under his arm. He was being cross-examined by Mr. Kellock, the counsel to the commission, who wanted to find out the basis on which he had issued the particular warrant. He opened up his day-book and said, "Yes, on such and such a date I issued the warrant."

Mr. Kellock said: "Do you have a copy of the information?"

"Oh, no, I never keep copies of the information."

"Why?"

"Well, because nobody ever gave me enough money to have a file or a filing cabinet in which I could keep copies of the warrants."

"Do you recall the discussion?"

"No, I don't recall the discussion."

"Do you recall who came in."

"Well, my day-book doesn't say it, but if Sergeant So-and-so says he came in, he must have come in."

"Well, Mr. Justice of the Peace, why did you issue the warrant?"

"Well, I issued the warrant because I guess I thought it was appropriate."

A nice retired old police officer, a fine gentleman, but what useful function is he serving in the system of administration of justice? None at all.

If you care that little about the so-called function of issuing search warrants, then let the police issue them, because it is obvious that that gentleman was issuing whatever the police asked him to do without any question, without any record, without any examination.

That system breeds the kind of thing we were reading about in the paper the other day, where justices of the peace are making \$30,000 and \$40,000 a year on a fee basis for a job that could be reasonably comfortably done and well done by a very junior person trained in administration and being paid, say, \$10,000 or \$12,000 a year and doing the job much more efficiently.

Surely that is part of justice policy, and that's the kind of thing that you should have been extrapolating from the Pringle report and telling us what you were going to do about it.

The minister is quick with the word, he is fast on his feet, his answers are amusing and I enjoy his sense of humour. But when I try to analyse his answers to questions affecting the course of administration of justice, I just can't bring them forward. In this particular secretariat, I wonder what its continuing function is. I just can't figure it out.

Here's the report on the task force on legal aid. It's a very important document. Mr. Justice Osler sat for quite a time, heard a lot of evidence, was assisted by able counsel and produced this report. The report was in the minister's hands for several months, according to the dating on it. We have yet to hear from the Provincial Secretary for Justice, the Attorney General or the Solicitor General, or whoever is supposed to do it, what the government's approach is. Do you agree with Osler or do you disagree with Osler? Has the time come to change the direction of legal aid in the Province of Ontario? Has the time come to say the system we've got is as good as it can be and we're not going to change anything?

Surely that is what the Provincial Secretary for Justice should have been talking about in his opening remarks in these estimates. His predecessor fluffed the opportunity and I suggest this secretary has fluffed the oppor-

tunity when he introduced these estimates the other day.

I was intrigued by his questions. He throws out 10 questions; I counted them. Ten questions to whom? To himself or to the world? To me? To my colleague from Lakeshore? Ten very fascinating questions.

If you have these questions in mind, why don't you say, "One question that concerned us was, do we wish to continue to pour people into the system or should we devise ways and means of diverting them from the system and handling in a less formal fashion those whose offences may be petty but whose apprehension, prosecution and conviction cost the province considerable sums?" That was question 1.

I would have much preferred it if you had said, "That was one question which occurred to my advisers and me and this is what we think about it." It would at least show you are doing some thinking. It would at least show you had some ideas. But you have posed 10 questions and maybe, if we are all patient and we get some more estimates from you before the next election we will have another 10 questions because obviously it is a questioning civil service. It is not an answering civil service.

I'm not going to bore the members of the House with the other nine questions in their several parts. But you pose questions; no answers. Where have you been all these years? Not you, collectively you, collectively the secretariat for justice. What have you been doing if you have to ask questions like, "Do we have essential data which inform us how well the present system works?" There is a really intelligent approach. We've got a secretariat for justice and you are asking if we have essential data which tell us how the system works.

If you are making a pitch for a computer, you have enough power and authority to go and rent a computer and put your data together. Why do you waste the time of the House by asking us if you have enough data to see how the system works?

Hon. Mr. Clement: The member wasn't even in the House.

Mr. Singer: No, I know. I read it, though, very carefully and as you said you were good enough to send me a copy; I don't know whether you sent everybody a copy. I have spent some time on it—it is all marked and I am going to be talking about the various bits and pieces of it.

As I say, if you are making a big pitch for a computer I wouldn't mind the Attorney

General's department having a computer. I am sure there are some computers out there somewhere; some of your colleagues have use of them. Why don't you rent some time on a computer? Feed the facts in, get the answers out and stand up and say, "The data show there are so many recidivists who are in jail and maybe we can keep them out if we do something else and that is what we are going to do." But to ask us silly questions and make a long pitch for a computer, what are you achieving?

You are very concerned these days about the effect of alcohol on many of our citizens. I think you should be but I notice in the redraft of the Liquor Control Act that while there is power for the police to take alcoholics off to these reclamation units there doesn't seem to be much of a programme for building reclamation units to allow the police to take the alcoholics off to them. It is very nice to have the provision there but you don't seem to want to implement it.

I remember a few years ago when not you but one of the ministers—I think it was the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development who just walked out—stood up and beat his breast with justifiable pride and said, "We are going to build all these drying out places and things are going to be different." That's part of justice policy, isn't it? Or should be. Where is it? That's the kind of thing you should be talking about, to my mind.

The minister says on page 5 of his remarks:

I shall continue to meet at least weekly with my colleagues to discuss with them their policy submissions and propose legislation that will be subject to analysis by the secretariat staff with respect to their priority and their impact upon ministries within the field and indeed upon the other policy fields.

I can just picture the minister meeting at least weekly. He walks in with three hats. He sits at the head of the table, "I am the secretary." He runs over to his right, sits down and puts on another hat. "I am the Attorney General. Mr. Secretary, I want to say so-and-so." Then he moves around to the other side and says, "I am the Solicitor General. Mr. Secretary, I want to say such and such." Then he has got a new minister in Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman) who must be finding it very, very difficult to wade his way through that morass of administrative confusion. The provincial secretary must be spending a considerable amount of his time helping his colleague and directing him to where the different offices are.

I would have thought it might have been an important part of justice policy to tell us what you are thinking about insurance in Ontario, automobile insurance in particular. We have had reports. We have had things commissioned. We had that Tory lawyer out in Oakville who wrote a great lengthy report about insurance. We have had submissions by the Bar Association, by the Advocates' Society and by the insurance companies. Did we get anything from you about insurance as part of the justice policy? No.

I sympathize with your colleague who has direct responsibility for that ministry. He lost his superintendent. The superintendent unfortunately passed away. He was a gentleman who gave great service to the Province of Ontario.

In the meantime, what is our policy? Is that part of the secretariat? You need to look into that. It seems to me from the way you talk that if you have these weekly meetings, what do you discuss and what kind of policies do you emerge with? When you set up your approach to these estimates you have several meetings to say: "Give me 10 questions so I can put them in my speech." Not answers but questions.

Well, what are we going to do? We are going to have a family law reform programme, a unified family court, subject to Ottawa paving the way by amending the Divorce Act. I would have thought that if there was a justice policy about a unified family court—and I think it's a good idea—that there might have been substantial value in saying, "In justice policy, this is what we mean by unified family court. We can't bring it into force until"—it would have been another opportunity to make a terrible-Ottawa-people speech—"those terrible people in Ottawa who move so slowly that they are frustrating their true paths of justice move, but this is what we think should happen."

Think of the press you would get on it. You would even get support from, I am sure, the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor), myself and my colleague from St. George (Mrs. Campbell). We all think that's a great idea. But how do you handle it? You handle it in one sentence once a year which is better, as I say, than your colleague did a year ago.

You are going to have a pilot project in delinquency prevention. I presume you are against delinquency. I think that's great and so do we all. But what is your pilot project? How are you going to get at it? You have these weekly meetings. Tell us about it. Take us into your confidence.

And then there is the Training Schools Act. You are going to amend that and also the Land Titles Act. I spoke about that before. As I say, for every year for 16 years I have seen an amendment to the Land Titles Act. But there is no statement of policy that we are going to have a new system of land titles or certification of titles. You say, "We are going to bring in a new statute." I think you have a phrase in here: "And in case anyone has any doubt, we are going to bring in a lot more new statutes too."

I just picked up the Juries Act here, Bill 1. It is very important and very controversial. Did you have to have many policy meetings before you got around to drafting that one? I don't know.

I turn to a very important area, and I am reading on page 7: "The secretariat this month assumed the responsibility for co-ordinating the services of ministries in this field in aid of people." I was listening to a CBC broadcast the other morning out of Kenora. I don't know how well informed the people who were participating in that were, but what they seemed to indicate to me was that presently in Kenora there seemed to be two bands of vigilantes, Indian ones and white ones, who seemed to be stirring up incidents of physical damage to each other at a great old rate.

As I say, I don't know the authenticity of this report but if we are very concerned, and I think we should be, about services in the field to native people, I would have hoped that some of the problems in Kenora and other sections of the province would have begun to be lessened. This was on the CBC just the other morning, and I'm sure the minister, his secretary or his deputy could get a tape of that. I would think he should be very concerned about the suggestion that was made on that programme.

I'm puzzled—and here you're getting to the real crunch of your programme—when you say: "This brings me to the whole question of input to the process from the overwhelming majority who are not directly engaged in the system on one side or the other. . . . We have a duty to perform in ensuring that the public is made fully aware of the many roles which citizens can play . . ." Therefore, you say, "We're going to organize a series of meetings across the province."

What are you going to do in your meetings? Are they going to be like the cabinet meetings you have in Kingston one week and Cornwall the next week, where you sit there and receive briefs and nod knowingly? Are you going to appose these 10 questions to the

good citizens? I saw somewhere that your first meeting probably will be in Ottawa. Are you going to say to the good citizens you manage to produce at your meetings in Ottawa, "I asked 10 questions in the House the other day. Do you have any answers for them?"

What is it that you're going to take out to the people? Goodness knows, you've got reports coming out of your ears. Are you going to ask them whether they like what's in Osler's report on legal aid? Are you going to ask them whether they agree with Pringle when he talked about Landmark and police? What are you going to do? Who's going to go with you? And while you're gone, who's going to mind the shop? Who's going to be Attorney General? Who's going to be Solicitor General? I don't know; I guess it's election year fever that sends you all out scurrying around hither and yon.

Mrs. M. Campbell (St. George): At public expense.

Mr. Singer: At public expense, to give you great exposure—and the minister exposes very pleasantly. He tells good jokes, he smiles, he doesn't antagonize—he doesn't say very much, but he doesn't antagonize very many people.

I notice the comment in here that, "for example, the fact that in the past six months the total numbers of people held in the Toronto Jail increased by nearly 40 per cent." I think that's a very tragic statistic. I suppose that leads to another question: What are we going to do about it? There's no answer from the provincial secretary or from his secretariat. There's not even an answer in reply to the very urgent point, raised year after year by a series of grand juries, that the time has come to tear down that terrible building. If you're unable to cope with the increased traffic, at least give them a little better facility. There's no answer to that at all.

So many of these remarks go back to the question period. The minister talks about supporting the increased use of referrals by police, encouraging pre-trial mediation and community-based dispositions. How are you going to do that? Who's going to do it? Whose responsibility is it? What people are charged with it?

It sounds like a very interesting paper that some eager student has prepared for his professor in about third year of university: "Give me 12 pages on the administration of justice." It doesn't sound like a responsible and thought-out programme of development of

the system of the administration of justice in the Province of Ontario.

One thing that bothers me very much is the minister's comments in relation to the Fifth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of the Offender. The minister pays tribute to the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development, "who, through his eloquent pleading at the fourth congress, was primarily instrumental in Toronto being chosen as the site for this year's meeting." As the secretary is undoubtedly aware, there are many citizens of the Province of Ontario who are very disturbed at the thought that the Palestine Liberation Organization, an organization of terrorists, are going to be welcomed into the Province of Ontario, apparently by the minister and by his colleagues, to take part in this conference.

I am sure the secretary must have seen the action taken by his colleagues and mine, the Benchers of the Law Society of Upper Canada, who rescinded their luncheon invitation to the delegates at that convention because among the delegates were going to be those terrorists from the PLO. The governing body of lawyers in the Province of Ontario said: "We are not going to have any part of them. We are not going to take them to lunch and we are not going to make our facilities available to them."

I would have thought that the minister, in applauding himself and his civil servants and his colleague the secretary for the great work that was done in this regard, could have spared a moment or two to mention, in passing, the attendance of the PLO here in the city of Toronto and in the Province of Ontario. I would have thought that perhaps he could have shared the views of a federal Conservative, Claude Wagner, who is the external affairs critic in the House of Commons, who addressed a dinner in Ottawa the other day, and who said:

Canada has no cause, no justification, no rationale for opening doors, or standing back while doors are being opened for terrorists and those who support the terrorists.

That was a direct reference to the attendance of the PLO at this conference, to their being admitted to this country, to their being hosted by the people of Ontario and to the conference being boasted about by the secretary.

Frankly, I am very unhappy and very disappointed, and very disturbed by it.

I am not suggesting either that this secretary, or the hon. member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman) embraces or encour-

ages the PLO; in fact, I know the opposite is true about both of them. But I would think there is a public responsibility on ministers of the Crown who know that this event has come about, albeit not by their choosing, that when they are going to refer to the United Nations and this conference on the prevention of crime, to say a few pertinent and appropriate remarks about how they too abhor the action of the Palestinian Liberation Organization.

There are a lot of other topics I thought the minister and his secretary could have dealt with. My attention was caught the other day by Robert Miller's column in the *Star* relating to the Premier's war on sin. A great, great contribution, I think. I'm being deliberately sarcastic about it. I suppose it follows that clause in the Throne Speech:

The government will seek the co-operation of law enforcement agencies and the general public so that our cities and streets will remain among the safest and most secure in North America.

That's certainly very important.

I think the press said: "We are all for law and order this year." Nobody is opposed to law and order. We are opposed to juvenile delinquency. We would like a better land titles office, and that sort of thing, but we have to wonder about that fascinating appointment of Judy LaMarsh to inquire into violence in the media. It certainly achieved one thing. It removed any question of her being a candidate in the next provincial election. I guess the Provincial Secretary for Justice was happy that she was not going to be able to be a candidate in the Niagara region.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): For what party?

Mr. Singer: But what is Judy going to do about violence on television?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Eliminate it.

Mr. Singer: Yes, sure, she is going to stop all those terrible murders that we see on television night after night; those great detective stories that appear—what's the name of the fellow without any hair?

Mrs. Campbell: Kojak.

Mr. Singer: Kojak, yes. I don't know whether Judy likes that programme or not. I find it rather entertaining. Is that what she's going to inquire into? What is it that she's going to do?

Is she going to tell the *Toronto Star* their news stories are too dramatic and they're talking about too much violence? Is she doing to do anything about Yonge St. and the body rubs? No, that's not the media; that's right. What is it, really, that Judy is expected to inquire into?

The leader of the NDP pointed out you've got all sorts of reports in your files, if you want to read them, about violence and the effect of violence. What are you going to do about them? Are you going to say: "Isn't that terrible? We're the government of law and order and that sort of thing can't go on here any longer?"

Then we hear the Premier saying, "Permissiveness is terrible." What is permissiveness? What kind of permissiveness is he talking about? Is he talking about the ability of people to make up their minds about what they want to do? What permissiveness is he complaining about? If there is a permissiveness crisis facing the people of Ontario can't you enunciate a little more clearly what you're worried about?

Do you feel books should be censored? Do you feel magazines should be censored? Do you feel our newspapers should be censored? Do you feel we should pass meaningless resolutions about censoring television both in Canada and in the United States?

Do you feel that Don Sims should be tougher with the censor's scissors down at his office? Maybe he should be. Why don't you say it instead of picking out all these cute catch phrases and saying, "We're against permissiveness, a sin of modern day society."

My goodness gracious, some of us like to think we've lived long enough in this world that we've got some idea of what goes on. These pap-like phrases really produce nothing and when they're designed solely, apparently, to influence an electoral process one has to wonder about the intelligence and the sincerity of the people who put them forward.

It must be the function of the Provincial Secretary for Justice, who wants our streets safe for people and on whose shoulders—whether under this hat or some of the other hats—is going to fall the responsibility of training police officers and instructing them in what to do to enforce these programmes and, perhaps, even to enunciate them. I think if there are thoughts within that justice secretariat about what we are attacking, what Judy is looking for and what terrible permissiveness which goes on in our society has to be stopped, now is the time we should hear about it. I doubt very much, Mr. Chairman,

if we are going to hear anything along these lines at all.

Mr. Chairman, I've expressed, I think rather briefly and in a rather restrained fashion for me at least—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): That is right. You are mellowing.

Mr. Singer: —some of my grave concerns about this secretariat. I think it is a useless appendage upon the people of Ontario. It performs no useful function. It should be done away with and, therefore, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I have a motion.

Mr. Singer moves that vote 1101(1) be reduced from the sum of \$469,000 to the sum of \$1.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The super ministry which covers the fields of the Attorney General, Consumer and Commercial Relations and Solicitor General has degenerated badly in the past year and before that. We've had precious little legislation before us, almost absolutely nothing. The only stuff introduced was withdrawn; it was a rather slender reed having to do with marital relations on which they got a lot of flak and haven't had the courage or temerity, whatever it is they haven't got, to bring it forward again.

The department itself has now devolved, as it should have initially from the very beginning, onto the head of a single man who holds, as a super minister, his weekly Thursday morning colloquies, mostly with himself, as has been pointed out, or with the last remaining potentate from another realm, the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Potter). I'm sure they enjoy coffee together. The Minister of Correctional Services is an excellent chap.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): I think he speaks to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

Mr. Lawlor: Oh, yes, he does speak to him once in a while, I suppose. But, it has become a farce. I agree with the member for Downsview, that the matter should be reduced to \$1 and that the department should be wiped out.

After all, you have the three heads. I don't think the Solicitor General should ever be returned, much as I'd like to give the member for Halton West (Mr. Kerr) a job to do, something to keep him occupied. I think that case is coming up on Monday.

Surely a man of his quality can be found in some other position, rather than simply using up provincial resources in this regard. It is a thing which you as a minister are perfectly competent to handle in your own right. It was done by previous Attorneys General of the province without turning too many hairs down through the many years. This technocratic nonsense of setting up echelons and departments and categories and stratifications very poorly commends itself to us. As I say, nothing is emanating from your department.

We always exercise a very gentlemanly care not to be too acerbic immediately but to give the new esconced minister his leverage, his time to generate and to begin. Well, your time is up.

We have been waiting. We didn't expect from Old Soft Soap, your predecessor, very much; and we got nothing. But we have respect for you and we think that you've got the qualities and the competence to move in this field.

An enormous number of things have to be done. I'm going to run through a list. Just the other day when these estimates were brought in, as they normally are *deus ex machina* from some seventh heaven, we were told in the afternoon they would be going on at night and that type of thing.

As for that wretched House leader you've got there, why don't you confine him in the lower dungeons of this place here in chains? He has no regard for the opposition whatever. He doesn't know what tasks we have to perform. We are expected to be downstairs, upstairs, in our nightgowns, anywhere. It's incredible. And he doesn't give a damn. He is the most obtuse man I think I've ever met. To have a House leader so insensate as that, is just disruptive of the life of this place. We ought to have an opportunity of at least 48 hours notice to prepare to come on. Well, we had it, but that was by—was it the grace of God or the grace of the Law Society or the judges of Upper Canada—because they wanted you to speak last night?

Mr. Singer: It was the judges who had a dinner at provincial expense, to which only government people get invited.

Mr. Lawlor: Right, yes.

Mr. Singer: He forgot to mention that, though.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, we will get back to it in the Attorney Generalship. As a matter of fact, we were promised a seat at those dinners just in order to kind of hob-nob with

the boys and find out about that great collegium down at the end of the street here and how, as they put it, they live in such close collegiality. I'd love to see this collegiality working, particularly with beefsteak. I suspect there is more beefsteak than collegiality.

Mr. Singer: It is a very good dinner with several kinds of wine.

Mr. Lawlor: I don't doubt it. I suppose the cocktails in advance of it keep the judges' minds working in a way which would not otherwise be the case.

Anyway, here you have three portfolios now. It has degenerated badly. You don't call in and bring in and have the swath that you might have. The developing fields of law are not within your jurisdiction in a direct sense where everything is happening, or most things are happening.

There is the whole field of environmental law which is enormously interesting and important, all evolving and evolving rapidly. What real liaison have you with that particular area? Very little I suspect. The Minister of the Environment (Mr. W. Newman) is in the resources field and out there somewhere. Somehow you should encompass that.

It always struck me: What are questions of human life doing in the Ministry of Labour, where there are very little human rights at best? The whole figment is set up on the basis of a certain kind of inhumanity with respect to labour. That minister is the esconced arbitrator over the whole thing.

Take human rights out of Labour and get them where they belong in an area where you are dealing with them every day in a decisive way in the actual mechanisms and in the flowing life of the courts and the administration of justice, not out there in some limbo, which is incidental and quite ancillary to his main function, which is arbitration of disputes, hard economic problems. These problems are of a different nature. They involve economic problems, true, but far more with its gravamen in your area and not over there,

As I said, with the visitation of the gods coming on this particular estimates, I sat at the desk here and wrote up casually, nonchalantly, 28 different heads on which I was anticipating in the last year some form of incremental movement. By incremental I mean you can just barely detect it—under a microscope, let's say, if you had a large enough one; as at Palomar.

I'll just run through them very quickly without comment, then may I make comment.

In the whole area of family law, since 1965 we have had an outpouring of reports that stand about six feet high that one carries around to the various conferences on family law. We've had the major one, from the Law Reform Commission, and absolutely nothing has happened. The crying need for something to happen is just overwhelming. Is it because you are in the slough of despond, of election fever or something of that kind? Sometimes I think, looking around this House in the past two weeks—

Mr. Singer: But the minister wants to have these meetings around the province to ask them what they think about the reports.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, all we are doing at the moment, it seems to me, is marking time, and therefore the kind of impact one would wish to make on the proper life of the province is missing on this particular occasion of your estimates. It's a shame but this is the way it is.

What I'm saying, in effect, is that I think you are afraid to upset certain male votes, certain chauvinist piggeries, if you will, or uniggeries, or whatever it is that you fear with respect to elements in the population who, if you come on strong in this particular area, while you may garner here you lose there. So the whole thing is set up on some kind of political equation in which it doesn't solve itself; just leave everything alone and do nothing and that's probably the sanitary path.

In the area of franchising legislation we've had that wretched report sitting there. It's turned green. It used to be a lemon yellow, but I noticed the other day that it was turning green.

Mr. Renwick: Sammy Grange is on the bench. We'll probably be dead before the report is implemented.

Mr. Lawlor: That is right. Incredible. And you know more about franchising legislation than your predecessor. You know the interstices of that. You know its validity. You can move ahead. You were the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. You had delegations attending upon you for weeks there at one time. You had an avalanche, an inundation of people.

In the whole area of warranty legislation, the member for York Centre (Mr. Deacon) of this House has called meetings. He has been far more effective than any minister in the province in this particular field. He has tried to generate all kinds of movement. I attended many of them and we got all kinds of input.

You—not you personally, but your department—did your best to obstruct him because he was showing some kind of vitality in the area. And nothing has come out of it. It all sits fallow. I don't know if its vegetating, fecundating or simply rotting, but it ain't moving. Nothing is happening.

Mr. Singer: But they are against juvenile delinquency.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, they are really going to zero in on those juveniles. In the field of court reform, look at all the volumes. We went over this, you know, with a fine-tooth comb pretty well last time, and we will return; as a mere exercise in self-flagellation we will return. We will come back to Corregidor in the early evening, just as the bloody sun is going down—your sun.

Mr. Kennedy: Join the PCs; don't be despondent.

Mr. Lawlor: Here we are—court reform; volumes, most intricate stuff. The government is completely unprepared to alienate a single judge's vote. Can the poor devils vote in our provincial election? You may not even have to alienate one.

Here he is, making some kind of gestures on the family law side of the fence and on the amalgamation side of the fence, unwilling to be determined and conclusive and clear and courageous. Say something. You haven't the courage to stand up and speak. That's what leadership is. That's what government is all about. You don't sit plump in the middle of the fence, usually on a spike, and do nothing. That's a form of self torture I wouldn't even wish on the minister. I've been just sitting and waiting to see what side you are on.

I think they should be amalgamated—if you want my position. I think the benefits that would flow out would be overwhelming on a logical basis. As to the intertwining responsibilities of the court and as to which functions the county court judges perform vis-à-vis the Supreme Court judges or vice-versa, it would be for the mutual benefit of all. These childish jealousies in judges quite puzzle me.

There's one positive note in the whole thing—in all that internecine nonsense—one positive note; it shows that the judges are human. Why, necessarily, do we have to be human in the most petty sense, seeking to preserve our personal prerogatives? That's where we really take fire. I can't believe it.

All right, so let's get moving. It's silly. If you don't want to do that, say so. Say that

you think it's a misconceived document when it says that they should be amalgamated; that you're going to affirm the status quo in this matter; that the benefits that flow from it are such and such. I'd like to know what they are. I want a reasoned judgement.

We never get that. We get arbitrary decisions that come out of the blue. What went into the formulation of those decisions? What was the *raison d'être* of the remarks? They never seem to come out anywhere along the fence here. There is always some kind of hidden faculty.

Why it is so quite puzzles me. I thought the job of democratic government was for rational men to speak of their reasons with one another and test the validity of them, weigh them. We never get that. Nor when you make your decision will you come out with a series of statements as to giving the background. You never do.

I'm urging that you begin a new regimen, a new outlook on the way in which you approach this House, on the way you approach your own responsibilities in this ministry and disclose your motivations and what goes into these decisions.

If you feel it is simply better not to step on eminent men's toes, etc., because they might get ingrown toenails or some kind of malicious disease, then say so. I'll understand. We're all subject to similar afflictions in this life. I mean, I go around wounded like a beast, never having the possibility of being a cabinet minister. Well, what's the point? Can anything afflicts a human being more? Can you think of anything that's more grievous than the thought that this will never happen? Well, my life is blighted by the thought. Sometimes it's hard to get up in the morning knowing that today is going to be another day on which you can't be a cabinet minister.

Mr. Kennedy: Don't lose heart. Join the Conservatives.

Mr. Singer: That won't help either anymore.

Mr. Lawlor: I'm afraid I have lost faith in that possibility, too.

The role that you're supposed to be playing in these estimates, etc., has to do with the process. It has been pointed out in this opening statement that you made, as to the one piece, the serial whole that your ministry must perform with respect to the apprehension, prosecution, conviction and imprisonment of human beings.

When I was speaking last week at some length with the Minister of Correctional Services in this regard, I deliberately omitted going very deeply into after-care problems. The problem was—and I think you have the instinct of the indicia in your opening remarks, that you have the smell of the rose—namely, that there are too many people in jail. In this jurisdiction, because of a very peculiar mentality—indeed subsidized, encouraged and supported down through the years by diverse Attorneys General—the judiciary, provincial court judges particularly, have as almost their first instinctive reaction the inclination to send the guy down, without very much cognizance of the cost to the public. And with very little cognizance, indeed, of the reformatory or what debilitating effects that precise action that afternoon may have on that human being; very little awareness of it.

You can point out the economic circumstances and say that it is costing an awful lot of money and doing damn little good; but they will say: "That's not our responsibility. It is up to the government to provide the facilities in which to keep these men penned. We don't care; that's their job, it is not our job."

What you have tried to do, and what you are doing, is to work with Mr. Justice Hart; I hope very closely indeed, because he has issued in the last two years a whole flood of reports and statements about the criminal process, about the various concepts that have to go into the process with respect to alleviating incarceration, as to the use of fines, as to the use of restitutionary measures, as to the North York group, etc. But that is not enough.

Mr. Singer: He doesn't read his own reports why should he read ours?

Mr. Lawlor: It should have the sense that women appearing for shoplifting or petty assaults or various forms of theft, that sort of thing, ought not—and in first offences it normally doesn't—to bring about people being incarcerated.

The fact of the matter is that too many still are and that this penchant persists. I think statistically speaking we are one of the jurisdictions in the world which has the largest number of people placed in jail over against conviction. It's an incredible situation. You, as the super minister, must begin to reverse that process, working in conjunction with your fellow ministers and in conjunction with your third selves. You haven't got

schizophrenia, you've got trichotomy or whatever it is that is divided into three parts.

Having a little consultation over a drink some evening with yourself in another role you could very easily do this. I think you would have to instruct the judges not by a mandate from above but by conversations with them in assembly, that policy is being changed in Ontario, and the use of the criminal sanction to start with in many offences is no longer justified, it must be handled in the community by way of community offices. This is particularly true of the juvenile field, of course, so that the whole operation with respect to policing will be obviated or at least very greatly modified in a humane direction and away from the courts.

Secondly, when you get them to the court the provincial judges and the Supreme Court judges must not move in that direction; they must look to other alternatives; a couple of which I have mentioned—a greater use of parole systems; greater use of probation services.

The Minister of Correctional Services is doing a good job in this area, but he only deals with them when they have arrived from your basic demesne and he has to take it from there. It is the arrivals I am very much concerned with now. They are super-numerary, unnecessary, and it is not doing society good to send numerous people through to schools of crime. That is all the jails of this province are.

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if I could interrupt the member for a moment to recognize the member for Yorkview who has some guests.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and my apologies to the member for Lakeshore for interrupting him at this point.

I am sure the House would very much like to welcome a group, which has arrived at the House and is now in the gallery, from Emery Jr. High School in the riding of Yorkview. It is a group of new Canadians, people who have recently arrived in Canada, some of whom have become fairly familiar with the English language, some of whom are still struggling very hard with this very difficult tongue. They are here this morning to visit the Legislature and to look around. I am certain all of you would like to welcome them here today.

Mr. Chairman: Would the member for Lakeshore continue please.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, it's the tongue that Shakespeare spoke but nobody speaks it like that.

We have the central thing here, with your top hat, so to speak in the middle, the Attorney Generalship. Aftercare probation is a crying scandal in the province. It falls within the demesne of this ministry and your ambit.

Men are coming out with very little money in their pockets. What do you expect them to do? The whole of society is raised against them but there is nothing done by your ministry to foster understanding, to set up a greater reconciliation, an acceptance into the community. Some poor devil is accused of homosexuality and Charlie MacNaughton comes down on him like a ton of bricks and jettisons him from his job. This particular form of sanctimoniousness seems to permeate Tory mentality.

You are kind of a unique guy because you have been able to break a little away from that. You must find a lot of your colleagues rather stuffy and insufferable in this particular regard with their all puritanical nostrums and concepts. There is a little line in Jacques Brel's thing, "I am alive and well and living in Paris," the thing about the little nostrums from Kant, the one about the girl from the Salvation Army. Do you know the song? If you don't, I will play it for you some time.

In any event, it is in the aftercare field that a great deal of emphasis and direction is going to have to be given. I would ask you to turn your mind to that area in this particular ministry, if it is going to continue to exist at all. The ministry could be abolished and the whole work that the ministry is supposed to do would be an ongoing work.

There is no necessity for the superstructure of the ministry to do it. You, in this tricorn portfolio that you have, can just as easily have an odd conversation with your fellows in a similar field and in broader areas than what you presently enjoy. There is no reason to have this superadded structure in order to do that.

Mr. Singer: It would be easier on your health too. You wouldn't have to bounce from chair to chair.

Hon. Mr. Clement: That's a point.

Mr. Lawlor: We would like to hear very much about the whole field—this is point 6; it is going to take me a long time—of uniform store hours. That's a real clinker, isn't it?

Mr. Singer: Sunday laws too.

Mr. Lawlor: If you move this way, you might lose 10 votes. If you move that, you might gain 12. Which way are you going to move? You will have to jump like a cat. It's a hot tin roof.

Mr. Renwick: He's not. He is just going to leave it the way it is.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, he's not going to do a damn thing. He is going to sit back and smile.

Mr. Singer: He has still got a few more colours of papers he can bring in—red and pink and yellow papers.

Mr. Renwick: Actually, it is a federal government problem, he will say.

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Mr. Lawlor: Oh, yes.

Mr. Renwick: If only the federal government would alter the law.

Mr. Lawlor: We have a green paper on it. We have heard precious little and we would love to see what's going on. Some proposals have emanated from this side of the House, particularly from my colleague from Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy), with respect to a very sensible thing which you might weigh and consider in the process in these Thursday adjudications that you perform and from which, as I say, absolutely nothing seems to emanate. You are getting a darn sight more in the Justice portfolio from various members of the opposition, which you either disdain or adopt quickly, than from any kind of generation at source where we look to.

We come to what's becoming again something of a hoary old document, sitting around here gathering moss and rolling no stones. I am thinking of the fifth volume of the inquiry into civil rights by Mr. Justice McRuer. Just to bludgeon you a bit, I am going to take time during these estimates to read out the chapter headings just to see what you ain't done. It has all been sitting before you for many years now. What are your bright boys back there doing, the terror of the law profession? Everybody goes to the Court of Appeal and trembles in the face of the astute, scissor-minded, razor-edged members of the colloquium that you have backing you up there.

When it comes to drafting a little legislation and alleviating a lot of conditions—the Air Pollution Control Act, the Archeo-

logical and Historic Sites Protection Act and the athletic commissioner ain't been touched, the Farm Products Marketing Board is a sacrosanct body which no one must impinge on, particularly the superminister of justice; the fire marshal's department sits there awaiting attention. The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario was somewhat modified. That's the one thing that you have done.

The Liquor Control Board of Ontario is much talked about and we are beginning to get some minatory, sneaking legislation on some internal aspects of that, but not according to the doctrine of McRuer and what he proposes.

The Liquor Licence Board's procedures are abysmal in terms of what it does and its modes of hearing. Have you ever been down there? Have you ever tried to get a licence for a client? You must have when you were practising law, considering all those licences that just swamped Niagara Falls. They all have a little huddle in the corner as though it were some kind of football game, and they're not going to tell you what the signals are, because you may be on the other team. It's a most incredible performance.

Mr. Renwick: You can't hear a thing. They just sit at a table.

Mr. Lawlor: You can't hear a thing; the room is crowded with lawyers and people making application. You go up to a little table. It's as though we were going to have the estimates, but instead of me prating from here, I sit in front of you and whisper at you. I'd probably get through a little better than having to shout. That's the way the thing is performed; it's a real charade.

I wanted to find out what to say for my own purposes, so I sat there straining my ears—but not a word came, not an iota of life. When I finally got to the table myself, I thought the best thing probably was to shut up. Having reached that high estate of being able to whisper in the ear of the commissioner, I said to myself, "I am home free. I am not going to say a word." He smiled and I smiled. Then he said, "Good day." We walked out with the bloody licence, but I couldn't figure out why.

Mr. Renwick: Did you refund the fee?

Mr. Lawlor: No, I didn't refund the fee.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): It pays to keep your mouth shut.

Mr. Lawlor: My client was extremely well satisfied. He said, "If you'd opened your

damned mouth we would have lost it, I can tell you right now."

Then there's the Milk Commission of Ontario. What about the Milk Commission? Can't you move a little bit in that field? It's sitting there, palpitating, waiting for a little going over—not a body rub, just a little new legislation.

The mining commissioner is the most derelict person in the province; he sits in a hollow aerie, removed from all human contact, and you won't even speak to him. He's crying for a little conversation.

The Ontario Energy Board—well, I won't bother with that one. With Bob Macaulay in front of it all the time, earning vast fees, that's enough of an affliction for the Energy Board for one year, don't you think?

The Ontario Food Terminal Board I didn't even know existed until I read McRuer. You apparently don't know it exists yet, because you've done nothing about it.

The Ontario Highway Transport Board is an iniquitous institution eating at the vitals of our national life, handing out various forms of licensing and so on in the most questionable manner and with its internal workings all awry. Did you know that? Well, that's the case. Why don't you do something about it?

They all sit there waiting for a great Provincial Secretary of Justice, such as we're going to turn you into. Like Pygmalion, we're going to have to fashion you, because apparently nobody does anything on their own over there.

Mr. Singer: We haven't got enough time, for which I'm sorry.

Mr. Lawlor: The Ontario Hospital Services Commission, the Ontario Human Rights Commission, the Ontario Labour Relations Board—all wait your assiduous and subtle attention.

The Ontario Municipal Board—

Mr. Haggerty: There's one that you should do something about.

Mr. Renwick: There's one. There's the Minister of Labour.

Mr. Lawlor: It's been reviewed. There's also a report from this House, done by a select committee, giving added recommendations over and above these.

I hope the message is beginning to penetrate. I sincerely trust that I am beginning to get through, slightly.

The Ontario Securities Commission hasn't been revamped; it hasn't been changed. Then there is the Ontario Telephone Services Com-

mission, as well as the Ontario Water Resources Commission. There are all kinds of recommendations and comments with regard to their internal workings. I would also mention the Police Act and the Workmen's Compensation Board. Finally, there is the Proceedings Against the Crown Act, which I think we probably did do something about two years ago.

But there is a whole host of things which I thought would be worth mentioning. Why would a member of the opposition have to get up in this House and recite something which is common knowledge, which is before you every day of the week and which was submitted to you in the best of faith? Despite the rest of the report and the substantial measures you've adopted, you've allowed this particular field to remain hanging, dangling, inefficacious. I don't understand the lack of response. There has been a number of new Attorneys General, one after the other, each one less assiduous in his task, and less willing. I get the feeling that they are interim, that they are really transitory.

Have you got that feeling? If you have, then transit, and let's get somebody to do something with all this law that is awaiting. In the meantime, various injuries are being inflicted upon the people who appear before these numerous boards and commissions. The administrative law is defective—it's defective in gross part—or the report wouldn't be there. I think McRuer is much too sensitive, you know, to merely procedural matters; but it's a necessary portion of law. The substance of law is infinitely more important.

These people who get caught up in civil rights legislation always think, their argument is, that in the interstices—civil rights the basic law lies. If that's straightened out, all the rest will follow. That's not true. All the rest doesn't follow. As a matter of fact, what follows is a sense of complacency. "Look what we've done." And that's what followed in your case, in the case of your government.

You have moved, under Wishart, in many areas. And those were jubilant days, you know, the days we were working like slaves here; the legislation pouring out; we were in committee all the time; we were analysing; we were moving. It was a sense of something happening. It is very hard for a few members of the opposition to have to carry that kind of burden and lead. You, with your staff behind you, you are in a much more favourable position, and you should recognize that.

Nevertheless, if we are going to be here at all, and have a sense of fulfilling some kind of obligation to the public, then you have to initiate and we have to respond; and you are not initiating. And that gives a certain sense of fatigue and despondency over here. You are kind of lost in an underbrush. Nothing is happening.

That's not what we are here for. I can be doing something better out there. If you don't propose to do anything, and the justice ministries are stagnant, then all right, go and do something else. Life is too short and things are too important. There are too many injuries to be attended to, too many people who need help, to spend one's time in this vacuous chamber if there isn't any particular cause to be served, something that you can get your teeth into and do something about and see the law change.

I think maybe we are the only members who may feel this way, because we feel we are great participants in justice. We feel that we do have an input, that our voices are heard, that we do offer legislation, not just in some minor iota way, with the odd comma here and there. No; in a very deep way. And that has always been the rapport, as I have experienced in this House. Wishart would alter whole paragraphs without turning a hand, saying, "Yes, that's sensible," not standing on his grandeur or hauteur or sense of deportment or his portfolio, not at all. And you are that same kind of man; you'll do it.

Mr. Renwick: So would Bert Lawrence.

Mr. Lawlor: So would Bert. But I won't say anything about the rest; they wouldn't. But they didn't know the tradition, and they hadn't the sense of the interrelationship of the communication that took place in his field.

I want to resume that as long as we have in this House a sitting. As I say, we may be standing here only marking time while the Premier downstairs is marching up and down, perusing his options as the newest poll comes in. The poll may delight him at 3 o'clock this afternoon, and this all then becomes a somewhat insufferable exercise.

Mr. Singer: Judy might never be able to find out if there is violence in television.

Mr. Lawlor: All right. Yes, the eighth matter had to do with new concepts in dealing with criminal cases to which we have reverted. It was a great shame; it was indeed a great shame that you were ill at the latter

part of last fall. There was the whole field of advertising, substitutional advertising, the arguments with respect to class action. Again you showed a liberality of spirit during the thing, which of course couldn't be replaced by your deputy, even if he were in the least disposed to show it, which he wasn't. After you took ill, that unfair practices thing took a complete new shift. The whole atmosphere in that room changed; it became restrictive where there had been an opening up, a flowering and the legislation was taking scope.

I still think my friend from Riverdale was dead wrong on the whole real estate thing; he didn't know what the panel for the legislation was all about. But leaving that aside—

Mr. Renwick: Unfair practices in the real estate trade don't matter. As long as property interests are maintained inviolate, we socialists will stand together.

Mr. Singer: How did you con the committee to put that in for an hour?

Mr. Ruston: Some of his colleagues said that he didn't do it, though.

Mr. Lawlor: At the end of the day, we got a somewhat restrictive and truncated piece of legislation, which was a great shame. I would ask if you would take another look at it.

There's an enormous amount of work to be done in the field of consumer law. That is the second great field, after environmental law, that is evolving at a pace that most members of the profession can't maintain.

The third field in which you don't really have much to do either, I suspect, is the field of poverty law. After all, in every law school in the province now there are special courses in this field, which is novel over against our days in law school. Nobody ever dreamed or talked about going to serve the poor when one came out; you were going to serve the wealthiest client that you could drag out of the bramble bush. But that's not the way any more because of the broadening perspective taking place.

There are good things taking place in the world. While you see a lot of viciousness and perhaps an increasing sense of violence, on the other hand there is an intermingling in all that of a greater graciousness and a deeper sense of sharing than has ever before existed in this wretched civilization.

What about the racetrack field? How can you have these particular estimates without even one word about that? Consider the cost to the public purse of Lawrence gallivanting over the face of the earth and looking at the

rear ends of racehorses, then this voluminous report is presented and sits on our desks. It surveys the horse-racing industry from Guatemala to Dubuque, and nothing has happened.

Mr. Singer: They discovered some farmers have class B tracks and they don't want to interfere with them.

Mr. Lawlor: Is that a field where the Tories are going to lose a lot of votes?

Mr. Singer: They think so. Ray Connell tells them that.

Mr. Lawlor: Is that right? I suppose there are people who might be offended if you set up these governmental-run computer betting shops around the city and, therefore, you might lose the odd vote here and there, over against maintaining the whole clientele of the bookies, the touts and that very under-world element which spawns it. It's a cheap breeding ground of crime, and it's all held in the private sector.

Do you respect free enterprise so much that you want to prevent laws coming in that might take the touts out of operation?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order: I hesitate to interrupt my friend but I don't see a quorum here.

Mr. Chairman ordered that the bells be rung for four minutes.

Mr. Lawlor: You notice, Mr. Chairman, the fairly large number of opposition members and the relative scarcity of Tories. If this quorum call wasn't met, it wouldn't have been met for very good reasons just as the other day. We expect you Tories to supply at least 15 members in this House at all times. If you are not prepared to do that you are going to get some of these embarrassing quorum things.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): With you bellowing it is cruel punishment you are talking about.

Mr. Lawlor: That is the least you can do out of 74 members. We don't come in here to supply your quorums for you to keep this House going.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Will the member for Lakeshore proceed?

Mr. Lawlor: It is government business we are attending to.

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): Let's not fool around with percentages.

Mr. Lawlor: The racetrack field.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: I think we came to the conclusion that was a vote-losing one and therefore absolutely nothing was going to be done. We've come to the same conclusion on the previous nine, I think, and very little can be expected pending the announcement which we all await.

How about a Bill of Rights? My friend from Riverdale has been asking for a Bill of Rights in this province for a long time. You moved on the ombudsman finally, after numerous urgings, in order to get some favourable publicity on the eve, and that's fine.

Mr. Renwick: They haven't done it yet.

Mr. Lawlor: No, we haven't seen it yet.

Mr. Singer: Talking about it.

Mr. Lawlor: We're anticipating.

Mr. Renwick: That's equivalent to being done for the Tories.

Mr. Lawlor: Don't you think, in these weekly colloquies you have, you might get down to talking about a Bill of Rights for Ontario? I think that's spelling it out. We are thinking of a number of Bills of Rights for various segments of the population.

No. 12: Nothing has been done for over a year now—18 months—on the whole vast problem on which we spent so much time to so little purpose, the problems of privacy and computers. I would expect that with the research ministry, the ministry mulling these problems, once in a while some kind of statement might come out and you would distribute among at least members of the judicial committee and all the rest who may be interested some kind of observation—not partisan, not committing yourself to anything—showing that ongoing work and thought is developing in this field.

You are aware of the impingements of a modern technological civilization upon human's rights, how they move in constantly, how it becomes more and more on the present, how the whole instrumentality grinds us down and would flood us if we aren't aware and aren't constantly reacting in the whole area of vigilance. Are you being vigilant? We have no assurance that you are aware, or staying up to date, or what input you are getting, or what papers you receive,

or what you do at all in that area or, for that matter, in any area.

What are you doing in the area of the Competition Act? You remember the very considerable debate initiated by, again, the member from Riverdale in this field; largely a field having to do with federal policy, true, but with enormous implications for the Province of Ontario, upon which you took a stand—I can't remember whether it was you personally but in any event, it was a negative and obtuse stand, a destructive stand with respect to the policy.

Again, such is the power of Ontario, and such is the power of our ministers that when they speak conclusively, in a categorical way, about any subject under the sun, they do alter Ottawa. They do. And why should it always be always for the worst; always destructive; bringing in positive legislation which is going to have some fulfilling effect or shaping effect in controlling the economy and giving it direction, and you are just decimated with a machine gun. Then they immediately cave in. They always give in to you. So don't tell me in this House that the provincial government is ignored by Ottawa. In every field which I think is important, when you speak you speak with a sword and you draw blood. This is an area which I would like to hear a little bit more about.

What are you doing on the whole range of constitutional questions? I mean, not just with respect to Indian affairs, the role of the Indians say in Ontario, native people's rights? That is an ongoing, evolving and developing field, too, in which we over here are particularly concerned about. The nice balances on price control; what role or influence or what weight can we bring to bear in this province on the inflationary thing, over against multinational and interprovincial corporations.

What is under our constitution? It's not spelled out. It has to be worked over.

We have come to the conclusion, on our interpretation, which we think is pretty shrewd, of the British North America Act that you have plenary powers in this regard, with respect to provincial rights over intraprovincial trade and commerce problems. But do we get any fill-in? Do we get any dialogue back and forth about the matter? Do we know how you feel about it, except again to do nothing and say nothing?

Whether you propose to move into these fields or not is a secondary question. That's a question of political policy. Ours is a question of law at the moment, in which you, being the chief law officer, have a mighty role to play. You are not playing it.

You are failing in your responsibility. Minister after minister is failing. Why is it? Why do democracies fail? Because ministers of the Crown find it is the most easeful thing to do nothing. They get away with it for a long time, and it brings dividends in esconement in office. But there is a point where it begins to work like a maggot in the fabric of society, where moves that must be made are not made because of timidity, because they are afraid. When that fear, the fear of moving, possesses that government it is finished. Not only is it finished, because it will show through in cracks, in the crevices, but it will also be finished in the sense of an internal rot and a kind of dislocation.

This is what some of us fear is happening over there. If you want, like Horatio at the bridge, to put your bony shoulder to the buttress and hold the thing for a little while longer, there you have a task cut out for you.

Mr. Renwick: I don't think that is what Horatio did; not the shoulder to the buttress.

Mr. Lawlor: Isn't that what Horatio did?

Mr. Renwick: I think you mean the Dutch boy and the finger in the dyke; not Horatio.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, whatever Horatio did at that damn bridge.

Hon. Mr. Clement: He was a dentist.

Mr. Singer: The member for Riverdale should take him outside and give him a few lessons in parables.

Mr. Lawlor: No. 15, you have set up an advisory committee with respect to practice and procedure. I would like to know a little bit about it. I believe it's an ongoing thing. We have the first volume at least of the Osler task force on legal aid. This would be a more worthwhile subject just as the other one would be when we get into the Justice estimates proper. I won't dwell on that today. I think many of the recommendations of Osler should be immediately moved into but, as I say, we'll abide that particular event.

Mr. Renwick: What for? The Attorney General?

Mr. Lawlor: For the Attorney Generalship. The Law Reform Commission has slowed up along with you. I think they have slowed up because of you.

Mr. Singer: They are frustrated.

Mr. Lawlor: They get totally frustrated.

Mr. Singer: Yes, nobody pays any attention to them anymore.

Mr. Lawlor: They have all these reports sitting around and nothing is being done. What's the point of producing novel law simply to have it obfuscate in some corner of your department? You've slowed them down too, one of the most vital sources of law in this province. Look at the areas that have to be covered. The whole contract law has to be resuscitated.

Mr. Renwick: The whole of women's rights.

Mr. Lawlor: The whole of women's rights and the master-servant relationship. The law of estoppel is in the state of terrible flux without any particular definition. There is the law on unjust enrichment, which is the golden crevice of contract law. There is a possibility of opening up remedial measures and not being hogtied by all these arcane rules of evidence and the internal rules with respect to contractual rights upon the whole field of unjust enrichment. I'd love to see a report of the Law Reform Commission on unjust enrichment and its evolving concept.

I recommend to you, by the way, in this particular regard—and I'll come back to it during the Justice estimates—a book by Lord Alfred Denning called, "The Changing Law." It's getting pretty old, but most of the things that he says are changing in "The Changing Law" ain't changed in Ontario. That book was 1953.

Mr. Renwick: Denning has recently denounced that book as a radical pamphlet.

Mr. Lawlor: He did?

We are disappointed over here that you haven't moved on no-fault insurance. All these law things, these meetings going on in the province, the turbulence there was about 10 months ago are all washed over. I suppose there is oil on the waters and you're the one who put the oil there. That's a form of pollution, oil on waters. If it catches fire again, it will have very grave, detrimental effects to yourself and to this whole province and to the people who are anticipating some kind of action.

We are concerned about the report on credit unions of the select committee of this House and what you've done through past years. This is the one thing that each

seriatim Attorney General has done. These reports came out almost immediately. They were reviewed within the thing. A task force perhaps was set up to assess it; turn it into law. It came out of one end and it immediately got attention. I know there are particular problems with respect to its trust funds and the way in which—

Mr. Renwick: There is really only one problem.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, really only one problem. As I understand that problem, it has been cleared away too. Why isn't there anything before us? It's getting to be two or three years now since that report was submitted and there is no reason in the world why it shouldn't get action. We submitted a report last year, and I trust that we'll get our final report on trust corporations into this House before the election is called. It's being printed at the present moment. That's in the laps of the gods. More importantly than the gods, it's in the hands of the printers and we are waiting on that. But we had mergers, consolidations and amalgamations before you.

My friend, the member for Riverdale, tells me that in the Securities Act, which is not going forward apparently, there were a few clauses embodying some of the recommendations contained in that report. Nothing further has been done. That required very slugging hard work—no one knows it better than you; you were the chairman during the thing. Nothing has happened.

It is cumulative. My point in this little speech is not to say you have faulted here, you are deficient there, you are inadequate here and you have not moved there—that is not the point. That is understandable; you can't do everything. The problem here is that you don't do nothing in area after area. It is just a cumulative sense of ennui.

Hon. Mr. Clement: That double negative makes me think I was very positive.

Mr. Lawlor: I used the double negative to try to emphasize the point.

Hon. Mr. Clement: I see. I hope you feel better.

Mr. Lawlor: All right. I've got a particular little beef about the Petty Trespass Act and that sort of thing and the use made of it by Dominion Stores and other people against picketers, etc.

These wretched people set up themselves on public plazas and invite the general public

to come and buy their wares from them. When the people come for the purposes of pointing out the kind of inequities the stores perpetrate on other human beings, by walking up and down and saying so in terms of free speech, they have the impact of that wretched, out-of-date, archaic and anachronistic statute thrust upon them. Take a look at that thing; even the very wording in it. I won't read it to the House but I had some kind of mollicoddle reply from the former Attorney General on this particular thing. I thought it the Attorney General's letter of July 23, 1974, when I brought these remarks to his attention was a disgrace. As I say I won't read it because it is the usual mild, mellifluous stuff saying somehow the law has to be enforced; somehow the law is a very vital thing en masse. Yes, it is in favour of entrenched interests and great financial power. It is not in favour of those who go and put themselves out to speak for their brothers in California. In Montreal these days they are using the mandatory injunction procedure in order to achieve their ends by another means. I trust that if they try that in Ontario you will be very aware of what is taking place.

You talked about the new federal court. You must be concerned in your ministry, in your discussions, as to what its role and function is going to be and whether you have managed, along with your fellow Attorneys General, to scotch it because when they had this meeting here last year that was one of the things which was irritating them in the statement of a speech made by your deputy not so long ago. Frank Callaghan on Jan. 6, 1975, made some remarks touching on this subject.

May I just question you on a legal point? On reading one of the statutes and I don't remember which one—it just came to my head; the Public Authorities Protection Act or something—doesn't it say—I don't want to exclude Frank from anything; come to my surprise party—isn't it the law of the province that deputy ministers and members of the civil service are unable to speak in public on the minister's behalf? Only the minister can do so or his parliamentary secretary? I am sure I can produce a text for you that says that, literally.

I happen to think you should look at it because if any ministry is going to have to obey the law it is your own ministry. If the law needs changing, then change it.

Hon. Mr. Clement: Does the member want me to answer that?

Mr. Lawlor: I am sure all I have to do is phone your department and I get the text and verse taken right from the Talmud every time so they know what I am talking about in this particular regard. If you want further information I will seek to supply it.

Police commissioners. The member for Downsview has said enough about that for the moment.

Gun control. Do you have a role in that? It is very important. Some kind of palavering statements have been made about it, but very little is done.

You have moved in no regard with respect to what my friend, the member for Riverdale, mentioned earlier: the rights of women. To me, this is marital law, but not just in the field of property or the juvenile areas— and all those volumes that concern these reports. In the specific area, you are playing that one out—arent you? In terms of doing anything before the election or before moving at all, it's being left to float. It's in abeyance.

We have before us now the Expropriations Act. I trust you will move on it with fair certainty—and you made a minor amendment the other day with respect to it. That certainly needs some review.

The final thing I am going to mention at the moment—and it is not the end of my speech; it is just about the middle—is the area of limitations law. You know that the programme "Ombudsman" on the CBC on Sunday night has done some yeoman service with regard to pointing out the various injuries inflicted by this, again, wretched ancient law where people are cut off.

I will be writing you shortly on a particular case, too—you know, the Collins case. You know about it. Here is a fellow who won his case in the Supreme Court of Ontario and then some bright fellow—would that some people weren't quite so bright; a little more humane—discovers in the Public Authorities Act a time limitation of three years. Under the regular negligence law—

Hon. Mr. Clement: Six months.

Mr. Lawlor: Six months, all right. You have to sue the Crown or take action against the local health authority within six months. He, of course, had failed to do that. Therefore, the whole of the operation was washed out. And are you offering him any compensation? Are you seeking to do anything for this man?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: You have got a line about limitations in your speech, but you don't mention the excellent report of the Law Reform Commission on it.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, that's what I want to talk about. Here we have a very fat report with all kinds of recommendations.

Mr. Singer: And a good one too.

Mr. Lawlor: I am not going to flagellate you on this particular point. All I am seeking to do is to precipitate you into some form of action. The previous ministers have had this report. I suppose that one is four or five years old now. It's an area where a great deal of harm is being done.

For weeks, "Ombudsman" presented case after case—not just in this jurisdiction, necessarily—but in Ontario, too. The recommendations call for some alleviations, some review power, some ability by a judge using discretion to give alleviation from that particular—

Mr. Chairman: Would it be a convenient time now for the member for Lakeshore to adjourn the debate?

Mr. Lawlor: I would be quite pleased.

Hon. Mr. Clement: I would like to speak to the member for Lakeshore before he bursts forth from the House today.

Hon. Mr. Clement moves the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: I beg to inform the House that in the name of Her Majesty the Queen, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor has been pleased to assent to certain bills in her chambers.

ROYAL ASSENT

Clerk of the House: The following are the titles of the bills to which Her Honour has assented:

Bill 3, An Act to regulate Political Party Financing and Election Contributions and Expenses.

Bill 22, the Representation Act, 1975.

Bill 31, An Act to amend the Succession Duty Act.

Bill 32, An Act to amend the Gift Tax Act, 1972.

Bill 35, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act.

Bill 36, An Act to amend the Corporations Tax Act, 1972.

Bill 38, An Act to amend the Ministry of Culture and Recreation Act, 1974.

Bill 43, An Act to amend the Expropriations Act.

Bill 59, An Act to amend the Forestry Act.

Bill Pr11, An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines.

Bill Pr12, An Act respecting Sheridan Place.

Bill Pr12, An Act respecting the Township of Goulbourn.

Bill Pr14, An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

Bill Pr25, An Act respecting the Township of Bruce.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the House, I would like to say that the estimates of the Ministry of Community and Social Services will be held in committee on Monday. In the chamber we will consider, first, item No. 10 and then No. 9, and return to the estimates of the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. Clement).

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to:

The House adjourned at 1 o'clock, p.m.

ERRATA

No.	Page	Col.	Line	Should read:
33	1333	—	35	The suppliers' incremental cost plus an equal share of the savings.
33	1333	—	39	5. The interconnection agreements provide for interchange of surplus interruptible power
33	1334	—	24	1965 68,040 28,265 309,668 1,426 407,399 1,831
35	1370	2	54	Hon. Mr. Davis: Fortunately, this legis-

CONTENTS

Friday, May 2, 1975

Political activity of civil servants, statement by Mr. Meen	1449
University grants, statement by Mr. Auld	1451
National transportation policy, statement by Mr. Rhodes	1451
Ontario study on Quebec separation, question of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Breithaupt	1453
Mercury pollution, question of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Breithaupt	1453
Home buyer grant, questions of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Deans	1453
Mirrors on cars towing trailers, question of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Breithaupt	1454
National transportation policy, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Ruston, Mr. Foulds, Mr. Reid	1455
Status of physically disabled persons, question of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Lewis	1457
Political activity of civil servants, questions of Mr. Meen: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Deans	1458
Lawrence Heights Community Centre, question of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Singer	1459
Staff for associations for the mentally retarded, question of Mrs. Birch: Mr. Foulds	1459
Lynwood Ave. Enterprises Ltd., question of Mr. Irvine: Mrs. Campbell	1460
Health and safety hazards at Elliot Lake, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Martel, Mr. Reid	1460
Windsor provincial public building, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. B. Newman	1460
Removal of red glass from legislative star, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Bounsall	1461
Reforestation programme, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Reid	1462
Working hours for truck drivers, question of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Burr	1462
New home assessment delay, question of Mr. Meen: Mr. Ruston	1463
Smoking ban in industry, question of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Deans	1463
Ontario Energy Corp., question of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Haggerty	1463
Subsidized dining for members, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Germa	1464
Report, administration of justice committee, Mr. Ewen	1464
Third readings	1464
Estimates, Provincial Secretariat for Justice, Mr. Clement	1464
Royal assent to certain bills, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor	1483
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to	1484
Errata	1484

JOURNALS AND PROCEDURAL RESEARCH BRANCH
DIRECTION DES JOURNAUX ET DES RECHERCHES EN PROCEDURE
ROOM 1640, WHITNEY BLOCK
QUEEN'S PARK, TORONTO, ON M7A 1A2

